2022

Non reporting of Sexual Victimization in Male Prisoners

CHRISTOPHER ELLIOTT
Walden University

Walden University

College of Psychology and Community Services

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Christopher D. Elliott

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Jana Price-Sharps, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Scott Gfeller, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Victoria Latifses, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

Non reporting of Sexual Victimization in Male Prisoners

by

Christopher D. Elliott

MA, Monmouth University, 2011

BA, The College of New Jersey, 2009

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2022

Abstract

Sexual assault within prisons continues to occur despite federally mandated safety protocols and reporting procedures. Male inmates must also navigate the challenge of upholding societal gender norms to meet the ideal of hegemonic masculinity as identified in Gender Order Theory. Seven formerly incarcerated males were interviewed for this study. The interviews were designed to explore four relevant topical points which explored the roles that stereotypical/hegemonic masculinity traits play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration. 2) The role gender roles stress/conflict play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration 3) The impact that identifying as male has on individuals who are sexually victimized during incarceration. 4) Other aspects of identity that might prevent the individual from reporting the victimization. Participant responses were transcribed and analyzed using NVivo to extract patterns and meaning from the participant responses. The participants' answers revealed that both the culture of silence within prisons and reporting process itself appear to be barriers to the reporting of sexual assault within prison. Participant responses also seem to reflect that the specific negative gender-based connotations of male sexual assault are effective in causing harm to the victim and keeping them subordinate. This research shows the need for positive social change including gender teachings, prison cultural framework, and to the current structure of reporting sexual assault within prisons, in order to protect incarcerated males from the harmful elements of the gender socialization, prison culture, and the perceived inability to safely and effectively report being sexual assaulted during incarceration.

Non reporting of Sexual Victimization in Male Prisoners

by

Christopher D. Elliott

MA, Monmouth University, 2011

BA, The College of New Jersey, 2009

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2022

Acknowledgments

I must first thank my chair, Dr. Jana Price-Sharps, who demonstrated belief in me and continued to support me through one of the greatest challenges I had the fortune to experience in the journey to my Doctorate. I would also like to thank my second committee member, Dr. Gfeller, and my URR, Dr. Victoria Latifses who also offered guidance and insight throughout this process.

I would be terribly remiss if I did not thank the professors in my graduate and undergraduate programs - the inspiration and information that they provided me with is a substantial part of why I chose higher education and, ultimately, to improve myself in hopes of leaving the world better for my time in it.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The struggle for gender equality has seen major recognition in 2018 with the growth of a movement in known as the #MeToo movement (Johnson & Hawbaker, 2018). Occurring mostly on social media, the #MeToo callsign is used by individuals to indicate that they have suffered abuse or unfair treatment, typically by a male. Some who identify as male have joined, expressing that they have also suffered sexual abuse or unfair treatment due to their gender (Dutton & White, 2013; Rosin, 2014; Blum, 2016; Associated Press, 2018). This trend may be new to social media, but the concept of a male abusing others with their power is not a new concept; it has a name: hegemonic masculinity. The basic premise of hegemonic masculinity is that it represents "those attitudes and practices among males that perpetuate gender inequality, involving both men's domination over women and the power of some men over other (often minority groups of) men" (Connell, 1987, in Jewkes, et al., 2015, p. S113). As the discussion of hegemonic masculinity grew in the public eye via the #MeToo movement, the American Psychological Association released a report called *Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Boys and Men* (2018) which includes best practices for working with the male gender due to the different needs of males based on specific social and cultural influences. With this study, I sought to explicate the role of hegemonic masculinity regarding the sexual victimization of incarcerated males to, first, better understand behaviors of nonreporting and then use the findings to address this problem in U.S. prisons.

Background

Jewkes et al. (2015) contend that hegemonic masculinity is more than simply a passive or active oppressive mechanism; rather, it is reflective of specific and general social norms of most or all cultures, and a collective project (Donaldson, 1993; Jewkes et al., 2015). This social mechanism is made more complex by the concept of multiple masculinities (Connell, 2016), that have a hierarchical structure subordinating men into groups, including marginalized individuals or groups, some of which are victimized by men in a dominant group (Connell, 2016). Hegemonic, as a socially constructed and oppressive mechanism, is emboldened by myths about male sexual victimization and victim blaming.

For the purposes of this research, *male sexual victimization* is defined by the Prison Rape Elimination Act ([PREA], Public Law 108-79, 2003), Rosin (2014), and Hammond et al. (2016) as all unwanted sexual contact, coercion, or content, including but not limited to unwanted and nonconsensual: (a) rape; (b) sexual assault (touching) of any kind; (c) aggravated sexual assault (exchange of bodily fluids or penetration of any type); (d) sexual harassment (verbal) of any kind, including comments, innuendo, sexual drawings/writings, threats, demands, comments, promises/deals, and/or coercion, of any kind, that are sexual in nature; (e) stalking for sexual purposes/voyeurism; and/or (f) the use of any substance to induce within an individual a state of defenselessness against any of the aforementioned actions. All of these actions include being penetrated and being made to penetrate (Penland, 2015).

Research has shown that when males are sexually victimized, they are blamed in a different way, compared to females (Hammond et al., 2016), because males are expected to be strong and able to defend themselves (Jewkes et al., 2015; Wilson & Scarpa, 2017). Furthermore, when males are victimized by a female, they are seen as less than a man or accused of wanting the sexual activity (Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Hammond et al., 2016). Male rape myths, and myths of male sexual victimization, seem to stand as significant barriers to reporting sexual victimization by males. These myths, and the assumed status and abilities of males both socially and as a gender, are socially constructed and ultimately used against the male victim (Hammond, et al., 2016). Numerous authors (Ratele, 2013; Connell, 2015; Jewkes et al., 2015; Connell, 2016) suggest that this is not simply an issue of local culture, but rather a result of modern practices based on colonial gender systems, including the idea that male gender status is one way that individuals may see the world such that only the knowledge held and transmitted by males is perceived as factual. Hegemonic masculinity, fundamentally, creates social norms that tell the individual that reporting is done by the weak, just as is being victimized (Kubiak et al. 2016).

Overall, male sexual victimization is an underreported and under-researched phenomenon (Javaid, 2017a; Javaid, 2017b; Kubiak et al., 2016; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017). Even now, many researchers of sexual assault and sexual victimization often do not fully address or include male victims, leading some researchers to ask for a gender-neutral definition of sexual assault (Rosin, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). Of the existing research, only an exiguous amount addresses potential correlates

between male sexual victimization and reporting or underreporting the assault. Much of this oversight is tied to social constructs of masculinity (found largely in male rape myths) and, subsequently, an acceptance of these roles socially (Hammond et al., 2016). Kubiak et al. (2016) argue that reporting (sexual assault) is a decision influenced by many factors, including "the beliefs and attitudes of the culture" of which the individual is a part (p. 94). Moreover, Kubiak et al. (2016) posit that the physical location in which a person resides, such as a college or prison, has institutional barriers and policies that further influence reporting.

In settings of incarceration, the sexual assault of males is seemingly accepted as either inevitable, acceptable, or both (Javaid, 2017b). Male prisoners who are victims of sexual abuse are attacked not only by other prisoners, but by staff as well (Beck et al., 2014). The institutional response to the sexual assault of male prisoners was lacking until Congress created the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) in 2003. Furthermore, there is research on and discussion of constitutional violations by institutions of incarceration under considerations of deliberate indifference and cruel and unusual punishment; additionally, debate on the role of Eighth Amendment in these situations have been discussed for many years (Ng, 2014; Penland, 2015;). But male sexual victimization is not simply a political situation, nor is it a problem that belongs to one country, region, or even sociocultural instances. Kubiak et al. (2016) report that almost 150,000 instances of sexual victimization of males in prison occur each year in the United States. Due to this statistic, they assert the correctional setting poses unique challenges and that it may be

possible that prisoners reporting sexual victimization may be the group with the lowest reporting rate of all men.

The concept of *carceral spaces*, which Moran (2014) defined as spaces of bodily control, wherein the individuals are subject to experiences that transcend or move across one physical setting to the next (e.g., from prison to the community), thereby inscribing an experience on an individual, typically one of stigma and altered identity. The social norms, expectations, and hierarchies of prisons are therefore subsequently compounded across experiences – the social construction of the male gender makes its way into the prison setting, where it will become part of a variant of hegemonic masculinity and alter the individual once more after they release from prison; this is vital, as Carberry (2017) asserts that various performances of masculinity, including hegemonic masculinity, is demonstrated in institutions, such as prison. Furthermore, Michalski (2017) offered a sociological and ethnographic examination of how violence in carceral spaces is dependent on and reinforces patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity, thereby perpetuating the very cycle that hegemonic masculinity seeks to maintain. See Appendix A for an annotated bibliography of core research informing the study.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to better understand the correlates of why men who have a history of incarceration do not report sexual victimization that occurred in prison, and to then effect change via insight into this phenomenon. The PREA was established by the United States government in 2003, and current research is conducted largely on the foundation of PREA; this act was meant to address male sexual victimization that

occurs in prisons and included the creation of avenues and procedures that made reporting victimization easier. Leith (2017) reports that across the public in the United States and the United Kingdom, between 12.5% and 15% of males report being sexually victimized, and some not until a year or more after the assault. Leith (2017) then discusses that gender roles, as social constructs, may play a significant role in the decision not to report victimization. Furthermore, Ricciardelli (2015) found that prison masculinities were exaggerations of the social construct "of masculinity evident in larger society" (p. 170). In their research using ecological theory and reporting barriers, Kubiak et al. (2016) have determined that the factors that enable individuals to report and those that function as barriers to reporting, particular to carceral settings, are ill-defined and need further research.

Significance

Sexual victimization in males is still an underreported and understudied phenomenon (Ioannou, et al., 2016; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017). Prisoners are a vulnerable population (some vulnerable to the very men and women charged with watching over them) and are more so if they have been victimized as children or if they are mentally ill (Dutton & White, 2013; McLean, 2013; Nielsen, 2017; Turchik, 2017). This research fills a gap in research and understanding between sexual victimization in male prisoners and the reasons why those individuals do not report male sexual abuse. The significance of this research is in the elucidation of barriers that are socially created and taught to males throughout their lifespan and in the expansion of research on male sexual victimization, specifically in U.S. prisons. Male sexual victimization, in general, is

an underreported phenomenon, thus leaving the victims to further suffer in silence (Kubiak et al, 2016).

Male prisoners are a vulnerable population and victimization of these individuals is also understudied (Navarro & Clevenger, 2016). This research illuminates mechanisms that pose a risk to the health and well-being of those individuals. The United Nations has identified prison rape as torture and has created the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT; which the United States has not ratified or signed) that contains broad protocols to ensure the health and well-being of prisoners, viewed as vulnerable and marginalized, and to hold institutions accountable for what happens to prisoner within their walls (Ashmont, 2014).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical basis for this research was Raewyn Connell's gender order theory, specifically hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1982; Connell et al., 1987). This theory describes masculinity as a dynamic construct that is varied depending on time, culture, and individuals. Hegemonic masculinity, which is a precise enactment of male dominance over others in society, stems from cultural hegemony, which has roots in Marxist theory (Dutton & White, 2013; Ricciardelli, 2015; Javaid, 2016; Juan, et al., 2017). Looking at the imbalances in gender and maleness specifically, this theory not only sees the constraints that stereotypical gender roles place on males, but also identifies possible reasons why men would not identify themselves as victims and moreover victims of sexual abuse; specifically, this theory informed my research analysis on why male prisoners may choose to not report being sexually victimized.

Those involved in male sexual victimization that occurs in prison are subject to the mechanisms of gender and specifically hegemonic masculinity, stemming from the social creation and expectations of gender (Javaid, 2016; Nielsen, 2017; Wilson & Scarpa, 2017) as it breeches the walls of the prison to permeate the culture within. Furthermore, Kubiak et al. (2016) have outlined that the influence of rape myths (attached to gender) needs to be examined in a carceral context at both the individual and macrosystem levels. Connell's theory allows for a nuanced examination of gender identity and behaviors, both sociologically and socially, and the dynamic components of gender order theory allow for a robust exploration of both male behavior generally, and masculinized behavior in an oppressive milieu.

Research Questions

The two main topics addressed by this study were (a) barriers to reporting sexual victimization (while incarcerated) and (b) the role of hegemonic masculinity in reporting practices. Four research questions drove this study:

Research Question 1: What roles do stereotypical/hegemonic masculinity traits play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration?

Research Question 2: What roles does gender role stress/conflict play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration?

Research Question 3: What impact does identifying as male have on individuals who are sexually victimized during incarceration?

Research Question 4: What other aspects of identity might prevent the individual from reporting the victimization?

Nature of the Study

Qualitative research seeks to examine phenomena with an approach that is naturalistic, that is, by looking at behaviors in natural setting as opposed to a constructed environment, such as a constructed laboratory setting. The idea is to understand the phenomena through the experience and perspective of the research participant, hence I interviewed individuals who were formerly incarcerated. The research contained open-ended questions designed to elicit responses about reporting behaviors, perceived challenges to reporting, resiliency factors (factors that helped them report), and gender identity; opportunity for participants to identify reasons why they did not report sexual victimization, if any, was also provided. Participants who had been incarcerated were asked about their experiences and perceptions into prison and gender identity, and the reporting process, among other topics.

The qualitative data collected was categorized and coded. Behaviors, themes, key phrases, and patterns were identified and connected with barriers to reporting and facets of hegemonic masculinity. Participants were asked to discuss why they would or would not report a victimization had they experienced or witnessed one, and why they did or did not report any sexual victimization that they witnessed another person experience (if any). Participants were also asked to expand on communication in prison, the impact of sexual assaults on incarcerated individuals, and the role of assaults within prison life. Participants were not asked about any of their own experiences of being assaulted or

sexually assaulting others, only to discuss what they perceived as barriers to reporting such things.

Limitations to this Study

This study faced several limitations that may impact its generalizability. First, this research included seven participants, which may result in little representation of the experiences of the larger prison population. Second, this sample was drawn from the Pacific Northwest, which is culturally different from other parts of the country and other countries, thus representing only a portion of beliefs and practices. Third, due to the nature of the study and the questions, participants may not have given accurate answers to avoid being thought of a particular way or reliving a difficult experience. Fourth, this research occurred during a time of limited social contact, but if data had been collected via a website or some other method limiting direct contact, the participants may not have been appropriate for the study (e.g., a female inmate answering as though she were a male). Lastly, it is important to note that I had worked in a prison and am subject to bias due to my experiences when interpreting data once collected.

Types and Sources of Data

Seven male participants who had a history of incarceration were recruited for this research using nonprobability, purposive sampling; specifically, I used a process of self-selected sampling, as the participants directly responded to advertisements that requested participants with the specific trait of previous incarceration. Flyers calling for participants, with permission, were displayed at probation offices, housing units (halfway houses, transitional housing, post-release housing) and facilities (retail stores, coffee

houses, staffing agencies) that were located near the probation offices and housing units. Flyers included general information about the study and participants needed (males who were previously incarcerated). The flyers contained information for the participant to sign up for the research interview, as well as a disclaimer about the nature of the study, including the times and dates of interview sessions, informed consent for research participants, and information on local counseling and support services. Similarly, social media was used for this same purpose, as this is a primary source of information for many people, and the research was conducted during a time of limited contact (COVID pandemic).

The total interview time ranged between 20 and 60 minutes. When the interviews were completed, data was analyzed to identify reasons that sexual victimization may not have been reported.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Literature Search Strategy

Literature for this study was acquired several ways. First, peer-reviewed journal articles were the primary sources of information for this research. These articles were predominantly dated between 2015 and 2020, though earlier articles were used as primary sources or if they provided a poignant insight or result not found in more recent articles. The Walden University's electronic library database was used to access literature databases, including ERIC, SAGE Journals, Thoreau Multi-Database Search, Psychology Databases individual and combined search (PsycARTICLES, PsycBOOKS, PsycEXTRA, and PsycINFO); EBSCOhost, ProQuest Psychology Journals, ResearchGate, Springer, and several relevant journals of the APA. Google Scholar was also utilized with the same date and peer-reviewed parameters. Relevant news articles that were found online or in magazines or other publications were utilized as I came across them, or via other references. Reference lists in primary sources and journal articles were used and cross-referenced for efficiency in saturation, and some authors, such as Connell or Javaid, provided many leads and rich bibliographic sources.

Some of the primary search terms used in this literature search strategies included: *Hegem*, male victimization, male sexual victimization, prison* and *(male) sexual victimization, male reporting, PREA, rape myths, homosoc*, Eighth Amendment, prison rape, gender norms* and *prison, reporting* and *barrier, sexual assault* and *male victim*, male victim** and *mascul** and *prison*. Other specific and related terms were used, but not

exhaustively or to saturation: *importation, carceral,* and *male rape*. Many of these terms were used in conjunction with each other.

An asterisk was used as a Boolean operator to help provide more results efficiently; for example, *Hegem** could be *hegemonic* or *hegemony*. In many of the searches, multiple searches were conducted with related words, such as p*rison* and *male sexual victimization*, and *carcer** and *male sexual victimization,* again for efficiency and intent to reach literature saturation quicker. Similarly, similar terms that such as *male sexual victimization* and *sexual victimization* were both conducted in multiple searches, though they may have yielded quite different results.

Theoretical Foundation

In 1985, Carrigan, Connell, and Lee wrote the following sentence: "The political meaning of writing about masculinity turns mainly on its treatment of power" (p. 552). In 2006, Tarana Burke began using the phrase "Me too" with sexual assault survivors, a phrase which later became the #MeToo movement when the phrase with a hashtag went viral in 2017 ("An activist, a little girl", 2017). Today, when a story of sexual abuse and victimization surfaces on a social media platform, other users of that platform can add the tag #MeToo to indicate that they have also suffered some form of sexual abuse (the tag can be used to search for stories connected to it on the social media platforms) and as a rallying cry that the victims are not alone (Johnson & Hawbaker, 2018). A common thread in this movement is that the abusers are almost overwhelmingly male. There is much debate about why this may be, but the current sweeping across this dialogue represents hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity has been defined by Connell

(1987) as a concept that represents those attitudes and practices among men that perpetuate gender inequality, involving both men's domination over women and the power of some men over other (often minority groups of) men (Jewkes et al., 2015). Hegemonic masculinity is now being addressed in television advertisements (e.g., Gillette), psychological guidelines (American Psychological Association [APA], 2018), and has even been the topic of a recent awards ceremony held by the United Arab Emirates, wherein the country was recognizing individuals for gender equality; apropos of this discussion, it should be noted that all of the recipients were male ("UAE gender equality awards...", 2019).

While the hegemonic masculinity has been conceptualized in different ways over the years, Connell and Messerschmidt revisited the concept in 2005, creating important groundwork from the original conception of hegemonic masculinity in 1983. Hegemonic masculinity has grown from the concept of gender performance enacted through male bodies (see Nayak, 2006) to the full and complex structure and processes that will be explored in this discussion across a variety of contexts (see Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Vescio et al. (2021) offer that masculinity is "precarious and easily threatened", and that, "to embody the culturally idealized notions of masculinity one must be (a) high in power, status, and dominance, (b) emotionally, physically, and mentally tough, and (c) reject and distance from all that is feminine, gay, or otherwise unmanly" (p. 2). While this summary is very compact, it is also necessary to understand these are keystone elements to hegemonic masculinity, but that there is more to be seen in masculinity, both in public and during incarceration.

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) assert that masculinities within a hierarchy initially stemmed from conflict between straight and homosexual males - the hegemonic ideal of a male is one that subjugates and degrades other male presentations, as well as nonmales and any other gender construction, identity, or expression that does not live up to the hegemonic ideal which perpetuates a patriarchal sense of control and way of knowing and being. Though only enacted by a small portion of males, hegemonic masculinity was and is normative, celebrated, and continually practiced as a type of social ascendance (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). To meet the hegemonic ideal, archetypal masculine traits must be prominent (Ricciardelli, 2015). As forces assert themselves on the masculine identity, it goes through iterations and defends itself against threats to itself (Ricciardelli, 2015).

Colonial Origins

The colonial period of exploration and conquest in history saw various political ideologies and power structures being exerted and creating new centers of power. Colonial expansion brought about new local knowledge, historical knowledge, and theoretical knowledge applied to all manner of things (Connell, 2016). Carrigan et al. (1985) offer a valuable foundation for discussion of the historical construction of hegemonic masculinity, as the relationship between genders is a relationship of power, and they discuss the beginnings of an entire trajectory of privilege and assumed hierarchy that was set on a vector of gendered and colonial social rule, and apparently presumed to be without challenge. As Carrigan et al. (1985) state, masculinity is

> constantly constructed within the history of an evolving social structure, a structure of sexual power relations. It obliges us to see this construction as a social struggle going on in a complex ideological and political field, in which there is a continuing process of mobilization, marginalization, contestation, resistance, and subordination (p. 589).

As the world grew and connected, social and gender orders began to change, beginning the struggle for modern male gender identity (Connell, 2016). Fortuin (2018) sees the colonial framework as not only limiting males to the hegemonic masculine ideal, but within that framework, also limited racial and affective connections between males. Fortuin states that the limitations imposed by the old colonial mindset strives to reduce the masculine ideal to the body and mind, encapsulating it via status and social resources. Connell (2016a) uncovers a global economy of knowledge; a collective understanding of gender and its politics is what will create an understanding of the new global forms of gendered power. As a comparative and performative process, masculinity needs other masculinities, sexes, genders, and identities so that it can assume power and dominance over time and across locations (Michalski, 2017).

Modern Processes

Among all the processes discussed here, hegemonic masculinity is not entirely comprehensive for all behaviors, nor is it necessarily the cause for them, but rather a descriptive term to help us understand a dynamic process within society (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). The authors are careful to remind the reader that hegemonic masculinity is not a cultural norm, per se, but rather an outcome of numerous cultural

factors. Jewkes et al. (2015) process these ideas through the lens of Connell's (1987) patriarchal divide, which indicates that while males have the choice to behave in a variety of manner, they ultimately position themselves opposite and superior to women and other men; (internalized) gender follows a trajectory and spreads like a web. Moreover, Nayak (2006) elaborates on Connell (1995) when discussing that masculinity is a "body-reflexive practice" that transcends to a social world with its own symbolic classes, and as this research will argue, masculinity in excess increases these class divides and presence (Beck (1992), p. 35, in Nayak, 2006). The body is also a currency that males may use within this class system, sometimes against their will (Nayak, 2006).

Jewkes et al. (2015) and Leith (2017) argue that masculinities are multiple, fluid and dynamic, and that they are positions based on social contexts, sometimes directly opposing other gender and identity positions; male is opposed to female, and heterosexual male is opposed to homosexual male. Javaid (2018) adds to this line of thought when stating that masculinities are also contested, hierarchical, actively constructed, and collective. Ratele (2013) suggests that hegemonic masculinity, or masculine domination, is actually dependent on traditional values that are, essentially, hegemonic and patriarchal, and that (American) history has really placed males seeking to uphold this practice in a place of fear and constant identity negotiation – notions that complicate identity formation and practice, and almost seem counterintuitive.

Moolman (2015) offers some summary of what masculinity is, and the description, as far as the social ideal, does not offer any surprises. Hegemonic masculinity is an assumed and privileged state of being, one that is created, negotiated,

and sustained through performative actions that occur each day in social contexts. Masculinity and dominance, embodied and known by any alpha male, can operate in various and dynamic presentations and adaptions that do not lay in any basic cultural form, but expand over a chronological trajectory.

Kapur and Muddell (2016) note that the gendered practices, such as the hegemonic masculinity that is accepted in many countries, exerts a powerful and dominant counter to femininity, and this inherently invites different assertions and disruptions of power, all within a hegemonic framework, and that the male victims of such processes may not even realize that they have been victimized, or be willing to report the victimization. On a global and transitional scale, victimization moves beyond individual power and into cultural and national power and coercion; patriarchy as a system is oppressive and uses various forms of violence and reduction allowed by (any particular) culture – gender is created by that culture, and this means that males can be reduced to female, socially. Javaid (2016a) finds that hegemonic mechanisms constrict males to an aggressor role, as male victims are less than male, and that male victims transfer their hegemonic power to their assailant, thus deepening the range of hegemonic masculinity. However, Javaid (2018) asserts that males remain male after an assault and that social ideas and gender expectations may create a twisted image of how sexual victimization is constructed and what it consists of. Leith (2017) notes that as a socially constructed model, the male is limited, rather than innately empowered, in some regards, such as their response to a situation, such as being victimized and seeking help, from which follows a limited ability to offer or provide help. Victimization without

acknowledgement, according to Artime, McCallum, and Peterson (2014), can lead to higher levels of distress than victims who did receive acknowledgement and support.

The creation of what it means to be male, as socially constructed, is a key factor in this discussion, just as the gender reinforcement that an individual will encounter on many days. Kerr and Multon (2015) describe gender identity ("subjective sense of one's maleness or femaleness"), gender role ("expectations of a society about the proper behaviors for" a gender), and gender relations ("attitudes and behaviors of males and females in relationships with one another and the ways in which gender roles shape social relations") with regard to their development in an individual. The authors discuss these facets of identity as on a spectrum (as opposed to binary or dichotomized) as influenced by the media and information directly from others, such as toy companies or educational settings (representation of the genders in various studies and gender roles in textbook pictures). It is vital to point out that hegemonic masculinities can include who and what they want (hypermasculine and stereotypical males), while excluding that which is not male, which is not heterosexual, and that which challenges, violently or otherwise, the existing hegemonic structure (Ricciardelli, 2015).

Fisher and Pina (2013) note that much of the construction of what a male should be is easily seen in the stereotypes of the male gender through the lens of rape myths that pertain to males. While the myths will be explored in greater detail at a later point, it is the social and cultural stereotypes, which are taught as part of gender socialization, that really give power to the myths. Tatangelo et al. (2017) suggest that as males begin to invest in socially created gender-based norms, they absorb representation of the male

figure from parent, peer, and media sources, and this may inevitably lead to their cognitions about the gendered body as adults. These three sources of gendered ideal in the physical body move from influential to canon, and includes the entire spectrum of masculinity, as the research by these authors reflects in the response found in the Masculine Physical Attributes Investment Scale. The other consideration here is that peers will engage in disapproval of non-normative behaviors, meaning that when a male boy engages in behaviors not attributed to males, the actor is somehow socially punished by their peers.

Liben (2016) conducted research that supports the operation of gender schemas' influence on a child's perceptions and experiences in a social world wherein they are taught gender performance based on their biological sexual characteristic (sex organs), and ultimately their appearance (Liben, 2016). With each experiential opportunity, this information is compounded and develops into gender scripts (Liben, 2016). Conry-Murray (2017) finds that peer interactions, gender schemas and scripts on the cognitive process of genders and finds that children may demonstrate inflexibility about norms and stereotypes concerning gender. Conry-Murray refers to this as essentialist thinking, which is the belief that gender is "internal, fixed and indicating substantial differences between the sexes. However, Rogers et al. (2017) note that traditional masculinity relates to "compromised psychological functioning" related to higher rates of depressive symptomology, antisocial and avoidant behaviors. Further, the constant struggle to achieve and keep the masculine ideal is untenable causing discrepancy strain ("psychological dissonance") and trauma ("traumatic strain"), due to the process one

must go through to achieve and keep the ideal - masculine dominance is corrosive to emotional and psychological development.

Spivey, Huebner, and Diamond (2018) examine how parental responses inform gender identity against a child's nonconformity to ascribed gender presentations. For these authors, their research sees gender identity as arising between three and five years of age and reflecting the child's sense of gender (non-binary). But the fair amount of variability in expression of gender interacts with parental response. Parental (as well as peers and others) response can support the child's expression of gender (and gender identity) or damage the child's sense of self. Bartošová and Fučík (2017) explore the concept of emerging identity, gender, and (social) role through typical lifespan development. As the individual develops, the authors suggest that social institutions also develop, both in the historical and influential sense. What these means for gender is that the environment in which the gender roles develop, there is a dynamic series of changes undergone by the role models as well. While this structural scheme of gender conceptualization is subjective or specific to each household, the authors state the individual gender and gender attitudes of the individual are continually shaped and raised by society.

Once established by society, it is not only the beneficiaries of the practice and transmission of hegemonic masculinity who continue to build and drive it, but it is also the victims: the idealized male is sought after by females who, also influenced by society, continue to seek after and support the idealized masculinity (Jewkes et al., 2015). Morrell, Jewkes, and Lindegger (2012) summarize the creation of hegemonic masculinity

in their research when they suggest that there are interactions between the socially created gender norms, individuals, and social groups are efforts to legitimize hegemonic masculinity, and that these interactions are both complex and interactive, as well as affecting varying levels of control across situations, contexts, and times. Moreover, Jewkes et al. (2015) contend that the gender order is comprised of other social mechanisms, such as racial and economic inequality, and traditional social structures, which help to comprise patriarchy, thus leading to a seed from which hegemonic masculinity grows. As inequalities in all realms grow, so does the strength of the hegemonic dominance, which does not necessitate a violent dominance, nor a singular hegemony, but rather fluid and varying male hegemonies that permeate many facets of a society and culture (Jewkes et al., 2015).

Ricciardelli (2015) suggests that hegemonic masculinity is culturally influential, in that it confers authority and leadership, as well as control, over others. Construction of hegemonic masculinity changes over time, and is defined by what is (male, heterosexual) rather than what is not (female, homosexual). Identities projected on identities. Dangers, toughness, endurance, boy to man, appropriate vs. inappropriate aggression, macho attitudes, banter and vocabulary, sexuality is masculinity, feminization loss of masculinity, solider identity band of brothers increase in masculinity. Dominant masculinity. hypermasculinization. stiff upper lip, normative masculine identity is an obstacle to the expression of emotional distress, lacking a language to express distress. weakness and distress – not a man, outlets came via alcohol and non-threatening ways, inability to express distress was an inability to recognize it.

Dutton and White (2013) discuss the gender paradigm, which is a set of rape myths and gender stereotypes that not only psychological and physically harm males (through lack of access to treatment and professional support following a victimization), but also contributes to the concept of hegemonic masculinity by downplaying the human needs of someone identified as 'male'. Patriarchy, then, is supported, and the actual needs of males go unknown, downplayed, or become mythological or legend, as though these needs never existed, relegated to the status of 'fairy tale'. As the authors state, "The gender paradigm never acknowledges the existence of male victims, in part because shelters for men (and therefore, samples of male victims) have never existed" (p. 11). And it has been noted that masculinity is not "outside of time", but rather a socially and biological genetic system that is about control and social order, then embodied by the biological masculine frame (and genitals), reproduced in social spaces, and practiced through comparison, tradition, and perceived value (Ratele, 2013). The feminine and homosexual individuals are not males, and are therefore less-than, just as the juvenile male is not-yet. Carberry (2017) reminds us that the attachments that the child makes in its youth, including educational spaces and the psychological ownership of those spaces, will largely determine how the child sees itself. A healthy learning space is the best opportunity for doubt, mistakes, and self-exploration. Unhealthy spaces with severed attachments, Carberry (2017) offers, causes developmental issues for the masculine individual as a life course outcome. Essentially, the patterns created in the child extend, potentially, over a lifetime.

Jewkes, Morrell, Hearn, Lundqvist, Blackbeard, Lindegger, Quayle, Sikweyiya, and Gottzén (2015), in their own research, open with the notion that all of this, as mentioned before, relies on the acceptance of the hegemonic as that which should prevail and that males, therefore, can choose how to practice their gender. Self-image, then, become critical, and the ability of the individual to operate independently on a cognitive level cannot be understated. People learn from each other, at all ages, and the area within which an individual practices their identity is a grand teaching ground. The individual is the individual because of collective practice, Jewkes et al. (2015) claim, and as the hegemonic identity continues to succeed, individuals seek its umbrella of protection and privilege. And while not all harmful (masculine) identities are necessarily hegemonic (subordinates can contain toxic practices), the hypermasculine traits that emerge fill the void created by myriad inequalities that can be found in any system that has interacting parts.

Moolman (2015) offers other supported for the hegemonic drive to prove itself, which is a requirement due to the almost evolutionary need from the hegemonic to negotiate its circumstances. Moolman (2015) and Carberry (2017) posit that prisons (carceral spaces that hold the body, which holds identity) refines hegemonic negotiation in her determination that gender, for an individual, has a reality attached to it, and that reality has to be remade within contextual iterations. Moolman (2015) conducted interview with 72 males incarcerated in one of three South African prisons. These males, identified as sex offenders, are recognized as having multiple (masculine) identities, constructed of their familiar relationships, ethnic and cultural identities, ages, and

sociopolitical contexts (such as being labeled “colored” as opposed to “Black”). What is considered homosexual in the society can be considered heterosexual or even hypermasculine in a carceral setting. This then shakes the foundation of the notion of toxic/non-toxic masculinities, and reflects the dynamic and changing expression of identity, sometimes going beyond gender but never departing from the framework provided by the outside world. Sex and relationships, then, become comfort, economy, as well as the surge of hegemonic growth. Sometimes, the behaviors that occur in prison are simply survival, and this, Moolman (2015) points out, transcends most other interpretations, at least according to the performers (the individual performing gender). All of this, regardless, occurs in an arena with spectators, who may learn from it, judge the performers, reinforce beliefs, or challenge them. Almost a feral display that one may see in a group of animals, the actions of sex and negotiated genders establish hierarchies, rules, and reestablish gender as the institution sees fit (more specifically, as those who are incarcerated see fit). And while Moolman’s (2015) research may seem distant (occurring in Africa) or part of prison culture (and distant from our living rooms), it does not occur so far from us, as jokes and stereotypes told between friends and in the various mediums remind us. It is not impossible to find many people who connect prison with rape that happens between the lowest type of people, or even people who believe that prisoners deserve what happens to them, but it is likely much more difficult to find people who fully understand the context of male sexual victimization, prison ethnography, or why victims remain silent (in any setting).

Acceptance of Gender

Gender, while central to identity, is curiously built upon the teachings of others; children are taught gender, gender roles, and gender actions, subsequently acting in and enacting regularly occurring interactions. While the individual strives to identify with their identity, information from others continue to influence the construction and expression of that identity, through social reinforcement of what is allowed and that which is forbidden to a gender. Males are oppositional against, and superior to, females, which represents the social hierarchy and dichotomized culture that is expected of both genders (Jewkes et al., 2015), and this binary sees propagation in gender opposition, racial inequality, and economic disparity. Gender is about something beyond equality, but function of the relationships and the individuals as well (Nelson, 2019). The concept of hypermasculinity, which follows from a dominance that does not require violence, is a tool that seems to be used by non-dominant hegemonies that seek to establish their own dominance when money, race, or other standard hierarchical supports are not available (Jewkes et al., 2015).

For Ratele (2013), gender-based social practices exist definitively in the larger social arena and are challenged by the collective and held to the scrutiny and judgement of many others, who either seek to uphold or subvert the same hegemonic and patriarchal structure(s); gender is complex and a very influential sociocultural factor (Miracle, 2016; Leith (2017). The body is not one's own, but belongs to the collective, as are the desires and practices of that body, as though any sort of perceived deviance will injure all of society (Ratele, 2013). Gender is not biological sex, but rather a reflection of beliefs and

practices, taught to children, and accepted (typically) by the larger society; hegemonic masculinity is an exaggeration of maleness (Ratele, 2013). The construction of the person inhabiting the body is the process and subsequent practice of gender. Ratele (2013) revisits concepts of the formation of what is referred to as traditional masculinity, which can be viewed as the foundation for, but not the ideal, hegemonic presentation of the masculine. As negotiation through masculine practices, as well as all gendered practices, occurs, there is never a final iteration or a completed, truly ideal form. However, as Ratele (2013) highlights, the data being transmitted is incomplete, confusing, or downright incoherent. Children may outright question what is being taught and while the parent themselves may not understand what they are teaching, or why they are teaching it, the lessons continue regardless, sometimes with more force than would have been used if the child had not questioned the parent. These critical misteachings are cobbled together from the parent's own knowledge, the context(s), and culture(s) they live within, and other factors, such as media or sports.

Because we interact with individuals, we think of each person as demonstrating acceptable gender norms, toxic masculinity, or as practicing gender ambiguously. Connell (2016) suggests, however, that our mindset shift to a systematic view of gender on a worldwide scale. Sociopolitical and economic forces, rather than only socialization, drive gender practices and interactions. The categorization of an individual's attributes, such as race or gender, are inherently separate and isolated, but global gender needs to be considered in a way that interacts with these categories and organizes them to form an abstraction of an individual. These interactions, are, according to Connell (2016), are

ultimately hegemonic. Power does not create itself, technically specific, but the gendered world that Connell (2016) describes shows room for little else. And, if gender is created in such a process, and in a free society, the challenges of gender in more restricted or unforgiving environment present questions that are difficult to answer.

Connell's argument about global thinking stems from what she sees as the colonial roots of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2015). This is a powerful basis, as not only does it describe the gender relations in the world today, but it examines the conquest of patriarchal intentions as necessarily deconstructing gender order through hegemonic violence aimed at destabilizing cultural and societal traditions through history. Taking on a postcolonial stance, Connell (2015) argues that Feminist theory and practice needs a revitalization that can occur through an expansion of Feminist purpose. Included in this expansion are perspectives on what individual states represent as far as hegemonic power; addressing the identity of individuals within genders; the methodology with which research and study is conducted; and geography, or more specifically, land (the physical area that cultures and practices reside upon and within). These four concepts are inherently and necessarily global but also chronological, as the trajectories of various histories build a structure that life is dependent upon, and this includes beliefs and practices that stem from those beliefs. These concepts are not only global, as Connell (2015) posits, but also subject to broader patterns of thought, which Connell identifies in three terms: the pyramidal model, mosaic epistemology, and solidarity-based epistemology. These patterns of knowledge are not only global perspectives but also patterns of teaching and inquisition. Connell's (2015) emphasis on the need for global

input into the global understanding of gender cannot be understated, as this geographically comprehensive network encapsulates not only cultural distance but the chronological scaffolding of gender transmission as well.

Gender transmission reveals itself, in most cases, in typical ways through typical avenues. Kollmayer, Schober, and Spiel (2018) report that at an early age, culture-typical gender expression reveals itself and thrives on the reinforcement offered by parents, teachers, peers, and comes as learned behavior, typically through observation, modeling, and cognitive processes that process and organize the norms of their ecosystems (at all levels). As the child develops their gender schema, this also informs their own identity (as they see themselves, and possibly as they express themselves; or, as the child performs gender and identity). Both norms and stereotypes tend to be stable over time (stereotypes less so) and tend to interact with and influence each other. Kollmayer et al. (2018) discuss achievement- and service-oriented traits and how each is represented by gender stereotypes, indicating some of the stereotyped themes passed down through normative socialization and reinforcement. Following this, the influence of descriptive and prescriptive traits highlights what traits a male and female do and should possess, which is a matter at the crux of gender teaching and development. These mechanisms have larger implications, such as education and job training, which are facets typically taught in schools alone (and jobs, eventually), but are reinforced by parents and teachers, and society at large. Parents, the authors state, are the primary influence on gender and gendered behavior in a child's life, including how the child is dressed and what toys they are given, as well as how much attention and monitoring the child receives. Eventually,

this leads into educational choices and emphasis (decided by others), and these ultimately shape society, as boys are funneled into some subjects (engineering, math) and girls into others (teachers, linguistics). This reflects the cultural knowledge passed down through institutions, which again represents hegemonic preference and practice. The obvious flaws in this system overshadow something of a more sinister tone (the shadow behind the light of hegemony), and that is what children are *not* taught – traits such autonomy or emotional regulation are left from the social education of girls and boys, respectively.

These lessons begin young. Boys are taught to utilize their bodies in certain ways, and this usage is invested in (Tatangelo, et al., 2018). Parents, media, and peers will push the male child to rough play and the female child to something else. This is not necessarily natural gender development, but socialized gender development, and in youth it is set and more difficult to productively challenge (change, adapt, or soften). Tatangelo et al. (2018) examined facets of Masculine Gender Norms (MGN) in diverse backgrounds and socioeconomic situations. The study looked at how invested the boys were in their bodies, the strategies utilized to change their body (aimed at becoming more muscular), the levels of esteem that each child had in their muscles and bodies, and the levels of influence from the child's friends and families. Peer influence, it seems, reflects the idea that males should engage in physical improvements of their body, but do not seem, according to Tatangelo et al. (2018), to say why or what the end result should be, beyond masculine. As these messages are created and reinforced by, and embedded in, society, itis not just the male who receives the messages – others are taught to seek out the muscular, rich, chiseled jawlines of ideal male figures (Javaid, 2018).

Power does not create itself, but the gendered world that Connell (2016) describes shows room for little else. Kollmayer, Schober, and Spiel (2018) report that at an early age, culture-typical gender expression reveals itself and thrives on the reinforcement offered by parents, teachers, peers, and comes as learned behavior, typically through observation, modeling, and cognitive processes that process and organize the norms of their ecosystems (at all levels). As the child develops their gender schema, this also informs their own identity (as they see themselves, and possibly as they express themselves; or, as the child performs gender and identity. Kollmayer et al. (2018) discuss achievement- and service-oriented traits and how each is represented by gender stereotypes, indicating some of the stereotyped themes passed down through normative socialization and reinforcement. Eventually, this leads into educational choices and emphasis (decided by others), and these ultimately shape society, as boys are funneled into some subjects (engineering, math) and girls into others (teachers, linguistics). This reflects the cultural knowledge passed down through institutions, which again represents hegemonic preference and practice.

The research by Kollmeyer et al. (2018) represents an important take on independent points of teaching and reinforcement, specifically those that address an institution, rather than an individual. Liben (2016) revisits the ecological systems of Bronfenbrenner when she states that what a person learns does not occur in a single, one-dimensional process, but rather in the interplay between layers and contexts. Liben offers a relevant discussion on the processes that occur within the child's development, those that teach and reinforce. The gender schemata, as Liben (2016) identifies them, guide the

child through the cultural composition of gender and identity. This was a future-oriented, chronologically predictive phenomena, as children will use the schemata to decide what is meant for them to learn and to do based on gender stereotypes. Liben (2016) found that a child's attitudes about genders and their own personal preferences, identified as pathways, arise (in part) due to the salient aspects of gender identity and reinforcement, which may occur as a sort of psychological shortcut, set to reduce cognitive complexity. As with reflexive teaching, Liben emphasizes the need to create an atmosphere and environment that creates the opportunity and acceptance of non-stereotypical gender expression. In fact, the entire discussion that Liben engages in, based on her earlier research and that of others, is a predecessor to the reflexive environment, in that much of it identifies a primarily educational milieu, but certainly a social milieu, in which children are raised to embrace gender-neutral opportunities for growth and identify formation. The rest of Liben's (2016) argument is against the gender essentialism that, practically speaking, teaches you cannot change gender easily, and that there are inevitable differences between gender.

The identity of the individual is consumed by a larger social identity; or, more specifically, how an individual interacts with the people and social norms within groups of others going through the same processes (Rogers et al., 2017). *Trait* and *normative* expressions of masculinity (the expression of good or desirable masculinity (i.e., assertiveness) and those expressions that can be considered masculine but maladaptive (i.e., aggressiveness), respectively, are explored, and accepted or rejected by all genders of children and subsequently continue to define and redefine what is masculine (Leith,

2017; Rogers et al., 2017). Hegemonic mechanisms such as agentic goals are introduced, pushing the individuals to reach for social ranking and dominance, creating a hostile milieu for the individual (Rogers et al., 2017). In the school setting, this may lead males to see school in a negative light and may cause them to perform at lower levels than females (or males who do not meet traditional masculine expectations), and they may continue to display maladaptive traits – this is a reoccurring trend with hegemonic masculinity but may begin during these crucial developmental stages (Rogers, et al., 2017).

Children begin to discover their gender and gender identity early, typically between the ages of three and five (Spivey, et al., 2018). Their expression of gender varies greatly, and is largely dependent on the family, who have expectations and teachings for gender in their children (Spivey, et al., 2018). Spivey, Huebner, and Diamond (2018) conducted research to examine parental responses to nonconforming behaviors and found that, perhaps unsurprisingly, male parents had the highest levels of discomfort when male children engaged in nonconforming behaviors, and parental corrective behaviors were higher in parents who viewed their children as gender typical. Parents who viewed themselves as warm or traditional according to this research, saw their corrective behaviors as positive, whereas parents who endorsed egalitarian parenting philosophies reported less discomfort and less corrective actions when a child engaged in atypical behaviors. However, the more frequently a child engaged in gender-atypical behaviors, the less likely parents were to correct them, and less discomfort was reported by the parent(s).

It should be clear that gender is not based on biological sex, nor is it not simple or without consequence – the whole of the discussion and processes surround the central idea of a specific type of cultural transmission; that is, the transmission of ideas and behaviors. There is, however, still some uncertainty about why each person's construct of gender identity drives them to act in certain ways. Klann, Wong, and Rydell (2018) urge us to consider that, at the larger level (macrolevel), hegemonic masculinity can lead to sexual assault, sexism, and even restricted gender expression (e.g., males do not wear dresses). These are all based on beliefs and focus on the experience of Gender Role Conflict – the idea that, psychologically speaking, being a male may be negative for the self (or others), which is a potential factor in what beliefs and practices are passed from father to son (Klann, et al., 2018). The complications become more poignant at this point, at least in a linear discussion of gender. A person sees their own gender, or their gender identity, through their own subjective lens (Kerr & Multon, 2015), not necessarily through anyone else's, which is what creates the struggle and need to eventually seek reinforcement, rather than accept it naturally (via parents and teachers), and this places them on a spectrum of gender (performance) instead of within the circles of a Venn diagram. Regardless of where they find themselves on the spectrum, social norms and messages continue to drive people to examine themselves in relation to other genders (male vs. female), within genders (male vs. male), and genders that may seem ambiguous, confusing, or unfamiliar - transgender, fluid, or another gender presentation that the person may simply not be familiar with (Kerr & Multon, 2015). The social complexities of educational settings, by themselves, are something that many people are

likely to struggle with at some point – each individual goes through numerous changes across many layers of their lives, including changes to their bodies and identities, as well as what children pay attention to (Rogers, et al., 2017).

Research by Klann, Wong, and Rydell, (2018) looked at how and what messages about gender are *transmitted* from father to son. Perceived levels authoritarianism of the father was positively correlated with perceived masculine norm modeling by the father, which in turn was positively correlated with perceived sexist communication, as well as levels of subjective sexism and gender role conflict in the son. As these levels increased, the quality of the relationship between father and son was rated as lower. However, the authors point out that gender norm internalization was influenced only by sexist communication that was perceived as authoritarianist. If parents are the archetypes, then their attitude toward gender will inform, at least initially, the child's.

However, it would be faulty to assume that even hegemonic masculinity, as transmitted and reinforced practice, and social framework, is a passive process. Some research, such as that conducted by Messerschmidt (2018) suggests that elements of hegemony may be part of identity reproducing practice. In the military, for example, the institution teaches the actors (soldiers) various mindsets and behaviors that are meant to ingrain the individual with a particular sense of self, and as that person continues these practices, the metaphorical knot continues to tighten and solidify the identity, which in turn strengthens the belief in the practices (Messerschmidt, 2018). In a prison, the prisoner is not simply prisoner #1234, but a vessel that continues prison practices (or defiance of them) even when not viewed by another person (Messerschmidt, 2018).

Identity is thus typically dependent on context and on the methods of indoctrination (including consequences for disobeying); this can include the formation of gender stereotypes and rape myths, as well as victim blaming (Cook & Lane, 2017a).

While there is much obvious conflict between the personal and gender identity, as well as the social identity (Messerschmidt, 2018), all these conflicts somehow reinforce the goals and teachings, the very existence, of hegemony and patriarchy. What the research by Messerschmidt (2018) reveals is hegemonic practice as a social currency, ever growing in value, in a market created by patriarchy – to refuse use of this currency devalues and excludes the consumer. As children begin to learn about the world, they encounter many lessons, and these teachings may become fixed or inflexible, which is sometimes referred to as essentialist thinking (Conry-Murray, 2017). Still, children have also displayed behaviors based on fairness over gender normality, though this can vary between the ages of three and ten according to some research (Conry-Murray, 2017). Why this is such a dynamic mechanism may be uncertain, but it seems to be related to the social setting, which may create pressure that a child reacts to, as many behaviors are reflexive; coincidentally, gender is said to be so (Conry-Murray, 2017). To examine this interaction, Conry-Murray (2017) conducted research that demonstrated that children were interested in fairness, but also in adhering to gender norms. When there was no preference stated, or when the hypothetical recipient would be given a sticker, displayed on their shirt, before or during recess, the children tended to adhere to gender norms, especially the ten-year-old participants. Conry-Murray (2017) posits that social desirability is the driving factor behind such choices, and that even when children take

fairness into account, they may be driven to change their own behaviors because of social pressure or expectation, more so when the recipient displayed no preference or would be viewed with the given item by others.

Psychologically, development is perhaps more complex as stages of life have their own processes and interactions, such as when an individual attempts to join a new circle of friends or expand their identity (Bartošová & Fučík, 2017). Continuing identity exploration, according to Bartošová and Fučík (2017), has become increasingly complex as economic and social forces change the way that people interact with their ever-growing world, and the authors state that the change on gender identity and roles has altered the way we conceptualize (our) gender. Gender roles are universalized now, as two-parent incomes are seemingly necessary, and there are fewer stay-at-home parents, for example, to enact stereotypical gender roles. In this light provided by Bartošová and Fučík (2017), the volatile changes effected by societal demand cause disharmony but allow for growth, whereas hegemonic masculinity allows for change only within one set of molds. For these authors, gender is theoretically comprised of individual, structural, and interactional dimensions. These dimensions are inherent to gender equality and are key to gendered interaction. Bartošová and Fučík (2017) offer that, overall, the individual socialization dimension, including that which comes from increasing independence in the world, could have a major impact on gender differences. The structural dimension has to with institutions and other social structures, and interactional is about shared meanings and interactions. These dimensions cover how a person moves about the world, and how behaviors are learned, performed, reinforced. The research conducted by Bartošová and

Fučík (2017) covers decades of gender theory, and looks at phenomenological theory, hierarchical gender structure, and a reductionist approach that looks at a person's subjective view of their identity and gender as components of the individual, and interactions as performance. In this light provided by Bartošová and Fučík (2017), the volatile changes effected by societal demand cause disharmony but allow for growth, whereas hegemonic masculinity allows for change only within one set of molds.

Gender Role Conflict

Gender roles are reported to play a significant role in overall adjustment in individuals, as they are a social construction and guide the individual in both fitting in to their (social) environment and in establishing their identity (Efthim, et al., 2001; Franchina, et al., 2001). Eisler and Skidmore (1987) defined Male Gender Role Stress (MGRS) as a mechanism by which a male may experience a given situation, feeling, or cognition as stressful due to "gender role socialization". Moreover, the encounter is viewed as a threat to the male's gender identity or their competency as a male, due to a violation of the "male gender-role cognitive schema (which) includes culturally mandated standards for appropriate masculine behavior as well as rules against engaging in non-masculine behaviors" (Copenhaver, et al., 2000). According to Copenhaver et al. (2000), the main situations likely to cause MGRS are those in which the male feels one of the following threats: Physical inadequacy; emotional expression; subordination to someone who identifies as non-male; intellectual inferiority; or inadequate performance. Moreover, males experience more MGRS when having to engage in behaviors identified as feminine (Eisler, et al., 1988). In the research conducted by Copenhaver et al. (2000),

the authors found that substance-abusing males who reported higher levels of MGRS were more likely to have committed verbal or physical abuse against the female partners, which shows potential for MGRS to reach levels that are a threat to others, at least when a substance is involved.

The discrepancy between the individual feeling that they are meeting their gender roles and not meeting them consequently yields psychological consequences for that individual (Juan, et al., 2017; Lowe & Rogers, 2017), and conforming to the socially created norms may offer the individual some benefits (Juan et al., 2017). For males, identifying as strong and in control may mitigate some of the damage that trauma can produce (Valdez & Lilly, 2014, cited in Juan et al., 2017). However, continued aspiration to achieve the male ideal may ultimately further psychological difficulties, as Juan et al. (2017) found when they examined males in the military who experienced sexual trauma during that time. These individuals, who live within the realms of masculinity and military conduct, find themselves dealing with additional MGRS from the military expectations, part of which includes the stress from restricted emotional expression. Furthermore, males with a traumatic background, whether military or civilian, may experience a negative impact from the restriction of the emotional processing needed to heal from the traumatic experience, in that the constriction of emotional expression interferes with the healing process, as males remain detached from a (social) support network (Juan et al., 2017). How each gender processes and responds to the trauma will vary based on the social expectations of each gender role (Elkins, et al., 2017). Furthermore, the social expectations of males influence the public and private spectrum

of emotions that the individual may feel or express (Elkins, et al., 2017). When something interferes with the individual's attainment of role identity, they may experience a negative impact on their psychological health (Efthim et al., 2001). Furthermore, identifying as a male and adhering to male gender roles may result in actively adhering to the social construct's requirements, such as attempting to be strong and dominant (Franchina et al., 2001; Shorey et al., 2011); this is, of course, if the male identifies a situation as relevant to his gender role, and pursues engagement in a course of action that supports that role, rather than acting in a way that gender role expectations have no bearing on (Franchina et al., 2001). Vigoya (2001), however, cites Nolasco's (1993) research which examined the socialization of Brazilian males and found that the men in the study reported the substantial stress in their lives was from attempting "to adapt themselves to social roles that inf act do not correspond to their abilities or their desires".

Artime et al. (2014) highlight the concept of gender role stress/conflict in the male's inability to acknowledge and/or report being victimized, as being a victim and even reporting victimization is not consistent with being masculine, as far as the socially constructed ideal – however, research has indicated that males who identify as gay homosexual less experienced gender role stress than those who identify as heterosexual. Klann, Wong, and Rydell (2018) describe GRC as having a negative impact on males, including increased risk of depression, body dissatisfaction, life dissatisfaction, decreased help-seeking (which may be directly applicable to the current discussion), increased substance use, and problems with their physical health. This conflict also makes the

experience of identifying as male more negative for the individual. These actions can render the performer complicit in masking or perpetuating hegemony (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). Additionally, individuals can use or present resources, just as they can restrain the discharge of emotions that the individual needs to release (Shermer & Sudo, 2016).

Male Sexual Victimization

Fisher and Pina (2013) argue that even though the prevalence for female victims of sexual assaults is higher, there is still a need to recognize that it is still a significant issue for male victims as well. Part of the issue lays with the definitions used regarding sexual victimization, but another significant piece comes from the lack of research on and reporting of male sexual victimization. While sexual assault has long related to male patriarchal culture, dominance, and control, it is important to note the underlying implication that sexual assault is also about preservation of traditions, such as hegemonic masculinity (Fisher & Pina, 2013). This is seen in the struggle females continue to face, even in 2020, when they are sexually assaulted, and in the possible amplification of the struggles that males face in being recognized as victims (Fisher & Pina, 2013). As males are not supposed to seek support, much less be victimized, they are far less likely to be taken seriously when other males go beyond failing to recognize them as victims, but now seem the male victim as weak and feminized (Fisher & Pina, 2013). While research on male sexual victimization has been accused of being "neglected by a predominantly traditional feminist perspective", that does not seem to reflect the reality of why male victims are not reporting the assault, nor why they continue to receive little empathy or support – in fact, it males weren't recognized as potential rape victims until 2009 in some

countries (D'Abreu & Krahe, 2016); even typing "D'Abreu and Krahe 2016 – only in 2009 were men recognized as potential rape victims" into Google Scholar results in an assumed clarification: "Did you mean: D'Abreu and Krahe 2016 – only in 2009 were **women** recognized as potential rape victims?"

In their foundational research, Growth and Burgess (1980) describe the wide array of environments in which males may be assaulted – where they live, work, during travel, but the risk is greater when the individual is by themselves or isolated. Of those assaulted in that research, 45% of males were penetrated by their attacker, and 32% were made to penetrate their attacker. Half of the 22 cases resulted in the victim being made to ejaculate. These incidents involve control, conquest, revenge/retaliation, sadism/degradation, counteraction (punish victim to deal with unresolved conflictual sexual interests), status and affiliation (gang rape to maintain status and membership with peers. Beck (2018) found that in prison and jails during the year of 2015, there were 24,661 allegations of some kind of sexual assault, which the author feels is an improvement in data collection and increase in reporting, yet much research would argue that this number is likely to be lower than the actual number of inmates who have experienced some version of sexual violence. Beck and Rantala (2014), for example, found that each year from 2005-2011, there was an increase of allegations made each year (prisons and jails). Beck and Rantala (2014) examined this inmate-on-inmate sexual violence and found that upwards of 44% of it involved force or threat, while for staff-on-inmate Sexual Victimization (SV) it was 20% and 1% (male and female, respectively) that involved physical force or some sort of abuse of power. In the public, Morgan and

Kena (2017) found that in 2016, only 22.9% of rape/sexual assaults were reported, with males reporting between 45-60.5% of the violent/seriously violent crimes committed against them. 60% of 23% of reported crimes is still low, according to the research that will be reviewed, but it still reveals tens of millions of male victims that have experienced some sort of sexual violence in one year alone. This may include verbal harassment (up to 18%; Kearl, 2014) or completed rapes (5 to 10%; Scarce, 1997). Oudeker and Truman (2017) found that between 2005 and 2014, approximately 305,000 males experienced some sort of repeat violent victimization (33.6% from an intimate partner, 25.6% from an acquaintance, 20.3% from a relative, 17.5% from a stranger). Other settings, such as college campuses, may see one in 16 male students suffer a sexual assault (Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Conley, et al., 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Wilson & Scarpa, 2017) but that up to 90% of male victims may not report, though up to one-third of male victims may experience revictimization (Conley, et al., 2017).

Kapur and Muddell (2016) build on this with their overview of sexual violence that males may encounter while in international and transitional contexts, such as war or imprisonment. Kapur and Muddell (2016) provide a structure in which to broaden our understanding of sexual victimization as it pertains to males; these authors point out that the response to the phenomenon is often problematic. Moreover, those professionals to whom male victims may report the incident are not always adequately trained and may even perpetuate misconceptions about male victimization. The gendered dimensions of sexual violence against males can almost be extracted from such an identification: Males are targeted to reduce them to something less than male, to cause and expose weakness,

and to, ultimately, cause damage far beyond the victimizing act itself. A male who cannot defend himself is weak and cannot defend his family or community. Forsman (2017) notes that prevalence of male sexual assaulted typically do not consider the subpopulations of males who may be particularly vulnerable or easier to victimize.

Du Mont, Macdonald, White, and Turner (2013) report that males are 5% of all seen sexual assault victims. Assailants are typically male and known, and there may also be multiple assailants and weapons used, the assaults resulting in physical injury between 33% and 66% of the time. Victims are more likely to report anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress symptoms, sexual identity concerns and sexual dysfunction, and seek to relieve stress via self-harm gestures, even if not intending to end their lives, but roughly 35% seek medical care and 58% seek psychological help, which helps to buffer against potential suicidal risk. In their own study, Du Mont et al. (2013) victims seeking help (33%) was double that of the general community (16%), with that help including an array of services, though not all 33% sought all services. Failure to seek services results in fully experienced trauma from coercion or assault, and that sexual assault kits utilized for males was roughly the same as that for females (42%-47%). Males may not see themselves as real victims, may require more acknowledgement as victims, including gender-sensitive approaches to offering males support and treatment.

Kubiak, Brenner, Bybee, Campbell, and Fedock (2018), in their research on male sexual victimization during incarceration, begin by capturing a larger snapshot of sexual victimization. Kubiak et a. (2018) report that, of reported sexual victimizations, 44% of females and 23% of males surveyed report being victimized. This presents, as will be

discussed, two very important pictures of the scope of the problem: (a) Females are typically represented as experiencing far more victimization than males, and (b) males are not typically considered to be victims of sexual assault, especially at such rates. But these complex issues have not received enough attention in the larger body of research will be addressed in the current study

Javaid (2018) notes that male rape is still a highly neglected topic in the realms of academia, as well as criminal justice and social discourse. In transitional contexts, such as (wartime) imprisonment, torture and other criminal acts, conducted in the name of victory and nationalism, often go mislabeled as simple acts of violence, even when targeting specific aspects of masculinity, such as the genitals, which the social concept of gender is directly connected with (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). But even this terrible image is assumptive of a masculine encounter – Males, in numerous countries, are subjected to many acts that are indirectly but intentionally sexually violating. For example, some males are forced into marriages, arranged or otherwise, and thus violates many aspects of their lives, including personal spaces and communities, in addition to any sexual act that may occur within the union. As noted by the authors, sexual violence against males occurs “without distinction” to any facets of the individual’s life and is often trivialized when ignored or misunderstood. Additionally, Penn (2014) reports that males entering military service experience a ten-fold increase in the likelihood that they will experience being sexually assaulted.

Artime, McCallum, and Peterson (2014) report that male sexual victimization is more common than assumptions may lead a person to believe, and that part of the

challenge is in the definitions and methodologies used in studies. However, these authors also report that only 15-59% of victimized men acknowledge that they have been victimized, which ties into a rape myth that is discussed later in this current discussion. According to Artime, McCallum, and Peterson (2014), only 20% of the males that they examined in the literature used the term rape to acknowledge what had happened to them, which compares to the upwards of 47% of females who acknowledge what happened to them as rape. While the reported rates do increase in males who experienced other forms of victimization, the highest percentage identified by Artime et al. (2014) was 73%, which was for sexual harassment. Overall, Artime et al. (2014) found that only approximately one in six males who have experienced sexual victimization at some point in their lives will identify it as such, at least as far as reporting. Again, these authors cite reasons that are seen as rape myths, but the reason inevitably connect to social constructions and expectations of masculinity and what it means to be male; as this discussion progresses, the reader is urged to attend to the thought that while hegemonic masculinity may offer the individual some sort of illusionary or real benefits, the restrictions that it places on the individual are difficulty to ignore. Dutton and White (2013) revisit the conversation about males and reporting victimization, noting that overall, males are less likely to see violence perpetrated by an intimate partner as something they should report, if they acknowledge it as a crime at all. If the male does report the violence, he is more likely to be arrested than the partner (85% of the time), even if there are varying levels of participation from both individuals, and the male is fifteen times as likely to be charged for the crime than a female, who may engage in as

much, if not more, violence than the male. Conley, Overstreet, Hawn, Kendler, Dick, and Amstadter (2017) found that between 3.5% and 11.6% of males in their study (approximately 2,800 males) reported some sort of sexual assault, with one third of the sample reporting that they had been victimized more than once. Jewkes et al. (2015) report that males who demonstrate hypermasculinity do have a history of personal trauma, and that male vulnerability, already oppressed by the masculine ideal, is not dealt with; rather, it is transformed into the un-masculine – that which is feminine and less than masculine.

Stemple and Meyer (2014) highlight previous research, including that by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Bureau of Justice Statistics that found males in the United States have suffered widespread male sexual victimization that matches levels of victimization in females. Stemple and Meyer (2014) offer that the stereotypical male perpetrator/female victim image is a faulty assumption of the phenomenon of sexual victimization, and reinforces the assumption, and continues to stigmatize and downplay the prevalence and impact on males. This entire concept is supported, Stemple and Meyer (2014) argue, by outdated laws, categorization, and practices surrounding sexual victimization. Rape myths continue to be supported and endorsed, and the jokes about prison rape and the misconceptions about the male experience during assault continues to be believed and continues to be reality. Stemple and Meyer (2014) illuminate a volume of reporting problems that plague male sexual victimization outside of the lack of reporting itself, which ultimately means that the former supports the latter of these issues. This does not include the various issues with

sampling biases that the authors found, including male incarceration during the periods of household surveys, thereby making it less likely that males will report any victimization and the increase in likelihood that male prisoners do not report victimization either. However, Stemple and Meyer (2014) offer that the challenges of researching inmates are real but add to the necessity of that very research. Furthermore, the authors argue, the methods of reporting available to males, incarcerated or not, and the surveys themselves do not contribute to eliciting reports of victimization from males, not to mention doing away with a number of potential barriers, discomfort, re-traumatization, or overall availability of the reporting of male sexual victimization.

It cannot be stated enough that male sexual victimization is a poorly understood and under-researched phenomenon (Hlavka, 2017). Mainly studied in specific settings or institutions, public study of this event is still lacking in the research. What will be discovered and explored in this current discussion are some of the components of hegemonic masculinity are the same pieces that directly harm the individual performing this angle of gender. Hlavka (2017) provides a necessary and somewhat extended discussion of male sexual victimization in the lens of heteronormative scripts showing the conflict between being a victim and being male – this is vital for the examination of barriers to reporting victimization which will be dissected and researched in this paper. Just what sexual victimization is, to males, is poorly understood both by research and by the individuals themselves.

Lack of research

When research is initially conducted on a topic, there is likely to be little foundational work to build upon. As late as 1980, when Groth and Burgess conducted their seminal work, research on male sexual victimization was lacking, particularly in carceral settings, and this was noted by Groth and Burgess. Du Mont, Macdonald, White, and Turner (2013) state that male sexual victimization is notably under researched, and Fisher and Pina (2013) report that male rape is still significantly unresearched, and lags 20 years beyond that for females, in spite of male victimization reports and treatment rising since the 1970s. Stemple and Meyer (2014) argue that male sexual victimization has not yet been properly addressed, in that the discussion and research of the topic are lagging behind that of female sexual victimization, based, in part, on feminist principles that call for equity and inclusion. Forsman (2017) notes that the literature on male sexual assault may be largest for incarcerated males, but much of it seems to be outdated and possibly redundant. Males in college make up the second largest population in research with rate that may be low due to underreporting and misunderstanding (Cook & Lane, 2017a). Males in college make up the second largest population in research, yet much of the research is with small-scale, non-empirical, and clinical (setting) data from before the year 2000, and is limited in generalizability due to designed weakness, definitional differences, self-reporting, small and convenient samples (Leith, 2017; Budd, et al., 2019). Some authors argue that male rape and sexual abuse still has no solid theoretical foundation (Javaid, 2018).

Elkins, Crawford, and Briggs (2017) emphasize that while research needs to happen, it is more than just research that is lacking. These authors see that multilevel risk and protective factors are necessary, including component that influence elements of sexual victimization, such as the nature and experience of the event. The increased attention toward male sexual assault is a good start, but it continues to be overlooked and under-researched (Gorris, 2015; Ioannou, et al., 2016; Elkins, et al., 2017; Hlavka, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Ngo, et al., 2018). As more is understood about male sexual victimization, more understanding about the various complexities of the phenomenon needs to be explored, such as the gender performances and psychological processes that occur during male sexual coercions (Richter, et al., 2018). Same-sex victimization appears to have higher rates than once expected, if even acknowledged (D'Abreu & Krahe, 2016; Richter, et al., 2018).

Hammond, Ioannau, and Fewster (2016) found that of all sexual assault, 15% of is reported by males, which is at least one-sixth of all victims, yet the research appears to be divided differently than this, with female victimization receiving much more attention. Besides the suffering of the victim, impact on understanding or responses, the lack of legal recognition is likely to keep the prevalence low, which makes it seem like less frequent phenomenon, though this is not the case – more research with larger and more diverse samples is necessary (Hammond, et al., 2016).

Again, the foundational work of Groth and Burgess (1980) looked at carceral settings and sexual victimization and since that time, most of research as focused on college and non-carceral settings (Kennedy, 2016; Cook & Lane, 2017a), and that

research shows only the hegemonic male stereotype (Kennedy, 2016). This projection of repression and concealment shows the negative male, the non-free being, and this does not represent the male that enters the prison, wild and modified by the world around it, yet in pain (Kennedy, 2016). Ahlin (2019) and others (Gorris, 2015; D'Abreu & Krahe 2016; Ioannou, et al., 2016; Hlavka, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Ngo, et al., 2018) continue to demonstrate there is a lack of necessary research and that the research that exists for male sexual victimization is estimated to be far behind the research conducted on female sexual research (Leith, 2017). This leads to lack of theory about the event (Javaid, 2018), which reduces it to speculation and misunderstanding, as the nature and experiences of male sexual victimization is overlooked and therefore treatment, risk factors, protective factors, and other facets remain ignored (Elkins et al., 2017). This is a public health crisis, even if it were to be rare, and reflects harmful, normative values (Richter et al., 2018). But estimates are projected to be low due to the underreporting and much of the research is not on incarcerated individuals (Kennedy, 2016; Cook & Lane, 2017a; Budd, et al., 2019)

Lack of reporting

The emergence of #MeToo on social media has created a rich expression of and avenue for females to tell their story, and for males, too. But to say to someone, who has suffered at the hands of another, that all they need to do is tell someone about it may be, deceptively, difficult, and there are a number of studies that show that there is a lack of reporting when it comes to male sexual victimization, and what has been reported is still misunderstood, trivialized, and suggests that there are higher rates then what is reported

(Hohl & Stanko, 2015; D'Abreu and Krahe, 2016; Elkins, et al., 2017; Forsman, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Richter, et al., 2018; Zilkens, et al., 2018).

Kubiak et al. (2016) define reporting (of sexual assault) as "a generic term related to the behaviors associated with help seeking, administrative relief, and/or other forms of justice or formal support that individual may engage in after experiencing sexual assault" (p. 94). However, it should be to clear that not all crimes are reported and the decision to report or not report a crime is not decided by the flip of a coin or on a whim, but rather the decision is comprised of various components of an individual's experiences, their trauma response to the assault, and other aspects of the prevailing cultural norms, myths, stigma, and biases (Elkins, et al., 2017). Kubiak et al. (2016) place reporting in an ecological framework that is dependent on multiple dynamic contexts; institutional context is relevant and will be discussed later in greater detail. These authors note that factors influencing (a male's) decision to report sexual victimization inside of prison is absent from the total body of literature. Some studies have offered some speculation but tend to address reporting generally. For example, Parks (2017) identifies that not only are sexual behaviors part of the entire constellation of behaviors, attitudes, social context, and psychosocial phenomena and individual and contextual levels, but that sexual responses are as well. This may be why reporting is typically delayed by six months or more (Porta, et al., 2018). But this is problematic – if sexual assault victims in one of every ten sexual assaults, and if one in 71 males will experience sexual assault in their lifetime, then why male reporting is such a rare and poorly understood phenomenon becomes bewildering (Porta, et al., 2018); even more so when it comes to protected

classes of males (such as inmates or mentally ill) or certain groups like the military, in which settings sexual assault increase by tenfold over the general public (Porta, et al., 2018).

Research that exists continues to suggest and find that a significant obstacle to reporting comes from the prevailing cultural biases, norms, and myths that a society or culture holds, even if taught at a young age and the individual is older now (Elkins, et al., 2017). It can take a lifetime for a person to tell someone else what happened to them, which is why self-disclosure is referred to as a complex process that will occur predominantly during adulthood (Elkins, et al., 2017). While females may be as much as six times more likely to experience identify sexual victimization, the identification of it is a crucial piece – males may simply not recognize their experience as victimization or abuse, especially if it deviates from societal norms (Elkins, et al., 2017). If only one third, then, of males identify their experience as sexual assault, what cognitive processes are involved in this, what processes can increase it (some studies suggest disclosure can be increased by as much as 17 times; Elkins, et al., 2017). But again, we ask how there can be an accurate scope and assessment of the problem if individuals do not identify their experiences properly or have the drive to report them. Elkins, Crawford, and Briggs (2017) discuss the influence of *intrapsychic factors* such as cognitive appraisal, self-esteem, self-worth, spirituality, coping strategies, and attribution styles and their role in interrupting maladaptive outcomes. The key element here is in how coping strategies and cognitive appraisals are used by survivors in understanding, defining, and experiencing victimization; even some self-protective, tension-reducing coping strategies may help

survivors navigate this process and engage in health and productive strategies (Elkins, et al., 2017). Avoidant coping strategies will then lead to different internalization processes that may lead to lower levels of reporting (Elkins, et al., 2017). self-protective responses found in problem behaviors can also be tension-reduction behaviors.

Ng (2014) notes that much sexual victimization is underreported, whether the victim is male or female. This author also notes that in societies where laws are by and for the people, then other aspects of the legal world reflects those people; forbidden acts are forbidden because of that society's norms, beliefs, and customs. In Afghanistan, Ng (2014) reports, the Pashtun code of conduct allows for the victim and the perpetrator of a rape to be killed due to the shame brought to the families, and in the same country, young boys are dressed as women and sold to men, so that while victimization in shameful, sexual slavery and abuse is an accepted aspect of the society, despite laws against it. Meanwhile, Great Britain has had laws for hundreds of years criminalizing homosexual acts, though these were finally repealed in the 1960s, but such assaults were not taken seriously, reflecting a distaste for homosexuality and a reluctance to support male victims. Ng (2014) states that numerous studies reflect that Great Britain continues to struggle with a public perception of sexual assault that brings significant shame to the victims, and this is reflected in the conviction rate of the crime. Here, too, rape myths control much of society's perception and the victim's behaviors.

The United States continues to struggle with legal definitions in a way that fully acknowledges and protects male victims, or simply by including them. Over 200,000 male inmates have reported being sexually abused, which is approximately 10% of the

prison population, and this number is more than double the number of sexual assaults reported by males in the public (Ng, 2014). Yet, the suffering goes on largely ignored, according to statistics, and victims deal with societal stigma, administrative indifference, slow and limited research, and a legal system that reflects the social beliefs, mores, and customs of its people, leaving males to be unnoticed as victims, male sexual assault to be a taboo people want to ignore, and a veil of silence enclosing the whole phenomenon (Ng, 2014).

Groth and Burgess (1980) did not feel it is so rare, stating that, like what female victims experience, males experience stereotypes that may prevent them from reporting their experience. Artime et al. (2014) found that only approximately one in six males who have experienced sexual victimization at some point in their lives will identify it as such, at least as far as reporting. In their own research, 51 of 99 participants did not identify their childhood abuse as abuse, and 34 of 45 males did not identify their previous experiences as rape. The rates were higher for those males whose abusers used physical force. Brenner and Darcy (2017) cite the Human Rights Watch (1998) research that suggests prisons are not given incentive or support to accurately report abuses, or allegations of abuse, and this can lead to inmate retaliation at the unjust system. Brenner and Darcy (2017) note that it is possible that members within the system itself may work to hide the claims of sexual violence, and since victims have very little control over the reporting process or investigation, they are then (potentially) victimized at the whim of the policies, practices, and staff. The internal nature of the investigations makes it difficult to get an allegation sustained if the perpetrator is a member of the system. This

can be exacerbated if the victim is not well-received by the police/authorities, as police may see things different from the victim, and attrition can increase as people are treated differently by the police for being a male victim, inmate, or if any sort of inconsistencies are present, or if evidence is somehow unclear (Hohl & Stanko, 2015). For example, the police are less likely to investigate a white male suspect who has no record, which can continue a cycle of abuse as well as increase the gap in justice (Hohl & Stanko, 2015). This is not just in the United States; research from South Africa suggest that when males try to report being sexually assaulted, it is trivialized or misunderstood (Richter, et al., 2018).

Kubiak et al. (2016) examine some of the challenges inherent to report in a carceral setting. The levels of scrutiny, and staff reaction to and mistrust of the inmate, compounded with the low reporting rates inherent in sexually violent crimes (16-36% in the public), create additional resistance in reporting. PREA has increased policies, procedures, and responses for sexual assault which may not be made fully aware to inmates, the policies may be unclear, and the procedures themselves may be difficult for inmates to negotiate. Additionally, the risk of being seen as weak or as a snitch is no small matter for an inmate, at least in male prisons.

Kapur and Muddell (2016) point out that within a (cultural) construction of masculinity as dominant does sexual victimization become "emasculating, so that victimhood is considered inconsistent with male gender roles." As a biological male, rather than a gendered male, this outcome may not occur, however, it is within gender that we may find obstacles to reporting. A complaint by a male victim may not be well-

received, and this may cause the victim to shut down. Further, as the Kapur and Muddell (2016) highlight, if an act of sexual violence is not identified as sexual but only violent, the dynamics of the entire situation changes. If coding or labeling an act of genital mutilation is done in a manner that wrongly conceptualizes the action as a violent act and not sexually violent, then no real record can be made, and male sexual victimization continues to receive less attention that it deserves, and ultimately serves as a barrier to reporting; physical torture and sexual torture are not the same thing. A victim with heightened reluctance to report abuse may not because of the risk of punishment perpetuates victimization in some countries (same sex relationships are punishable by death in 5 countries and imprisonment in roughly 70 countries); this includes restrictive legal and sociopolitical frameworks, wherein victims are less likely to engage with standard procedures used by victims of non-stigmatized crimes. Further exacerbation comes from a lack of trained professionals to receive or hear reporting or testimony, especially if these occur in front of the same sex as the assailant, in front of a camera or similar situations that make the reporting party uncomfortable (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). This is crucial, however, as narratives by males of sexual violence are necessary for creating accurate historical record of abuses.

But this is too simplistic of an overview, and requires more analysis, as Kubiak et al. (2016) offer. Producing this analysis as an ecological survey of reporting barriers, the authors begin with an examination at the macrolevel, which concerns the inmate's attitudes about prisoners and victimization. The significance of this level is found in how the individual internalizes rape myths, and therefore how the individual creates internal

barriers to reporting. These outcomes do not apply to the victim alone, but also to those responders that the victim reports the assault to. Again, the credibility of person reporting the assault may then be questioned in part due to those internalized rape myths. If toxic or hegemonic masculinity is influencing the reporter or the responder, then processes that downplay a victimized male may also affect reporting. For the male inmate, to assume that prison staff is on your side is a dangerous and difficult assumption, made no easier by assumptions that prison rape is acceptable and inevitable.

Looking at the exosystem level, laws and policies become the center of reporting challenges. Interestingly, one of the barriers faced at this level is that legitimate claims of victimization are now subject to increased scrutiny, and the victim must go through more of a process to have a claim substantiated. Other aspects of the policy, such as two-day deadlines, seriously impede a victim who has limited access to means and ignores years of research that demonstrates the impact of trauma on a person's level of functioning.

Moving to the mesosystem level, Kubiak et al. (2016) move closer to look at prison processes for reporting sexual victimization. Prisons, standing as closed systems, have their own policies and procedures for handling sexual assaults and the reporting of an assault. Reflecting on Goffman's (1961) total institution, the entirety of the judicial and administrative process rest within the institution itself. Still, the barriers attached to stigma, prisoner silence, and expectations of masculinity exist at this level, and are complicated further by problems in the mesosystem level (Simpson et al., 2016) – when an inmate files a false report on a sexual assault, they can be punished, even if the assault

occurs. If the victimization is caused by a staff member, research has shown that reporting may be the lowest due to fear of retaliation by staff.

The microsystem level of reporting and barriers is an interesting dynamic for inmates, as it concerns the relationships and supports available to the inmate. These informal systems of support do not simply encourage the victim to move forward and report the assault, but rather they are likely to be the receiving end of the victim's report, more so than the institution itself. However, it has been found in research that the reporting outcome of the friends and family, that is, to report or not, will influence the victim's decision to report.

Kubiak et al. (2018) have included a new ecological level, the assault level, which is described as the characteristics of the assault. These characteristics each have role in the reporting behaviors of the victim. While this is a new approach for an ecological analysis, these factors, outside of a carceral context, have been evaluated previously elsewhere, and include the relationship between the victim and perpetrator, severity, and type of injury/ies, possibility of retribution from the perpetrator, and the victim's desire to protect themselves and/or the perpetrator. In other settings, reporting is less likely if the victim and perpetrator are within the same organization. If the victim's injuries are more severe, they are more likely to report.

Lastly, the individual level has been analyzed by Kubiak et al. (2016). This level includes such things as gender, prior victimization, age, and, again, have been evaluated by other research as well. Gender, for example, is often studied and research has shown that males are less likely to report victimization, but age, on the other hand, has been

shown to have mixed results with regard to reporting, though some studies have found that younger victims are less likely to report.

Ahlin (2019) looks at inmate culture as a possibility for why inmates may not report being sexually assault, and this reduces the efficacy of PREA overall. It is not enough to understand what reduces or stops reporting, but how to increase accessibility, desire, and cultural support for this; males with better coping strategies and tension-reducing behaviors can help males to protect themselves psychologically, which may improve reporting rates (Elkins, et al., 2017). With so much research being restricted due to the protected (sometimes doubly so) status of the inmate, reliable data is certainly slower and more limited. Self-reports of inmates may show that up to 40% of inmates know about assaults that have happened, yet they are still low and contradict administrative reports (Ahlin, 2019). IRBs and agency support need to increase access and research in these situations, including secondary collection or analysis. Simpson et al. (2016) note that most research on sexual assault focuses on females and in the general community. Prisoners may have previously reported assaults, but what happens when they are incarcerated because harder to understand or even identify (Simpson et al., 2016).

The majority (54%) of victims may wait up to one year to report the assault (up to 15% may never report (Leith, 2017) and some may wait decades before they report what happened to them, and as time goes on, the complex processes that influence reporting may impact the decision to report (Elkins, et al., 2017). As the individual processes the event and weighs that against their view of themselves (including such intrapsychic

factors as self-esteem and -worth, the individuals coping strategies, and their attribution styles), the decision to report may become clearer, but it is important to remember that males may be six times less likely to report being assaulted (Elkins, et al., 2017). An important aspect of reporting is whether the victim sees the event as SA, and compared to females, males are about one-third as likely to even recognize their assault as such (Elkins, et al., 2017).

Barriers to reporting

What is it that keeps someone from reporting that they were assaulted? In a general sense, this is a misleading question – it is not as though a physical door, or the flip of a coin, prevents the report. For males, research indicates that it is a series of internalized concepts that are taught to them because of their gender; or more specifically, because of the biological sex characteristics (genitals) that they were born with and their gendered appearance, presentation, and performance in society. A lifetime of social interactions, constantly reinforced, teaches males that they are and are not allowed to do certain things. For example, research by Fisher and Pina (2013) suggests that the negative attitudes that male victims face are one of the main barriers to reporting sexual victimization. But what Fisher and Pina (2013) truly suggest is not simply negative attitudes, but an entire architecture of oppressive and repressive social learning; including, specifically, rape myths and societal perceptions (Ahlin, 2019), confusion about the event and/or sexuality, shame, and a number of other topics (D'Abreu & Krahé, 2016; Richters, et al., 2018). However, even when medical attention is needed, or reporting is somehow unavoidable, males approach it differently than females, and may

not even be able to fully explain it to those receiving the report or working with the victim (Hines & Douglas, 2016). Depending on the responses that the individual receives, they may even engage in hypermasculine behaviors which can exacerbate their symptoms or cause confusion for the individual (Leith, 2017).

Barriers to reporting victimization tend to be rooted in myths about victimization and masculinity, a point that will be revisited throughout the rest of this discussion. What Hlavka (2017) offers in her research is that hegemonic masculinity, via heteronormativity, does not allow for a male to be a victim in a way that is accepted and ultimately separate – males are powerful, their bodies, in Hlavka's words, impenetrable. Power, says Hlavka (2017), is key to dominance, hegemony, and patriarchy. Power over others, including females, resources, image, social status, and the power to be the aggressor. This idealized will be tested later in this discussion when male dominance via sexual assault of other males is analyzed, but the point is that victims, or males who are victimized, atypical, or penetrated are considered to be lesser males, if male at all. This stigma, for Hlavka (2017), is a social byproduct attached to shame. It is another reflexive aspect of life, and once shame has settled into a person it can change their self-image (Hlavka, 2017). Males, as victims, are viewed as responsible for their own victimization and inviting of the assault (Hlavka, 2017).

Navarro and Clevenger (2017) discuss the difficult in reporting an assault being connected with some of the socially expected aspects of masculinity, such as being tough or interested in sex. For some, according to Ng (2014), deciding to not report being assaulted may reflect a desire to adhere to societal perceptions of maleness, since

assumptions of gender are not only difficult to act against, but because it leaves the victim even more vulnerable. Seeing that most victims are female, males may not have the knowledge of what services are available or open to them. Navarro and Clevenger (2017) found that approximately 18% of their participants had identified that they were sexually assaulted, which is likely higher given the low rate of reporting by males. These authors also found that while male victims did report the assaults to close friends, faculty/staff members, and residence hall members, more than half (53.8%) did not report to anyone, including law enforcement, which seems indicative of some perceived barrier to reporting.

Even though research is lacking, patterns of perceived or actual barriers to reporting have emerged and do so repeatedly. Some identified barriers for males in the general public are listed below; before reading them, it would be helpful to consider the research by Porta, Johnson, and Finn (2018), which explores that there is an intersectionality of factors, meaning that it isn't simply one thing or another or even a compilation or reasons, but rather a compounding of demographic, cultural/societal, and internalized beliefs that ultimately lead to non-reporting. Perhaps more specifically, help-seeking behaviors are impacted by these factors and their interplay.

As the reasons for not reporting emerge, the entirety of this discussion is highlighted, yet the amplification in carceral settings is not fully understood. For some males in the public, they have trouble understanding what happened to them or that they were somehow at fault:

- Perception that the incident was not sexual assault/serious (Hammond, et al., 2016; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Victim did not feel that the event was important enough to report (Walsh & Bruce, 2014; Hammond, et al., 2016);
- Shame (Hammond, et al., 2016; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Penn, 2014; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Victim did not feel that the event was important enough to report (Walsh & Bruce, 2014; Hammond, et al., 2016).

Other males did not report because of concerns over possible consequences:

- Fear of retribution, including professional retribution, such as being fired or discharged from military duty (Forsman, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Penn, 2014; Walsh & Bruce, 2014;);
- Victim's belief that they would be blamed (Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Forsman, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Fear of losing social network (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Fear that other people would find out what happened (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Fear of being labeled as homosexual/having sexuality questioned (Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Forsman, 2017; Leith, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Fear of having to reveal sexual identity/preference (Forsman, 2017);
- Fear of damage to professional identity (Penn, 2014; Kapur & Muddell, 2016);

- Stigma or ostracization of self or family (Kapur & Muddell, 2016);
- Victim's fear of not being believed or taken seriously (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Walsh & Bruce, 2014);
- Victim's fear that others would not understand (Hammond, et al., 2016; Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018).

Reasons for nonreporting are varied, but they can become more complex, confusing, and difficult. Psychologically, the victim may be experiencing continued difficulties or sequelae:

- Victim felt that reporting the event would be too stressful (Walsh & Bruce, 2014; Brenner, et al., 2016);
- Victim was not ready to report the assault (Walsh & Bruce, 2014);
- Victim wanted to move past/forget what happened (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Victim considered the assault to be personal or private (Walsh & Bruce, 2014);
- Increased difficulty if arousal and/or ejaculation occurred (Porta, et al., 2018);
- Ongoing difficulty if social/familial roles shift, such as wife taking over perceived male responsibilities (Kapur & Muddell, 2016).

Perhaps most salient to the discussion here are the gender-based reasons some males give for not reporting:

- (Perception of biases/stigma (Fisher & Pina, 2013; Penn, 2014; Hammond, et al., 2016; Porta, et al., 2018);

- Fear of labeling self as a victim (Forsman, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Self-endorsement/acceptance of rape myths (Badendoch, 2015; Hammond, et al., 2016; Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Leith, 2017; Wilson & Scarpa, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Concern about gender-biased perceptions of sexual offences (Badendoch, 2015; Hammond, et al., 2016; Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Leith, 2017).

A final salient cluster of reasons given for nonreporting are the reasons connected to legal concerns or the reporting process itself

- Victim did not want their assailant to get into trouble, or had some sort of relationship with the assailant and wished to protect them (Forsman, 2017 Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Walsh & Bruce, 2014);
- Victim did not have time or means to address the assault (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Victim was unaware of how/where to report the assault (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017);
- Lack of privacy/poor handling of report (Hammond, et al., 2016; Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Leith, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018);
- Fear that resisting the assailant could be labeled as assault on the attacker (Hammond, et al., 2016; Leith, 2017);
- May be considered less credible/harder to prove than a female victim (Hammond, et al., 2016);

- Prior experiences with reporting or assault created experiences that may have increased resistance to reporting (Hammond, et al., 2016);
- Fear that their attacker will not be punished (Penn, 2014).

Last, while the reasons identified by researchers is varied, sometimes, no reason is given at all for nonreporting (Hammond et al., 2016).

Negative beliefs and rape myths, such as males can resist an attacker, may be held or endorsed by judges or members of the jury, or the police who are investigating the case before it even gets to court, if it gets to court (Fisher & Pina, 2013). Matters may be further convoluted when members of the jury and court see a legal definition that is full of gender-biased language, making it impossible for a male to be raped by a female, for example (Fisher & Pina, 2013). In the end, the victim experiences a secondary victimization/revictimization, and this may then turn to an unreported crime or unsupported victim, furthering the misconceptions of the crime and leaving the individual to remain silent and without support, treatment, or justice (Fisher & Pina, 2013). A similar experience may be had by a victim who seeks professional help, as can be seen by research on the biases and endorsed myths of therapists and counselors (Fisher & Pina, 2013).

Groth and Burgess (1980) first illuminated the barriers to reporting, identifying three rape myths that were specific to males: males should be able to protect themselves, their sexuality will be questioned, and reporting the assault is difficult in itself. These authors also indicated that males were victimized in processes similar to female victims, and any sort of perceived sexual outcome, such as ejaculation by the victim, may be seen

as a conquest by the offender and additional shame felt by the victim. One other idea of importance shared by Groth and Burgess' landmark study – The offender in the instances of sexual abuse displayed elements of hegemonic masculinity. Research from Hohl and Stanko (2015) illustrated that victim withdrawal from reporting, or attrition, is a complex matter, and attrition rates are highest in the earliest stages of reporting, whether it be because of misconceptions of gender, poor definitions of assault, the report setting or recorder, or any of the cognitive schemas/heuristics of the individual(s) involved in the process. Beyond lack of reporting, these matters can cause delays, dismissals, or more outright attrition when taken into account with other factors, such as the relationship between the victim and assailant, the types of injuries, the mental and physical health of the victim, and whether or not any drugs or alcohol were consumed by the victim prior to the assault (Hohl & Stanko, 2015).

Some information, such as the 1992-2000 crime report form the Bureau of Justice Statistics ([BJS], Hart & Rennison, 2003), show similar reporting rates by males and females (27% and 32%, respectively), and identified some reasons for not reporting a rape or sexual assault – it was seen as a private matter, it was not considered to be important, or it was reported to someone else (rather than the police). However, the 2017 report by the BJS on repeat violent victimization, 2005-2014 (Oudekerk & Truman) indicated that males experience significantly more repeat sexual victimizations than did females (45.4% and 28.8%, respectively). The BJS reports were conducted over numerous years and used a number of statistical analyses compared to the early work by

Groth and Burgess, but as this discussion progresses, a pattern of unrecognized and undiscussed male sexual abuse will emerge, regardless of procedure and analyses.

For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released a report in 2014 than examined sexual violence between intimate partners for the year 2011 (Breiding, et al., 2014). This report offers breakdowns of categories inclusive of all manner of sexual assault, but these will not be fully discussed here. What the CDC found was that approximately 1.7% of males have been raped in their lifetime, but the number of males reporting rape was too small to produce a reliable estimate. Still, 5.1% of males were also found to have experienced other forms of sexual victimization in the year preceding the survey (23.4% lifetime), most of which was perpetrated by females (male rape is typically committed by males, according to this report). This report consisted of interviews of 6,397 males (of which 5,848 completed the entire survey). Another notable feature of this report is that several elements of it mention that the number of males reporting various or total victimization were too small for reliable statistical estimates. However, the report ultimately determined that upwards of 16 million males had experienced some form of physical violence in their lifetimes. Of that physical violence, the BJS estimated in another report (Morgan & Kena, 2017) on victimization in 2016, 6.5% of males had experienced serious violence and 21.4% had experienced any sort of violent crime. Of all sexual assault or rape, only .3% were reported to the police (males and females), and .9% were not reported at all. The total number of males who experienced such violence was reported as 1,872,700. For the purposes of the report, rape and sexual assault was classified as violent crime as opposed to serious violent crime.

In 2014, Stemple and Meyer released an analysis of data collected by the BJS and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) from 2010 to 2012. Their determination was that male sexual victimization was not a rare experience, but rather that the prevalence was greater than largely discussed. Stemple and Meyer (2014) argue that sexual victimization is not just an act of power or control that occurs recklessly, but that it occurs with considerations of gender norms. As will be discussed in the next section, rape and sexual assault were, for many years (decades), perpetrated ONLY by a member of the opposite sex (male against female), though many instances of male victimization are perpetrated by a female (46%, according to Stemple & Meyer, 2014). Even further twisting the paradigm, sometimes the male victim is made to penetrate their assailant, which may be difficult to comprehend initially. Much of the argument provided by Stemple and Meyer (2014) is against the defining and classification of sexual assaults, wording which inherently and unfairly leaves male victimization unrecognized and unlikely. Stemple and Meyer (2014) also note that excluded from the data were those in carceral settings, including immigration centers, ultimately leaving approximately 2.5 million males out of the survey, and excludes analyses of socioeconomic and racial factors that could provide meaningful information. Furthermore, sexual assault occurs in these settings, hardly data to be missed. Furthermore, homeless populations are not likely to be captured either. How many males, due to their circumstance, have not been surveyed? The National Crime Victim Survey (NCVS, as reported by Stemple and Meyer (2014) indicated that between 2008 and 2009 over 900,000 instances of sexual assault had occurred in carceral settings. Other methodological limitations exclude other pertinent elements, such as

female-perpetrated unwanted sex, yet much of the recording of male sexual victimization continues to exclude these elements and many victimized and vulnerable males, who may have experienced one or multiple instances of sexual abuse.

Another, separate population of males can be found in the military. Specifically, military settings see sexual victimization outside of public assaults (more specifically, this phenomenon is labeled Military Sexual Trauma or MST). Penn (2014) states that 38 males in the military are sexually assaulted each day – increase tenfold upon joining the military. The article that Penn wrote is titled *Son, Men Don't Get Raped* – an unabashed statement about the status of being male and never being a victim, or perhaps denying it or keeping it to oneself. A victim of sexual assault, according to Penn (2014), could be dishonorably discharged for the perceived homosexual conduct. Penn lists this shame and professional damage, as well as stigma, as significant barriers to the report of male rape. It seems that, in the case of MST, there is no reporting because there is no faith that the perpetrator will be punished, or that any justice will be carried out. Seven percent of MST cases (that go to trial) result in a conviction; 81% of MST victims do not report the assault. Penn's (2014) interviews reach back to enlistments in the 1970s and cover all four major military branches, it includes hetero- and homosexual males, and it includes insights from individuals who run various military service organizations. Not reporting, Penn found, can be synonymous with not seeking treatment.

Many of the reasons for not reporting seem to be steeped in different types of fear. Badendoch (2015) found several of these in their research, including fear of revictimization in some way, or fear of how the victim will be viewed when they do

report, if they do at all. Badendoch's research indicates that upwards of 16% of all sexual assault victims are male, which means one of the next six males you encounter will have experienced an event on the spectrum of sexual assault, and there is a good chance they did not report it for some reason. Strikingly, one of those reasons may be that up to 59% of victimized males are unlikely to identify and/or label their experience as sexual abuse (Artime, et al., 2014). Some of this may have to do with limited research and the populations that are researched, but for the 73% of males that may experience harassment, many of them have been informed by their culture and believe that males cannot be harassed or raped by a female, (Artime, et al., 2014. Gender role conflict, created by threats and dissonance, eat at the self-image and the cultural creation, creating more distress and dissonance (Artime, et al., 2014; Budd, et al., 2019).

While males my feel less distress from female assailants or in situations that did not include force being used, male victims may then their victimhood and possibly exclude rape as a possibility at all, which could then also make unwanted touching of any kind almost negligible (Artime, et al., 2014). Males are told that they cannot be victims, especially to a female, and the dialogue between victims and friends, family, care personnel, or any other person that can have an impact on a victim's report is crucial (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017). It may be another male in a commercial or a legal professional that passes the message, but the victim receives it nonetheless and multiple times, almost always devoid of context (which may be irrelevant), and if the victim is an inmate, mentally ill, or somehow considered protected (or less-abled), then the likelihood of report is lower than if the victim were a free citizen (Kubiak et al., 2017) – if the

inmate was assault by staff, that rate is even lower. Even more basic is if the victim, inmates especially, have protection and privacy when they tell their story – if not, they could be in immediate danger and thus not bother reporting (Gorris, 2015). Cook and Lane (2017a, 2017b) have looked at identified victim barriers as well, including societal expectations (males should be able to resist attackers, males are sexually aggressive and are the assailants, not the victims, males only assault males if they are themselves homosexual, Cook & Lane (2017a, 2017b); victim blaming and rape myths interaction with race – minorities being more likely to hold negative views of victims of sexual assault, whereas higher educated individuals tend to blame victims less (Cook & Lane, 2017b).

Rape Myths

Burt's (1980) influential work on rape myths was appropriately titled Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape, which may be more poignant than the term rape myth. According to Burt (1980), rape myths are "stereotypical or false beliefs about the culpability of victims, the innocence of the rapists, and the illegitimacy of rape as a serious crime". While individuals and their beliefs vary, Burt (1980) found that several factors played a significant role in a person's acceptance of rape myths: Acceptance of interpersonal violence, sex role stereotyping, and adversarial sexual beliefs. Burt's (1980) research was focused on female victims and was supported by feminist theory, it is very relevant to this current discussion - the research reflects upon the stereotypical rape victim as a female who "wanted it" while permeating sexual assault and victimization research, perhaps unintentionally, to offer a mirror into thoughts about male victims –

any female, or male, can stop an assault if they want, so they must want it if they do not stop it. Burt (1980) discusses an additional consideration regarding each individual's internalization of rape myths – as sexually conservative individuals, some people hearing about an assault may have a difficult time in processing the actuality of the incident, resulting in victim blaming rather than acknowledging their own misunderstanding of or refusal to understand the assault. This ties into what Burt (1980) discusses as the personality correlates of those hearing about the assault, and their influence on how the victim's story, and the victim themselves, are received. If there are social acceptance correlates, or collective personality (social group) correlates, they would have to be those socially constructed, socially taught, and socially propagated beliefs about gender.

As will be explored further and further, the beliefs center on the idea that males cannot be victims – they can defend themselves or they want what happens, akin to the belief that a female who dresses a certain way wants sex (Ng, 2014; Hammond, et al., 2016; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018); males are not (as) harmed by sexual assault as females (Hammond, et al., 2016; Elkins, Crawford, and Briggs, 2017); males cannot be sexually assaulted by females Hammond, et al., 2016); sexual assault by another male only happens in prison or if the victim is homosexual and homosexuals are deviant (Ng, 2014; Badendoch, 2015; Hammond, et al., 2016); if there is an erection or ejaculation, the male wanted it (Badendoch, 2015; Hammond, et al., 2016) males initiate all sexual encounters (Hammond, et al., 2016; Porta, et al., 2018). Myths about rape and sexual assault, eventually, escalate into victimization and reporting barriers (Hammond,

et al., 2016). Some males are just unaware that being sexually assaulted is a crime that they can or should report (Badendoch, 2015).

Burt (1980) also discusses the experiential correlates of the information receivers, which includes knowing victims or having been victimized themselves, and how this may influence the way in which a person processes the sexual assault experience of another. Burt offers a theoretical model of the beliefs that rape myth acceptance is comprised of, based on the causal ordering of the variable clusters. Essentially, this model looks at how the variables (correlates) discussed by Burt inform each other in a causal chain that ultimately determines or affects an individual's rape myth acceptance. If this is the process, or part of it, for how people intake, process, and act on socially constructed theories of gender, then there may be a dual approach to the acceptance of gender roles and rape myths that have a profound impact on the assault and victimization experience of the individual, and their implicit and socially informed decision not to report the assault and victimization.

For males, this process combined with the process of identifying as male may be psychologically crippling. Burt makes a statement about this startling complexity of beliefs and culture in her research, illuminating the deep connection between a person's attitudes about sex, gender, and rape myths which applies to both the victim and the person hearing about the victim's experience. Hammond, Ioannou, and Fewster (2016) examined research on rape myths and found that part of the challenge is in the research itself - improved rape myth scales for males, along with more robust research studies, will help to provide more information that is more accurate and can be applied to more

situations. Additionally, Hammond et al. (2016) isolate the thought that rape myths directly translate into reporting barriers. Victims may be confused about what happened to them, and then unable to tell others about it for any number of reasons, including the judgement of the criminal justice systems, or that of their friends and family members. Males may not recognize what happened to them as assault, may think it is not serious enough to report, or may not report because males are not victims.

Wilson and Scarpa (2017) revisit Burt's (1980) research on stereotypes about sex roles and adversarial sexual beliefs in association with rape myths. The authors found that power dynamics of sexism, hostile and benevolent, played a role in the levels of post-traumatic stress experienced by the participants, in that if the victim felt hostile toward females, they may acknowledge that the event was more traumatic. This view of sexism, importantly, is expressed in beliefs about the opposite sex that are negative (hostile sexism) or stereotypical (benevolent) and may reflect cognitive dissonance that the victims have about gender, though the research by Wilson and Scarpa do not discuss this line of thought. What the authors offer, however, is that the cognitive mechanisms at play in their research may connect to post-traumatic functioning, which includes reporting, support-seeking, and sense-making, among other things, all of which tie into the propensity for the individual to feel comfortable in reporting what happened to them. Kubiak et al. (2018) provide research that examines rape myths as phenomena, including the sexual assaults occurring in carceral settings and how those myths envelope the atmosphere that allows the assaults and the investigations that may do the victim little or no justice.

Fisher and Pina (2013) report that the clear distinction between genders, as both victim and perpetrator of sexual assault, provides marked difficulties in addressing the sexual assault of males. Males are often not viewed as victims and seeing them as such confronts our beliefs about what masculinity is (Fisher & Pina, 2013). Much of this, unfortunately, stems from the myths that exist about males as victims; specifically, males as victims of sexual victimization. This is not just an issue of gender, but of the roles that we attribute to each sex, which then informs the assumptions we have gender, though they may be inherently faulty (Fisher & Pina, 2013). These myths are powerful things, and fundamentally inform our acceptance of and justification for sexual violence and the treatment that victims receive, including the stigma and blame that bind victims to silence and further degradation (Fisher & Pina, 2013). Males are supposed to be strong and capable of defending themselves, and either invite sexual contact, enjoy it (since they were erect or ejaculated), and can just shrug it off as though it was no big deal (Fisher & Pina, 2013). Males who are victimized are less than victims – They are weak and feminized, and the assault is downplayed as though it is not a real thing (Fisher & Pina, 2013). After all, a real man would have stopped it.

Like rape myths, some psychological biases frame victims in a poor light; belief in a just world, which may also be a philosophical construct, claims that no victim is innocent or that the victim deserved the assault as someone who has done something deserving of such punishment (Fisher & Pina, 2013). This deserving act may have been the male's perceived (and socially judged) promiscuity, or maybe he was just a bad person (Fisher & Pina, 2013). Regardless of the supposed wrongdoing that led to the

assault, the victim is blamed in both a priori and posteriori fashions – The victim did X and thus deserved the assault, and since the victim was assaulted/did not stop the assault/is assumed to have enjoyed the assault, it is no big deal. Brenner and Darcy (2017) see victim-blaming continue based on their behaviors, such as what they were wearing, and through attacks on their character (victims should act a certain way).

Javaid (2018) reflects that males are unlikely to report being raped due to the stigma, and because male sexual victimization is an afront to hegemonic masculinity and perceived aspects of male sexuality. Forsman (2017) discusses the invalidation of the victimization males experience due to rape myths via assumptions that an erection or orgasm during the assault means that it was invited or enjoyed (i.e., males want sex/cannot be raped). Penn (2014) takes this one step further is discussion of military sexual abuse, reflecting thoughts that victims are somehow deserving of the attack, which occurs in the line of service; worse still, victims are subject to the whims of the chain of command, which may order continued close-quartered proximity (to the assailant) during service. After all, males are expected to defend themselves, and lose masculinity when they do not (Groth & Burgess, 1980).

Besides rape myths and social reinforcement of gender behaviors, one may wonder what factors play a role in an individual's perception of barriers. Groth and Burgess (1980) initially posited that societal beliefs males include the notion that males should be able to defend themselves against sexual assault and that for males, the chance that their sexuality may become suspect, especially if they experienced arousal or ejaculation during the assault, can cause distress in the male victim, thus making it

difficult to report the event. Hohl and Stanko (2015) offer some insight into the reporting of sexual victimization, stating that many rapes are never reported (in the general population) and that only a few that are end in in the conviction of the assailant. Hohl and Stanko (2015) refer to some of the mechanisms of reporting barriers as an attrition problem or a justice gap. The problem of attrition, the authors suggest, is that victims withdraw their complaints or statements during the investigation for a variety of reasons, including insensitivity toward or problems in recording a victim's statement (such as lack of privacy or trained officers), or overall lack of criminal justice capacity to robustly address the need and of and information from the victim.

Problems with Definitions

With the understanding that research builds upon itself, almost like collective wisdom, previous research cannot be completely ignored. Lisak (1993) provides a striking sentiment in early linguistic research: Language that is sexist is not just hurtful, but it essentially negates the experiences and existences of a person or group. For most people, sexist language may not necessarily conjure up thoughts of how man may be negatively impacted by such things. However, sexist language does not need to objectify or demean a gender to negatively impact, but exclusion of a gender can be harmful as well. Fisher and Pina (2013) emphasize the importance of definitions in the legal realm, citing a lack of gender-neutral or male-inclusive vocabulary in sexual assault laws and litigation, which would then eliminate the concept that only males are capable of rape or sexual assault. Much research highlights the fact that males have not, historically (and even contemporarily), been victims, or even eligible to be such (Rosin, 2014; Hlavka,

2016; Turchik, et al., 2016; Forsman, 2017). In foundational research from Bart in 1980, she points out that even in the 1970s rape myths and stereotypes were prevalent.

That acceptance of myth and stereotype, though by definition false beliefs, continued to impact the legal system, social sex, and gender roles, and this created a cycle of restrictive definitions and punitive social perceptions. Furthermore, if an individual is accepting of interpersonal violence in their own life, then they are more likely to accept rape myths (Bart, 1980). These attitudes continue to saturate public life and are connected to other areas of sex and gender conflict, such as sex role stereotyping and distrust of the opposite sex (Bart, 1980). Even though research that happened 40 years ago demonstrated his, males are still often ignored as victims by legal policy and social practice across the planet – the individual in that space is, in most cases, destined to return to that world (Brenner & Darcy, 2017). Words are not just sounds but life itself.

One of the key elements of proper language also includes legal sanctions, as is the case for sexual assaults, which typically receive shorter sentences than rapes (Fisher & Pina, 2013). This means that even if a female assailant penetrates a male victim with a foreign object, similar to what may happen during a rape, they are still more likely to be charged with a sexual assault and receive less prison time than a male assailant charged with rape for a similar action. It is vital to specify the terms being used in an appropriate and reasonable manner that reflects the reality of the situation. Leith (2017) reminds us that some of the problems with inaccurate or unjust definitions include lack of standard definitions causing lower estimates of victimization or problems with accurate reporting, different variables measured across studies, or poor laws that struggle to accurately

define sexual victimization. Furthermore, complications or inaccuracies introduce or maintain errors in databases and statistical analyses (Kapur & Muddell, 2016) and impact our ability to advocate for or adopt legal reform to the needs of male victims, which also ignores the idea that males may not be the aggressors. (Turchik, et al., 2016).

Research from Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, and Merrick (2014) found that while only 1.7% of males have been raped, 23.4% reported other sexual violence, including" being made to penetrate another person, coercion to engage in sexual acts, (any) unwanted sexual contact, and unwanted experiences that had no contact, such as verbal harassment. Furthermore, Breiding et al. (2014) found that 5.7% of males have been victims of stalking. Sexual assault from an intimate partner accounted from between .5% and 14% of all sexual acts, which strips the victim of safety even in their own environments. Breiding et al. (2014) also found that 58.2% of males experienced sexual violence before turning 18, and that up to 71% of their population were forced to penetrate another person. These statistics apply to white males in the research; for other ethnicities, the authors found that sexually violent encounters (other than rape) range from 15.8% for Asian/Pacific Islanders to as high as 39.5% for multiracial males; Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native males, non-Hispanic Black males, and non-Hispanic White males fell between these rates.

Forsman (2017) looks at the challenges in defining male sexual assault and/or rape, including the reliance on legal definitions. However, these definitions are often outdated or exclusionary to males, or presuppose that sexual assault will occur with penile penetration. Definitions such as these limit the scope of all sexual assaults,

whether the victim is male or female. One of the major deficits that Forsman points out is that few definitions include concepts such as unwanted sex that is initiated by a female; a wholly sexist concept in itself. Beck and Rantala (2014) simplify much of the debate by defining sexual victimization as sexual contact with a victim without his or her consent or with a victim who cannot consent or refuse. This seems simple and directly applicable, but, unfortunately, the conversation has moved past this point - Morgan and Kena (2017), for example, define sexual assault as completed, attempted, and/or threatened rape, sexual assault, verbal threats, and unwanted sexual contact with or without force. Already, there is a significant change to the dynamic. While males have been historically removed from the conversation of sexual victimization insofar as being a victim, the continued silence that is perpetuated by social taboo, poor definitions and legislation continue to allow for males to be excluded from justice and treatment (Ng, 2014).

Rantala (2014) defines inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization as involving nonconsensual sexual acts or abusive contact with a victim without his or her consent or with a victim who cannot consent or refuse. The author states that nonconsensual sexual acts are the most serious victimizations and include any contact between genitals and/or anus and/or mouth, and any penetration, even if slight, and if done with a body part or any physical item. The other form of abuse identified by Rantala (2014) is Abusive Sexual Contact (ASC), which is defined as “intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person.” Rantala (2014) also describes similar behaviors by staff as Staff-on-Inmate sexual victimization and notes that this type of assault can include employees/contractors,

volunteers, official visitors, but excludes family members, friends, or non-official visitors.

Staff Sexual Misconduct (SSM) is somewhat different - according to Rantala (2018) and can be defined as any consensual or nonconsensual behavior or act of a sexual nature directed toward an inmate by staff, including romantic relationships. Such acts include - intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks that is unrelated to official duties or with the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire, completed, attempted, threatened, or requested sexual acts, occurrences of indecent exposure, invasion of privacy, or staff voyeurism for reasons unrelated to official duties or for sexual gratification. Staff sexual harassment includes repeated verbal comments or gestures of a sexual nature to an inmate by staff. Such statements include demeaning references to an inmate's gender or sexually suggestive or derogatory comments about his or her body or clothing, repeated profane or obscene language or gestures (p. 2).

Kapur and Muddell (2016) argue from another anger, suggesting that definitions need to be clear in their distinction between sex and gender, even more so when understanding about gendered and nongendered violence is sought. As males are viewed predominantly as perpetrators (and females as victims) this is not truth and therefore nothing is entirely defined – when feminism was seeking justice for females, criminal conduct of a sexual nature, including some war crimes, was identified as sexual violence, but this does not always stand for males (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). But continuing to deny that torture or abuse of a nature that involves genitals continues to deny male abuse

and sexual abuse in general. Previous documentation also needs new analysis to process it fully and further analysis of documentation needs to provide an in-depth range of contextual or procedural factors, some of which may include male perspective on these topics (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). In Africa, reports on transitional justice note that males are still not accurately recognized as victims of sexual assault; this may include forced circumcision that occurs as a violent act, rather than as a traditional child-rearing practice as Western civilizations may know it (Kapur & Muddell, 2016).

Going beyond just recognition of sexual violence, it is necessary to consider justice entirely which is to say that indictments and justice may not be achieved due to poor definitions or other socio-cultural implications (Kapur & Muddell, 2016) – poor conceptualizations and limited understanding will exclude victims from finding justice, as sexual violence depends on the recognition of the victim, or of victimhood (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). Belitz (2018) notes that definitions from the PLRA fall very short of all forms of sexual abuse, especially non-physical abuse that is still sexual in nature; even when these were included, there were various legal loopholes make it possible to avoid such assumptions and evidence for much of the sexual abuse that had occurred. The PLRA made this worse, since it shut out civil remedies, since the courts interpreted the PLRA to limit recovery that an inmate can pursue and leaves the inmate, who has not suffered physical or sexual injury, to purse only injunctive or declaratory relief. Without injury there is nothing for which to compensate; a violation of rights is recognized, but loss or injury is not, thus highlighting wrongdoing but removing accountability. Even when there is an injury, it can be argued that it may be trivial or de minimis, leaving

courts to struggle with the severity of the act and injury, and the 8th Amendment may be utilized to determine if the injury is considered to be punishment, and to what degree; court decisions that struggle with such things have profound and broad impact on the body and life. While the PLRA, PREA, and even DOJ regulations may struggle with these definitions (Artime, et al., 2014, note that the US DOJ finally changed its definition in 2012 to allow for male victims of rape).

Masculinity during Incarceration

Erving Goffman's (1961) total institution represents a space wherein people function as community but do so apart from the larger society, such as with a prison (Crewe, et al., 2014; Brenner & Darcy, 2017). These places have a different authority, different methods of carrying out daily activities, all geared to meet a specific purpose. But violence within these spaces is increased, making it nearly impossible to have a fair and unbiased system of investigation and justice that also keeps retaliation at bay, all while properly addressing sexual abuse. Banner (2014), in Brenner & Darcy (2017), points to the unique qualities of an institution, in comparison with other, unique institutions, and illuminates the need to find similarities for problem-solving across systems. The prison space removes freedoms and incorporates discipline (Crewe, et al., 2014), and males must face the navigation and presentation of their gender, while performing gender in a number of ways and contexts (Ricciardelli, et al., 2015). Prison gender is a deliberate act, building on the stifled emotions and externalization that has been socialized into males (Ricciardelli, et al., 2015). The total institution limits the expression of gender and

emotions, and as will be discussed, the hierarchies within prison ultimately detract from the safety and security of the inmate (Ahlin, 2019).

Patriarchy is a historical and global concept, so much so that it is worth calling it a force rather than a concept. Males adopt identities, catalyzed by developmental processes (such as identity development), and create new soldiers for the hegemonic theater, framed as a military concept and as social interaction (Ricciardelli, 2015). This concept of theater as interaction, involves the mask of masculinity, which is not only a display announcing that the individual claims their membership among the hegemonic, but it also hides that which is not desired (Ricciardelli, 2015). Masculinity in prison is not the masculinity of the streets, but it is used to taking a hegemonic mantle regardless. Ricciardelli (2015) notes found that hypermasculine elements were not necessarily superfluous in prisons, but rather necessary, such as placing murderers at the top of the prison hierarchy or seeing inmates engage in workout activities in the snow, in addition to many other behaviors and norms that occur in prison. The masculinity of prison is a distorted reflection of masculinity in the public, as the hierarchy exists between and among the genders (Ricciardelli, 2015). Ricciardelli (2015) argues that prisoner values are created through what values are on the outside, but that importation may be a continual process of conflict and expression, creation, and perpetuation of a person's culture – prison itself creates dynamics that can amplify or degrade these. Motivations inside of prison may become different than the motivations an individual felt when free, and it is tough to know if these changes are permanent, but the individuals who struggle

to adapt to the prison life may find themselves to be more vulnerable (Shermer & Sudo, 2016).

Prison is, historically and currently, dynamic and filled with a total violence that is perfect for use in a patriarchy (Crewe, et al., 2014). Fighting is practically a currency (see Nayak, 2006), as an individual can use it to protect what they have, acquire what someone else has, or simply teach another prisoner a lesson, all in the name of dominance and image (Ricciardelli, 2015). Even if the individual does not want this responsibility of creating and/or upholding the mantel of hegemonic masculinity, it may not be an option (Ricciardelli, 2015). As Bourdieu (1977, in Simon & Gagnon, 1986) puts forth, *cultural scenarios* involve the improvisation of behaviors and identities, which are discussed throughout this current research, and these scenarios may be seen as teachings amongst members of a given culture, such as inmates.

Michalski (2017) presents what he refers to as *a general theory of prison violence,* which he presents in the light of an ethnographical examination (see Sykes, 1958) and status relations (see Milner, 1994, 2004). Ultimately, Michalski discusses how the deprivation brought about by imprisonment and the necessary violence of carceral spaces interacts with hegemonic masculinity. The use of violence in the carceral space is reinforced by the idea that when everything is taken away (via deprivation) then it is necessary to assert, claim, and express one's identity with an acceptable mechanism, and this entire process reinforces the hegemonic. Michalski argues, through Sykes (1958), that the impact of deprivation underlies a distancing of the individual from *legal norms* and brings about a reinvestment of carceral expectations and norms, which is found the

inmate code. This code is the violent exposition of resource acquisition. While it has been shown that the counterpart of deprivation is importation, which is what the individual brings in from their pre-carceral lives, and this impacts to a greater or lesser degree how an individual adapts to prison. Michalski (2017) suggests that *resource structuralism* is a large part of this – an individual's agency is ultimately dependent on what power and resources an individual has at their disposal, and that actions based upon these power and resources is symbolic of them; the actor is thus trapped.

Michalski (2017) summons Goffman's total institution as a house for this process of social construction and deprivation(s), both as creator and arena that the inmates must traverse. Outside of prison, masculinity may be abstract or alien, but it is both unique to and separate from the individual, just as prison is to general society (Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Michalski, 2017). As the prison system fills itself with the hierarchies created by the prisoners (not to exclude the staff), they create a magnification of the behaviors within those hierarchies, so that every level (the most dominant males overall, and the most dominant in each hegemonic arena or level) begins to create its own rules for control of the particular hegemony, which may include a form of social control seen as (justified) moralistic violence (see Black, 1983).

In Czechoslovakian prison culture, Dirga (2017) found that the body was used in specific ways, such as tattoo work and bodybuilding to display masculine power and action, both as presentation and preservation. The performative body is theatre, acting as mask, brush, and weapon, to name but a few roles – production and performance are linked (Dirga, 2017).

Moran (2014) proffers that individuals with a history of imprisonment or incarceration have experienced an inherently corporeal environment, which reflects prisoner agency as well as the gendered experience outside of prison. As prisons are not entirely cut off from society, Moran (2014) argues that prisons have mechanisms of interconnectedness that keep prisoner and non-prisoner connected. Part of this connection is the general social order that can be found within a prison, and the lives of the prisoners which are far from routine, but rather full of many complex situations and interactions that are subtle. As Moran (2014) argues, the body itself is a medium through and across which operations and functions occur; the value of these operations and functions is closely tied to the performative elements of the individual, just as prisons represent the values of the society, culture, and politics that are pervasive within the prison. In Czechoslovakian prison culture, Dirga (2017) found that the body was used in specific ways, such as tattoo work and bodybuilding to display masculine power and action, both as presentation and preservation. The performative body is theatre, acting as mask, brush, and weapon, to name but a few roles – production and performance are linked (Dirga, 2017).

Moolman (2015) sees the prison as a carceral space that is created and made of physical bodies with social, collective inscriptions upon them that are hegemonic in nature. These, Moolman suggests, are demonstrated through heteronormative practices that are interstitial within the rules and codes of the prison. The prohibitions imparted by a carceral setting reduces may things, such as sexual activity and personal identity, and forces them to become something else. As Moolman states, gendered reality, in carceral

spaces, undergoes transformation that is already akin to the constant renegotiation of hegemonic practices and survival. and individuals, allowances, exceptions, and new normalities for the sake of that dominance. Any concept of consent is replaced by coercion, inherently, as much of this process is considered grooming by the dominant actors, and the marginalized prison wives, transgendered inmates, and homosexual and non-binary identities must submit and apply their instrumental values as the hegemonic male demands and allows. We then see compliance which is the expectation of prisons, and we hear silence which becomes the hegemonic milieu. Moolman molds this structure in a Foucauldian model, which places coercion and silence as surveillance, when then dictates (to some degree) how the system perpetuates itself, including the actions of the individual within the system. The arguments concerning homosexual consent, which is assumed to be automatic and perverse, are further distorted here for all individuals and for the myths about straight males who have not declared their homosexuality yet. Violence and surveillance ritualize, at least in prisons, according to Moolman, and what is ritualized here is legion: Hegemony, patriarchy, (hyper-masculinity, heteronormativity, heterosexuality, gender order, inscripted bodies, sexualities, prison sexualities, degradation of the feminine and the non-masculine, subjugation of the non-hetero, confluence of myths about sexual assault and prison, the carceral transition from and to the outside world before and after incarceration, and, ultimately, the loss of identity and expression through freedom, choice, and acceptance.

Hefner (2018) reframes the idea that incarceration and prisons do not completely negate an individual or their pre-incarceration self; rather, the social construction of the

individual continues to exist, but how they perform their identities changes based on the new context within which they find themselves. Prior to incarceration, the individual is organized, so to speak, into various categories. These each reflect a distance from accepted hegemonic power, acceptable gendered practice, and overall treatment and equality that the person may experience through their acting out of each identifier. However, there are times that in taking control of the feminine role, without necessarily forced to subjugation, allows an individual to meet crucial needs and receive for providing, such as services or supplies. This is a new power dynamic that reinforces binary and sees females or non-hetero as there to provide for males or as a method of keeping safe due to the resources one can offer in these roles.

Ricciardelli, Maier, and Hannah-Moffat (2015) examined the strategic use of masculinity in prison, including the mechanics of negotiating masculinities while incarcerated. The authors posit that the subcultures within prison are set in a framework that exaggerates qualities typical of assumptions about masculinity (e.g.: strength, bravery). The structures are organized by the criminal history and crimes of the individual, including those looked down upon, such as crimes against children or sexual perversion. The acceptable crimes are masculine and seem to reflect a process of masculinity as established by social context and prison ideology. Masculinity is complex and versatile, and multifarious, and is not found in an arena by itself, but rather compared and relative to other gender presentations, and seeks to be legitimized in its own way. Prisoners must also face the risk posed by going against their own self-image, as though psychological dissonance will produce trauma or distress. Fortunately, Ricciardelli,

Maier, and Hannah-Moffat (2015) note that aggression is not always necessary, though other actions serve the hegemonic cause nonetheless – bodybuilding, a prime example of performed prison masculinity, is not violent toward others, but does uphold the masculine ideal (Dirga, 2017). However, if the risk is great enough, research by Ricciardelli, Maier, and Hannah-Moffat (2015) found that some inmates may adopt strategies that could be culturally read as traditionally masculine and others that could be read as feminine (e.g., being passive or compliant) in an effort to deal with perceived risk. The risk, it seems, is entirely gendered, based on socio-cultural norms, and fall along a spectrum of hegemonic avenues. Feminine presentation, or any alternative/sub-masculine presentation, may have more risk or reward at times - context and performance, the mobilization of an entire range of masculinities, becomes hypersalient in a carceral setting, partially due to the deprivation and destabilization of the prison world.

Fortuin (2018) explores a new avenue within prison masculinity, one which adds new dynamics to the conversation. He notes that the prisoner is a hypermasculine individual, but also (homo-)eroticized, and this performance of masculinity will ultimately transcend the prison itself and changes the sexual dynamics for the male inmate, who now has the opportunity to circumvent the removal of typical sexual outlets by engaging in homosexual activity in prison; prison is a peculiar setting that allows and makes taboo certain fetishes and desires (Fortuin, 2018). Again, males seek closeness with other males in prison, the inmate must continue to receive no sexual pleasure, adapt to, or embrace their non-hetero identity, or enter a world of sexual coercion and/or confusion. The discursive nature, Fortuin (2018) emphasizes, of masculinities in prison

separates the process of making friends, of being male in the free world, and creates a disjointed image of the self, like one seen in a broken mirror. But as prison sex is transactional, violent, coercive, and forbidden, it may be more alluring to any who seek to use it as a weapon or explore it as a genuine matter of lifestyle or interest and curiosity. For Fortuin (2018), prison transforms more than the individual and the body, but the act of sex as well, as it may become a carceral process of taboo pleasure as well as violence and domination through conflation of gender and sex roles.

Kupers (2017) explores gender in prison and the role of gendered power in the lives of those incarcerated. Kupers begins by reminding the reader that the way society views gender is magnified in carceral settings. Just as in the world beyond the prison walls, being male does not make you a man, proving your masculinity does. This means that once attained, masculine status can be taken or lost, casting the individual into the non-masculine; for females, Kupers states, this does not occur. For a female, the degradation occurs, but she remains a woman. The depth of this statement is surely controversial and arguable, but within prison walls, losing status as a man brings about a similar fate – Violence and dominance through sexual use and coercion will occur for the male who loses his masculine status (whether by force or by choice). Kupers refers to such outcomes as draconian and notes that they are intensified in prison, just as stereotypical hegemonic behaviors are, though several social movements (including post-feminism) strove to change how males identified and engaged with others. Kupers notes that there are four structural elements within the code of male prisoners: (a) exaggerated dominance hierarchies; (b) clear and drastic separations of the levels within those

hierarchies; (c) increasing feminization as the individual moves closer to the bottom of the hierarchies; and (d) a lack of choices for gendered actions, which reinforces the hegemony. Superiority, within and without prison walls, keeps these structures in place, though the superiority may simply be perceived. Notably, Kupers suggests that the behaviors learned in prison will be continued upon release, continuing to drive inequality. Masculine males are in charge, those who are not perceived as the same are not tolerated (though they may hold on to some respect). Still, the fluid or ambiguous presentation is often met with threats and possibly violence; if nothing else, social castigation and exclusion. One cannot even ask for protection or less severe treatment, as this is received as antagonistic.

Kennedy (2016) argues that while prison masculinities have not been heavily researched, they are available to male prisoners, and that they may change, or be negotiated, over time. Furthermore, Kennedy argues that the hypermasculinity that may drive these masculinities may be held as a front, so to speak, during social interactions, but that the individual may not truly hold the values of hypermasculinity. While the presentation of self in prison and the prison code may be reflective of stereotypical but existing elements of masculinity, a portion of research indicates that the prison itself may limit more appropriate or acceptable expressions of masculinity. The entire continuum of crime, incarceration and identity development in an incarcerated individual may occur within the spectrum of subordination, and that the further deprivation of the carceral process thus renders the individual to an even lower status. Therefore, the individual sees that they are less of a man, and without resiliency or protective factors, masculinities are

deconstructed and begin to be performed as hypermasculinities as the individual reconstruct their identity (Kennedy, 2016); it should be noted that Ahlin (2019) found that successful use of presentation and resources requires that the individual has imported or learned prosocial coping mechanisms, as without the appropriate resources and ability to manage stress, there will be cumulative disadvantage to the individuals performance (Ahlin, 2019). Crewe, Warr, Bennett, and Smith (2014) talk about the need to adapt to the demands of prison life, at least for males. Crewe et al. (2014) talk about the complex world of prison emotionality, including the volatility and violent landscape, and it isn't just a static state of violence, but rather the risk of violence, nearly imminent each day (see Sykes, 1958), that drives some of the inmates to act as they do (tough, prepared to fight, proactive in their violence). It is not just physical safety in jeopardy, but also masculinity. Proactively violent and stoically accepting of their reality, males must seem tough, act tough, and prepare for what may come, and to turn on each other, so as reporting what has been done to them can be considered snitching or ratting and weak (Ahlin, 2019).

Crewe et al. (2014) offer the concept of conscious identity work to the conversation. This is a key notion, as the male prisoner must always think about who they are and who they portray. De Viggiani (2012) refers to this work as a front management tactic, but the performative nature is what matters in the moment. Goffman (1959) again appears here, as Crewe et al. (2014) offer Goffman's presentation of self as a terrific example of performative gender – The male prisoner presents their frontstage bravado while pushing away the backstage fear and anxiety, the true self in the current moment.

Prison does not offer a private space for the self or even rehearsal, and the backstage self is paradoxically crushed while the frontstage masculinity acts in many ways to protect it. The internal geography of male emotionality (Crewe et al., 2014) follows a script, as the actor portrays what prison, and society, taught them that they ought to be.

Crewe et al. (2014) discuss Crawley's (2004) emotional map, which offers the individual a method of learning what is acceptable where, even within the fences and barbed wire. The spatial creation of emotional allowance becomes very real and breaks free from the simple cross section that one may see in a glance. What an observer may notice is a landscape of unspoken rules, ways of being, reaction and proactive action, and a temporal arc of a male who enters prison with one (or more) masculinities as their map, which is now overlaid by the map of prison being, and prison masculinity. The whole of the prison is oppressive and repressive (Crewe et al., 2013) and within it, one finds constructs of prison masculinity – Makeshift weapons, hiding spots, and presentations (see Dirsuweit, 1990). Incarceration shapes the social practices and relations that one may find into a variation of what the male prisoner knew when they were free (Van Hoven & Sibley, 2008).

Whenever there is a deviation from the carceral norm, such as an exception allowed by staff (Crewe et al., 2014), a new space within the carceral space emerges: Third spaces (Wilson, 2003), wherein the culture of two worlds bleed into each other. Crewe et al. (2013) state that it is a type of gender compensation that plays out in these spaces; it isn't just a display, this posturing and acting also issues some control over that paradox of crushing what you hope to protect (see Johnson, 1987). As males are typically

taught to subdue their emotions, doing so in prison allows for collective coping (Crewe et al., 2013), in which the prisoners are not burdened by the emotions of another, nor are they reminded of their own. Of course, this just adds to the culture of masking (Crewe et al., 2013) and this is made by worse, yet again, by the paradoxical action of crushing the elements that make you vulnerable to protect them, that authentic self that you preserve (Jewkes, 2002, 2005; Liebling & Maruna, 2005). Crewe et al. (2013) state that, overall, focus is on relieving the self of negative emotions like pain or feeling alone. But the regulation of the emotions, especially positive emotions, is something that males often deal with, and only more so in prison. There is no obvious advantage, it seems, outside of the hegemonic systems and social order, and inmates are forced to use the hegemonic narratives to navigate power dynamics that are amplified and intensified inside a carceral setting (Javaid, 2018). Male sexual victimization is not quiet invisible, but very much part of the tapestry of incarcerated life, expected and joked about, almost disregarded as gum on a sidewalk for those that are not the victim – unsightly, undiscussed, inconvenient (Javaid, 2018).

Still, some opportunities for healthy release do arise, appearing in a variety of interactions and creative outlets which prisoners may find (Crewe et al., 2014). For example, marginal spaces or intermediate zones, such as visiting rooms, offer neutral emotional topography as emotional microclimates wherein the prison culture “permit(s) a broader emotional register”, and the male inmate is allowed to show his authentic self (doting father, loving son, individual in need of support; Crewe et al., 2014). Crewe et al. (2014) suggest that whatever occurs in these zones is sacred, and not allowed to be used

against the inmate in any malicious way, and in certain prison programs, such as a cooking class, staff helped to nurture positive emotions in the prisoners, who were allowed to connect with each other in friendly and warm social transactions and interactions. However, these authors point out that these zones were cultivated by staff, who approached the goals of the zones and the inmates in different ways. Foucault's (1979) spatial inscription meets Goffman's (1959) presentation…

Brenner and Darcy (2017) discuss the intensive isolation, containment, and culture of sexual violence within such systems, and how the victims and perpetrators typically function within close quarters of each other, sometimes having dynamic relationships. The maleness of the prison culture also influences how "these institutions respond to and create preventative measures against sexual violence (Brownmiller, 1976; and Brubaker, 2009, in Brenner & Darcy, 2017). "...settings that promote and facilitate male aggression are also known to be more prone to perpetuation of sexual violence (Cantalupo, 2011, in Brenner & Darcy, 2017). Brenner and Darcy (2017) state that within a prison there is "a separation from general societal norms, laws, and resources surrounding sexual violence...membership and identity conferred by one's presence in (this) system may be difficult to shed and results in different implications for reporting and finding justice" (p. 127), partially due to restriction of legal remedies. As a closed system, reporting and investigation becomes difficult, including the internal administrative grievance process. Brenner and Darcy (2017) submit that there is a dilemma between *rights* and *trust*, that occurs when an institution places itself over the individual, and possibly relates low levels of sexual violence.

As hegemonic masculinity is based in institutional and social settings, the prison setting amplifies and changes it, as will be discussed throughout the rest of this discussion. The performance of masculinity outside of prison informs that performance within prison walls and reflects social messages (Carberry, 2017) – the rituals of masculinity may be a prison unto themselves, and while they may inform criminal behavior, the prison will prey upon it as prisons have their own codes that describe ways of being and a lack of resources that make it difficult to negotiate healthy masculine behaviors (Carberry, 2017). The prisoner is now a number but also a representation of themselves displayed in their behaviors, which is interpreted, rewarded, or punished by others.

Sexual Victimization during Incarceration

It is unfortunate and harmful that jokes about sexual assaults have become seemingly commonplace when talking about (male) prisons (e.g., "Don't drop the soap"; Ashmont, 2014; Ng, 2014). Myths about sexual activities and proclivities in prison, and about individuals who identify as homosexual, continue to build an image of prison sex that continue to twist this topic into one where jokes are acceptable (Ricciardelli, 2013; 2015). Some authors see PREA as official acknowledgement of sexual assault in prisons, and thus acceptance of it, though the breadth of the issue is still not fully understood (Simpson et al., 2016) – this is problematic. Even more so, the lack of individual agency and power makes sexual assault to occur, yet this knowledge has not been appropriately implemented (Cook & Lane, 2019a). Violence in prison is not just violence, it is sexualized (Nielsen, 2017), meaning that it is directly connected to gender ideologies and

identities, meaning that is tied to biology (genitals) and society (gender roles). It is not random or unexpected (Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016), it is the result of societal expectations, conditions, prison settings and rules, and other factors to be discussed below, all under the umbrella of hegemonic masculinity. As many as 600,000 prisoners are raped each year, with as much as 10-28% of the prison population claiming one or more incidents of sexual assault happening, leaving this phenomenon to be known as America's *most open secret* (Shermer & Sudo, 2016).

Males in prison who are the targets of assaults become feminized and become known as bitches or prison wives (Ricciardelli, 2015). Hegemonic masculinity and rape myths, as well as myths about homosexual activities, continue to perpetuate this overall theme, and differentiating sex and gender is a function of labeling and organizing perceived and practiced inequality; there is no equality in prison (Nielsen, 2017). And while explicit homosexuality is looked down upon in prison, prison culture twists this further, making it acceptable for males to assume control and dominance by sexually victimizing other males. This contrasts sharply against prisoners who are incarcerated for sex crimes, such as raping a girlfriend, which is considered taboo among prisoners (especially when it concerns children), and the perpetrator of that crime is in danger of violent assaults while in prison (Ricciardelli, 2015), whereas the male prisoner who commits assault in prison is not acted upon with such violence. We are reminded, however, that incarceration includes attitudes that violence is acceptable, it is expected and inevitable (Shermer & Sudo, 2016; Simpson et al., 2016); other factors, such as

management styles and staff response can increase these beliefs in inmates and staff (Ahlin, 2019).

Ashmont (2014) offers that prison rape, and by extension sexual victimization, is possibly the most pervasive and ignored of all human rights abuses. Ashmont argues that 20% of male prisoners and 25% of female prisoners will face sexual victimization, and that the underreporting in the facilities is a significant issue, continually fueled by the fear of retribution or inaction, and the label of *snitch*. Because of the overall proportion of male inmates, they make up 86% of all reported or known rape cases, with at least 25% of males refusing to identify who assault them (Ashmont, 2014). Many males are assaulted by more than one person and experiences several instances of assault. Approximately 51% of all males sexually victimized in prison report the event, with only 3% resulting in any sort of discipline against a known abuser (Ashmont, 2014). Ashmont (2014) asserts that poor prison classification leads to higher rates of assaults, and the silence maintained by prisoners (it is well-known that snitches are viewed with disdain) is a hopeful attempt to avoid any retribution by the person being reported. Unfortunately, people see sexual abuse as part of the punishment and think it is fair that incarcerated individuals should suffer, and that unless there is serious injury, there really isn't anything that should be done (Ng, 2014).

Following these points, Caravaca-Sanchez and Wolff (2016) and Simpson et al. (2016) notes that estimates for victimization in prisons can be as high as 41%, but the majority of the research is from the United States, and may lack in methodological rigor, including poor response rates and non-random sampling; additionally, these authors

argue that many of the studies have conflicting information that may take away from or negate the results – prison administrators report assaults at a rate that is five times lower than the inmates themselves report (Belitz, 2018); combine this with the findings of Cook and Lane (2019b) that suggest very few prison staff think sexual assaults are rare (approximately 9%). If prisoners have a 30x higher rate of being assaulted than non-incarcerated individuals (males more than females; Ng, 2014), and if underreporting remains problematic, then what gives incarcerated individuals belief that they should report the assault? Belitz (2018) reports that around 50% of inmate assaults were committed by staff members, and that only around 1% of staff are convicted, these are more reasons not to say anything, and this is another failure of the support system. In fact, approximately one-third of staff members have been allowed to resign before the investigations concluded, thereby allowing the event to not become public record; this allows the staff member to get a similar job elsewhere without a record of what happened. Brenner and Darcy (2017) argue that hiding violence takes advantage of the trust that inmates, the public and the staff expect from the institution, but sometimes there is no or poor disciplinary action.

From 2009 through 2011, Beck (2015) reports that in such a short time, allegations had gone up by approximately 300 per year in United States prisons, with substantiated cases going up as well; this is reflected by information from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016) and Rantala (2018), who report that this trend was similar in adult and youth facilities. In fact, both the BJS and Rantala (2018) follow this trend from 2005 to 2014 and see continued increase in recorded assaults, allegations, substantiations

And what if, as some research presents, the sexual assault of prisoners by staff is predominantly enacted by female staff (85% of assaults are carried out by female staff; Nielsen, 2017)? This changes much of the discussion, especially aspects of consent and power dynamics (and removal of power), but it highlights that abuse of power (through dominance over a sexed body and limited choice) is the main exercise of dominant hierarchy. While female dominance is not the stereotype, it is yet another interrupted and confusing gendered process that relies on deprivation and threat, and subversion of choice (Nielsen, 2017) – if I am forced to have sex in prison, wouldn't I rather have it with a female? Hypermasculinity becomes the minimum tolerable behavior (Nielsen, 2017). Beck (2015), BJS (2016), and Rantala (2018) all found that staff assaults were not minimal, with prevalence as high as 40, 50, or even 64%, which means hundreds of staff on inmate assaults, in both youth and adult facilities.

Brenner and Darcy (2017) argue that resources for sexual abuse in these settings are limited and antagonistic and separate from a thorough system of care. Prison, as explored, is closed and total system, and this makes investigation difficult to conduct and difficult for survivors to tolerate, resulting in a system wherein people make seek to take justice into their own hands (Brenner & Darcy, 2017). This is dangerous – violence is already intensified in prison settings, and this is not an unbiased, non-retaliatory system; pictures of isolated occurrences of institutionalized assaults become mandatory. This feeds into an anxious assumption that is also a popular notion – prison rape is inevitable, prison staff is callous and vindictive, and the dynamics of the informal prison culture and communication is invaluable in understanding prison behaviors; when an inmate

overhears something or goes through the system, and these to not go well, this concept spreads to others and changes presentations and reactions of the inmates (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). Additionally, the sensitive nature of prison communications and cultural practice contributes to the difficulty of conducting this research, since what a prisoner says to a researcher is subject to inspection by others and may simply be too difficult to share (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). 3.2% of all people, 4% of state and federal prisoners, and 9.5% of juvenile detention report being sexually abused, yet jokes continue, and homophobia may have an impact on those who hear reports of abuse, because social attitudes about male victimization, homosexuality, sodomy, and rape, in addition to legislation that does not meet the needs of the victims, continue to contribute to what is seen as an isolated carceral world wherein violence is frequent and allowable (Ng, 2014).

Ashmont (2014) comments on the expectations in South African Prisons, which include rape and assault for the purposes of emotional terror and embarrassment, and gang rapes are prevalent against individuals imprisoned on false charges. However, such sexual assault and the allowance of sexual assault can be considered a violation of the Eighth Amendment in the United States, which addressed cruel and unusual punishments, as prison conditions are supposed to be humane and protective procedures in place, and there is collateral damage to the friends, family, and communities connected to each person (Simpson et al., 2016). Penland (2015) refers to sexual abuse in prisons as fecund and unrelenting, and dismisses weak defenses such as the consent defense, which argues that the sexual encounter was between two consenting adults, though there is no consent in prison, since prisoners are inherently vulnerable and in the staff's custody. Penland

notes that prison sexual abuse is also underreported, and that of reported allegations, only ten percent are substantiated. A possible reason for this is that some courts, such as the Second Circuit, requires the abuse to be severe in nature and occur multiple times. Penland (2015) also argues that male prisoners at a disadvantage with the consent defense because the defense sees males as capable of defending themselves, or if sexual activity had occurred then the male enjoyed it and would have rejected it if not interested.

Furthermore, vulnerable inmates (mentally ill, old, physically small stature, etc.) are considered more likely to experience threats and abused, as are first-time incarcerates (Ahlin, 2019; Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016; Cook & Lane, 2019b). Researchers also found that certain demographic information (being white, having a college degree, prior SV (pre-incarceration), incarceration for a violent offense, history of mental health issues) increase the likelihood that an individual will be sexually assaulted (Cook & Lane, 2019b). Prisoners who are not mentally ill and do not demonstrate any of these other seeming weaknesses can camouflage their vulnerabilities and fears through expected masculine norms (Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016), but the fact that mentally ill inmates are victimized at 2.4-2.6x higher than non-MI inmates is a disturbing statistic, considering that rates of mental illness inside the prison are 4-6x higher than in the general population (Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff 2016). Inmates that identify as homosexual are seven times as likely to experience coercion and two times as likely to experience threats from other inmates according to research in Australia that mirrors research in the United States (Simpson et al., 2016). Individuals who experienced victimization outside of/prior to prison may have experienced a four-fold increase in

coercion and eight-fold increase in threats, and prisoners who have been incarcerated for more than five years also reports increases in these areas (Simpson et al., 2016) – A vital aspect of all of these factors is how the individual was treated upon first trying to report an assault or threat, as it could influence decisions to report again, or the decision of anyone else to report at all. Poorly monitored areas and areas with less supervision can also increase the likelihood of an assault taking place (Ahlin, 2019). These may seem obvious but addressing contextual elements of correctional settings can be enormous in reducing or increasing the likelihood of assaults occurring, including the likelihood of an assault being reported, predominantly with respect management and administrative styles of the prison staff and any connected policies (Ahlin, 2019; Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016). Another set of factors that may play a role is where barriers to reporting an assault are formed (before, during, or after the assault, or some combination thereof), and whether or not substance use is somehow involved in the decision not to report an assault (Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016) – these may or may not be specific to a particular setting, but their consideration with carceral settings may warrant further exploration.

Homosocial spaces

Socialization, says Vigoya (2001), occurs in spaces of homosociality. For males, homosocial spaces are masculine spaces that reflect ways of being and hegemonic identity and dominance. Bars, courts, community meetings are emblematic of hegemony and thus devoid of females, traditionally (Vigoya, 2001). These are transitional spaces, existing psychologically and socially between the worlds of work and home (Vigoya, 2001), and attitudes about certain masculine topics are expected. Politics and business are

common, states Vigoya (2001), and male are welcome to talk about their private life, albeit in an impersonal manner. According to Jardim (1995; cited in Vigoya, 2001), this where males share their ideals of masculine behavior with other males, highlighting again the performative nature of being male. It is as if this expression, verbal and physical (through posturing and appearance), is willingly displayed for judgment in these places; the males take to these privileged spaces to display how they align with the social construction of identity that they strive for (Jardim, 1995; Vigoya, 2001). Males must face the precarious and dynamic reality that gender and emotions in prison are complex on a level beyond the public, as prison is volatile and pervasively violent and requires regular, purposeful work into the performance of identity as the individuals negotiates (or hides within) a hostile emotional geography (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). This is not simply a room with a collective of males who run free.

Again, one must wonder what role the body itself plays in this entire process, as though biological expression through physicality (read: genitalia) is somehow the underlying guideline for what can and cannot be close. Certainly, males can come together and discuss exploits (as both comparison and validation), or perhaps through certain shared experiences (death, reminiscing of notable experiences), but is this still the only acceptable closeness? Crewe (2014) states that the underlying affective dynamics between males mark a lot of what is not recognized in prison masculinity, and it is the homosocial space where males continue to find what they need in each other, and find, in females, yet another resource to be exploited. Males, seeking to build an affective bond with other males, cannot do so as they would toward females (even non-romantic) may

be relegated to hostile showings as a form of engagement. The complexity of this relationship, seemingly more sacred because it is explicitly (in explicit form) forbidden and must be negotiated indirectly; to bond and rally over sports, competition, conquests, ownership (vehicles, tools, females, masculine qualities) is to bond affectively through acceptable code. Prisons, then, conjure the hypermasculine and the oblique relations, which Crewe (2014) identifies as "deep friendships, irrationally powerful loyalties, and unspoken intimacies" (p. 399) Various roles arise in the prison, which is hegemonic but also homosocial, such as domestic roles (doing things for one another/the unit/the accepted group), deep friendship, and the unspoken intimacy, as noted. Some of the intimacy comes from deprivation (described below), some from the nature of the space itself. Though many know and engage in such practices, open declaration or viewing of such things is still forbidden and leaves the individual vulnerable to ridicule, assault, or, Crewe asserts, must be expressed to a multitude of individuals in a manner that recognizes the togetherness without identifying one recipient; a vie for collective support rather than emotional dedication, wherein the male finds the allowable identification and performance of depths otherwise unallowed or even seen as threatening, though any bleeding through is seen as jeopardizing the hegemonic ideal – (male) homosexuality is allowed when it is a collective understanding or bodily punishment (see Bosworth and Kaufman, 2012). So, even if prison culture dictates that working out is masculine, it is the force exerted on the bodies to become muscular that takes its toll through the limited access to working out, sustenance for growing larger muscles, and the expectation of the activity itself that is the punishment. And the dominance of this hegemonic act, for

example, is physical flirtation that is not sexual or romantic, and is one more aspect of the affective hegemonic courtship.

Hefner (2018) discusses how the carceral world reflects the general practices of the social world, though there is some altering of beliefs and behaviors. Masculinity practices and construction is not just control over the individual, but control over the collective mechanics of behaviors and relationships. Systematically, creation and coercion are applied to every individual who then elects to act in certain ways or identifies with certain (expected) actions. The identity and behaviors that one claims and enacts are not held in a vacuum but has a direct impact on the lives of those around them. Anyone may become a victim or an assailant, and existing research demonstrates that those who fail to perform expected masculinity or who openly identify as homosexual open themselves to ridicule, social condemnation, threats, coercion, and violence. Male inmates expect other male inmates to be heterosexual and masculine or fall approximately near themselves along the hegemonic and heteronormative spectrum. Individuals who identify as female or fully assume that role in some way assume a role of power as females or wives, or are given respect as being, and acting, in a manner that is consistent with the popular construct of homosexuality. Female is a position relative to male, and ultimately outside of power, but non-hetero and non-binary inmates may have greater access to material goods and information, which hetero male inmates will need at some point, thereby granting the individual outside of power some dimension of power. And of course, there is a sexual implication (and practice) here as well, which also grants some individual's power and provides a display of fluid prison genders and sexualities.

Hefner (2018) contends that what is created is an emphasized homosexuality, exaggerated (like heterosexuality and/or masculinity) by certain feminine characteristics, which then reduces the individual further into a complicit position of accepting what the dominant ideology wants. However, this divergence from the norm exposes chasms in power and identity that destabilize the front of gender and sexual stability perpetuated by the hegemonic masculinity purported to dominate the prison setting. While inequalities and injustices are created and supported, the stark reality that everyone within a carceral setting must face is that gender and sexuality are determined, to some extent by "the type of interaction and the type of social space", in addition to the context or the reason for the interaction.

Physical inscription

As noted above, the body becomes a vessel for the socially constructed masculine archetype; any male victim of sexual assault has had their status as male removed, becoming female, less than male, and/or property (Michalski, 2017). As noted earlier, Messerschmidt (2009) sees that society has forged sex and gender into one concept. Messerschmidt (2009) reveals that it is in this unification that problems arise, as children use their physical vessel to negotiate and interact with the world. They can do a specific gender or negate it and it is the latter of these two actions that can create significant problems, as any male who attempts to act against the masculine norm is scrutinized and judged, especially when the body is utilized in this attempt. One's appearance confirms or denies their identity in the eyes of others, and when this identity is somehow obfuscated or challenges a norm, it is no longer congruent with the expected presentation

of the body. The body becomes a tool that facilitates social actions as the individual adopts a new practice – the embodiment of the other. Messerschmidt (2009) states that this new practice can be reflexive or nonreflexive, and that for males observing this, hegemonic masculinity is thus challenged; males "doing" the female role, and females "doing" the male role, significant threats to hegemonic domination.

Dirga (2017) echoes previous research when stating that incarcerated time is reflected on the body. While Dirga speaks primarily of tattoos, there is more to it than ink and skin. The body, Dirga states, assumes the culture of the prison through assimilation to the process of becoming a prisoner (loss of range, contact, and choice). The body may become decorated or damaged (through self-harm or harm from others) or undergo transformation through cultural norms found in prison, such as working out. The body may be a tool or tomb as it negotiates the carceral world and follows the scripts of a new culture (prison culture) and hegemonic expectation. The body changes, which means the person changes. Punishment and discipline, restriction and deprivation, the control of others and the emphasis of what the masculine body should be and do – All of these factors and more weigh heavy on the incarcerated body. Proof, unfortunately, comes by way of acts of violence and shows of strength (against violence or the control of other inmates). Michalski (2017) adds to this in saying that while incarcerated, the physical body is the hub of all things, and the transformations it undergoes, the pressures it is subject to, are different than outside of those walls, and thus prison itself is not only a different type of geography, but also a different type of geology. When these differences become substantial, when the individual is separated from their gender by actions

committed against them (as well as thought), this separation becomes prevention of reporting, recovery, and growth, as well as disavowal of male as a free gender (Javaid, 2018).

Ultimately, prison environments are dangerous, and create victims, or at least the possibility that victims are inevitable (Caravaca-Sanchez & Wolff, 2016). After all, the prison world leaves each inmate with a very practical choice being a victim or the aggressor, the latter of which requires skilled physical, political/social, or sexual defense in the continual dynamic processes of prison socialization (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). This may be fueled or catalyzed by the isolation and withdrawal (and sometimes, paranoia) that inmates struggle with, but the climate of constant fear and threat leaves people with the feeling to act rather than react; a sort of hypermasculine or hegemonic vigilance or hyperarousal (Shermer & Sudo, 2016). It may be obvious, but it cannot be overstated – any isolated space that is filled with fear and threats of this kind creates ubiquitous risk to the safety and security of that space and those within.

Ricciardelli (2015) talked about the importation of familiar things (food, magazines, visitors) as the nexus between the non-carceral and carceral worlds. Restricted spaces, such as prison, are meant to deprive, and the separation from the familiar to the uncertain presents itself across several realms: people, place, food, norms, sex, social status, and other elements of familiar life (Ricciardelli, 2015). As people attempt to adapt to this new reality, violence is a possible method of adaptation, made worse when tied in with various hegemonic values (Ricciardelli, 2015). But adaptation may occur prior to incarceration, as a lifetime of behaviors and tendencies does not

simply go away, but rather helps to inform an individual's behaviors once inside a carceral space (Ricciardelli, 2015). So then, a male's identity is taken from his life outside of the carceral space, and the continued exposure to deprivation eventually results in a new expression of that masculine identity (Ricciardelli, 2015). But all of this that occurs within the walls of a prison is not entirely separated from the outside world; rather, prisons are modeled on a variation of the outside world, both based on the beliefs of society, the wills of those in power, and the proper process one must go through if they have broken the social trust (Ricciardelli, 2015).

The prison's cultures also import what the individual imports, and much like hegemonic masculinity, prison culture adapts to what is introduced to it, so as to grow and further perpetuate expectations (Ricciardelli, 2015). During the incarceration, each individual will experience this differently, and in place of personal experience and social instruction, the coercion of the carceral world and the desire to appear appropriately masculine (i.e., prison masculinity), thus becomes the reward for the individual, ensuring that basic behavior modification mechanisms reinforce such behaviors (Ricciardelli, 2015). As posited by Hefner (2018) and mentioned throughout this discussion, it is important to recognize how someone creates their identity in the larger social world, and subsequently interacts with various hierarchies and categories, as this will determine how they negotiate their prison interactions. However, what the individual is deprived of (female companionship, for example) and what they import (a sense of hegemonic dominance over individuals who identify as homosexual) will play a large role in their overall conduct. It is vital to remember that incarceration is seeking to impact the minds

and core of the person who is incarcerated, unabashedly, to force the person to act differently without *specific and deliberate intervention* by society as a whole, so a small portion of a given society seeks to transform the individual via discipline (Nielsen, 2017).

Criminal justice does not inherently benefit from apathetic, mass incarceration or blind eyes, and sexual victimization during incarceration reflects society's actions (or inaction), though society may act as though it is offensive and cruel (Nielson, 2017). Society imprints itself upon a person either actively or reactively, what that person experiences in prison may be brought back into society upon release (Nielson, 2017). However, what is brought back to the stress could be increased violence, individual isolation, assumed victimhood, loss of identity, *physical desolation*, and/or *intimate carnage* (Nielson, 2017). This is a normalizing and positivity that can be placed on violence as necessary and restorative for the community (Nielson, 2017). Inmates, who are subordinated, have only violence to combat the loss of autonomy, and that violence is wielded to find their identity in a setting which has depersonalized or dehumanized them (Nielson, 2017). Theories on gender, violence, rape, PREA and other reforms are not known by many who make them, because they are inherently alien and reactionary, not concerned with legitimate justice but with restorative moralism.

PREA and the Eighth Amendment

Ashmont (2014) argues that rape and sexual assault in prisons increase overall violence in those institutions. As prisoners feel more and more at risk and less protected, they begin to lash out against the system. These inmates then release back to the public and because of what they have suffered, they have lower rates of stable employment and

higher rates of reoffending (Simpson et al., 2016). PREA was established to protect prisoners and provide treatment and resources for them, in addition to holding prisons accountable for what happens to the inmates within (Ashmont, 2014; Penland, 2015). Prisons are supposed to have a zero-tolerance policy toward prison rape and prevention of such assaults are supposed to be "a top priority in each prison system." Furthermore, PREA is supposed to help protect the Eighth Amendment rights of prisoners (Ashmont, 2014; Penland, 2015). Overall, says Ashmont (2014), PREA is "deeply flawed" and presses no obligations on the prisons, only recommendations. Ahlin (2019) agrees to the extent that there is a reduced effectiveness in the concept of PREA and the Eighth Amendment.

The United Nations has determined that prison rape is torture and due to the intentional suffering forced upon the victims, it is ultimately seen as punishment and continued abuse of what may be vulnerable populations. Failure to address this reality and the abuses is tantamount to allowing it, and while prisons are a place for rehabilitation and discipline, they are not meant to serve as institutions of such torture. However, Ashmont asserts that American prisons are lacking behind protection of their prisoners, refusing to ratify or sign the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, which is a resolution set forth by the United Nations.

The Eighth Amendment of the Constitution of The United States addresses some of the issues of prison treatment that have been discussed in this current research. Specifically, the Eighth Amendment is protection against cruel and unusual punishment of prisoners. The reason that this document is being addressed currently is that legal

scholars have labeled the ongoing issues with sexual victimization in prison as a violation of the Eighth Amendment on two fronts: Deliberate Indifference (DI) and Cruel and Unusual Punishment (CP). The former deals with deliberate actions taken on the part of any prison staff that willfully ignore inhumane conditions in carceral spaces, such as allowing sexual assault to occur without addressing the issue, which may include protection of inmates (when possible), appropriate responses to abuse and assaults experienced by inmates, and the allowance or offering of treatment in responses to abuse and assaults. The idea is that the basic dignities afforded to all people are also allowed to inmates, who are not supposed to be subject to any punishments beyond those implemented in our criminal justice system; to knowingly ignore harm coming to inmates, as legal wards, is to condone such actions, and thus represents deliberate indifference of the welfare of those individuals who are legally identified as under the care of the state or some government entity.

Belitz (2018) explores a portion of prison and violence reform beginning with the 1996 Prison Litigation Reform Act (PRLA; based on misperceived excess of prison lawsuits), the 2003 PREA, and the 2013 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). What this trajectory reveals, over almost two decades, was ongoing challenges with legal definitions, but more importantly, problems with what is known as the burden of proof, which states that it is the accuser's task to proof that a crime occurred. Belitz (2018) puts forth part of the failure of the system is found the Fourth Amendment (the 4th) and the provisions for bodily privacy that are found within. Essentially, the 4th is commonly seen as the right to privacy, such as when a male prisoner wants to hide his naked body from

the opposite sex. More importantly, protections under the 4th can provide one more obstacle between imprisonment and sexual abuse - without valid penological purpose, sexual abuse is clearly a violation of the 8th amendment. It is not part of the penalty, despite popular belief that it is. However, the 2nd Circuit court included legal breadth that the burden of proof is not the actual evidence of injury, but rather that perpetrator's actions are offensive to human dignity (staff member) – this can include actions simply for the pleasure of the perpetrator or just to humiliate the victim. The courts determined that loss of liberty, such as imprisonment, is separate from mental or emotional harm, but it is still an independently cognizable injury. There is ongoing struggle with definitions about non-physical injuries (that do not cause mental or emotional harm) and the necessity of physical harm for some federal civil suits to occur - at the time of this article, the Supreme Court has not yet explicitly addressed the issue of SA as a due process violation, but many courts of appeals have held that SA does violate a protected liberty interest.

Nielsen (2017) takes a broader look at sexual violence in prison, beginning with a theoretical base comprised of social and feminist theories; much of the theoretical underlining of sexual violence, masculinity, and carceral settings is the idea that the body itself is reflective of the cultural arena in which a body is found, taught, and governed. Moreover, the gendered and biologically assigned identity of an individual becomes bound through inherently sexual experiences; or, rather, experiences are embodied by the individual, partially based on certain physical attributes. Feminism, then, connects gender to social position, or places in within social hierarchies, and the carceral setting creates its

own dynamic regarding this social positioning. Nielsen (2017) makes a salient point about the potential reinforcement and cycling of hegemonic masculinity and sexual violence: The experiences that become embodied within a carceral setting, while influenced by the individual's life prior to prison, also perpetuate future hegemonic and sexual violence once the individual is released from prison – Nielsen posits, "prisoners who return to their communities after the harrowing experience of prison…are more likely to normalize, accept, and perpetuate disturbing patterns of sexual violence already present" (p. 235).

Zero tolerance for violence and increased protection for inmates is only part of the duality of the body from which a shadow is made and the shadow itself. The continued surveillance, research, and criminalization of rape is part of the spectrum of the light that casts the shadow, but so much remains hidden, despite whatever physical or metaphorical panoptics may be employed. The necessity for policing in prison is a curious punishment, as it requires more surveillance of the prisoners, which increases, Nielsen (2017) feels, the dehumanization of the inmates. Nielsen also points out that such surveillance does not organize the behaviors of staff or increase the understanding of society but sits separate from the continuity of rape myths and entanglements of sexual violence and gender politics. If staff are the perpetrators, then how should an inmate victim use PREA successfully to use the grievance system and to report the abuse. There is a maze here, and there is no one who knows the layout. Nielsen (2017) calls for the improved observation (and legal recourse) of sexual assault, and all research points to the need to break the institutional allowance of such behaviors. *Farmer v. Brennan* showed us that

being in prison is your punishment, and much judicial or governing research, as well as commonsense, perhaps, tells us that sexual victimization is not acceptable as part of that process. But victimization is not the end, nor is revictimization. Victims continue to be punished via the stigma and reactions they face, the self-doubt and torment; other logistical issues take place for the victims in prison, as many (41.2%) are placed in solitary confinement (many when making allegations against staff), and over 35% are confined to their cells, thus restricting them and isolating them, drawing a spotlight. Some are assigned more restrictive settings. However, this punishment waived as protection does not go unnoticed, and may impact reporting. Approximately one sixth (14.5%) of victims received no response from prison administration. So then, why report? It is already a staple of hypermasculine culture to disincentivize reporting, as discussed so far, but PREA is meant to help people report. However, PREA can be ignored and PREA can harm the victims as increased surveillance, restriction, and intrusion are introduced. Furthermore, PREA language can be utilized by the defense as they make the attack seem non-sexual, thereby removing PREA altogether – this is already seen in victimization occurring in war, as discussed, since attacks on genitals are seen as violent, not necessarily sexual violence.

Numerous authors agree that prison staff and practices can violate the Eighth Amendment and possibly other Constitutional rights. For example, Ahlin (2019) states that reduced supervision can cause a safety hazard for inmates, as could contextual challenges (e.g., housing more vulnerable inmates with other inmates known to victimize other inmates). For Shermer and Sudo (2016) and Simpson et al. (2016), failure to

prevent or reduce these opportunities for victimization, especially when staff are aware of them, is a violation of the Eighth Amendment. As this discussion has explored, this has continued to be a working and accepted practice. What may be a disturbing conclusion, offered by Nielsen, is that while systems are incentivized to use PREA, it is mostly optional across settings, and compliance is hazy and manipulatable.

Social Change

A few key messages from other researchers are poignant, solemn, and necessary. These statements represent some of the main ideas that are represent the need for improvements in attention and research on male sexual victimization. Fisher and Pina (2013) proffer that when society takes such assaults as seriously as it does for female victims, then males may begin to see an increase in understanding and support. It is necessary for all victims to be treated equally and fairly, lest abuse finds one more refuge to hide within, and Lisak (1993) acknowledges this refuge, suggesting that male sexual victimization lies in a cultural blind spot, and that males need to be taught to and supported in the report of sexual victimization. Connell (2016b), who initiated much of the discussion and research here, states that, “Knowledge is not a substitute for action. But accurate knowledge and theoretical insight are priceless assets for action when action is concerned with contesting power and achieving social justice”. Burt, who conducted seminal research on male sexual victimization in 1980, offered several important thoughts that remain important almost 40 years after they were published. He noted that with such ingrained attitudes, changing sex role stereotyping will be difficult and needs to begin at very young ages, before it is complicated by sexual as well as sex role

interactions and continuing to combat the extension of sex role stereotyping into the sexual arena as sexual interaction becomes more salient in adolescence. Only by promoting the idea of sex as a mutually undertaken, freely chosen, fully conscious interaction…can society create an atmosphere free of the threat of rape. Rape is the logical and psychological extension of a dominant-submissive, competitive, sex role stereotyped culture... The task of preventing rape is tantamount to revamping a significant proportion of our societal values. Developing an accurate theoretical understanding of rape attitudes and assaultive behavior will help make social change efforts more effective (p. 229).

All victims of a crime suffer; suffering is an inherent aspect of the criminal act (as it is a violation of another person in some way), and the greater the violence and violation, the greater the suffering. The suffering is intense for the individual, but it is pervasive for society, as it impacts healthcare and services costs (Hines & Douglas, 2018), community well-being, recidivism rates and revictimization rates (individuals who exit and reenter carceral settings are more affected in that they may be more likely to be revictimized and/or experience greater distress from the victimization(s), Cook & Lane, 2017b), and other aspects of civilization that are ultimately beyond the scope of this research. Many scholars, organizations, and advocates offer recommendations and policy changes that will be discussed briefly here, but again is largely beyond the scope of this research.

Regardless of gender or sex, victims of sexual assault experience negative outcomes that hurt them and their communities. Some of the outcomes are specific to males, the significance of which can be found in specific aspects of gender identity, treatment and

services, socialization, education, and many other areas of human life. The magnitude, breadth, and impact of the suffering cannot be overstated, and it cannot be ignored any longer, perhaps needing to be elevated as a priority.

On a larger and more astonishing scale, the sexual assault of males has become a war crime and emerging concern of the global community, with the United Nations declaring conflict-related sexual assault of males to be a growing concern (Gorris, 2015). This line of thought is supported by the concept of sex-/gender-neutral terminology that can be used internationally and legally to address male sexual victimization, which is not always seen as sexual assault (as mentioned in the above-section on definitions). Therefore, if the assault is not correctly coded or identified as sexual assault against a male, then the literature and policies do not serve the victim to the level of their needs (Gorris, 2015). As local and international legal communities remain ignorant of male victims, hegemonic and patriarchic gender ideologies are reinforced, and the violence inflicted on the victim's identity and masculinity is allowed to continue (Gorris, 2015); the denial of aggression and violation against a male body reflects inequality and allows continued tactical use of sexual violence against males in this context (Gorris, 2015). Males are continually viewed as perpetrators but not victims, which renders male victims less likely to receive services and supports socio-cultural denial about male vulnerability, which then reinforces barriers, and ultimately crushes the understanding of gendered actions enabled through social and cultural teachings (Gorris, 2015).

Outcomes

Victims of sexual assault will likely experience the following (outcomes specific to males will be noted in parentheses): psychological sequelae such as shame, guilt, fear, anger, humiliation, a sense of powerlessness, confusion about the event, onset or increase in anxiety and/or depression and post-traumatic stress (Kapur & Muddell, 2016); emergence or increase in self-harm behaviors and substance abuse; exhaustion; weight loss; problems with sleep; damage to personal and social identity; higher levels of aggression (Forsman, 2017); struggle in familial, social, and romantic relations; damage to or confusion about (heterosexual) identity; ostracization; suicidal ideation (increased in males; Forsman, 2017), physical damage to the body (increased damage to male genitals, Kapur & Muddell, 2016); stigma transferred to family and/or children; an inability to leave the house thus impacting work; complex changes in gendered roles (and subsequent domestic violence); and potential overcompensation of negative masculine aspects (Kapur & Muddell, 2016). Artime, McCallum, and Peterson (2014) state that victims who do not receive acknowledgement may experience increased distress in any of these areas. SV victims experience worse health outcomes and increased exposure in carceral settings (Parks, 2017). Male children who experience SV are more likely (than children who did not experience SV) to develop mental health disorder as adults (Richter, et al., 2017) and SV overall is a predictor of both poor mental health outcomes as well as future victimization (Leith, 2017; Hines & Douglas, 2018).

Fisher and Pina (2013) suggest that any victimization needs to be acknowledge and recognized, including those that fly in the face of our own assumptions and

understanding, and that negative attitudes, biases, and stereotypical beliefs need to be acknowledged and challenged. This bulk of psychological, physical, and emotional sequelae should really be enough for any reader to realize that change is needed, but what the change looks like may be surprising. Darcy and Brenner (2017) note that sexual violence justice must occur within the scope of the larger criminal justice system, not simply the internal mechanisms of systems such as prison. Hammond, Ioannou, and Fewster (2016) offer that easier modes of reporting victimization, especially for males, is necessary, and this could help to eliminate many barriers that males feel.

Research conducted by Lambie and Johnston (2016) suggests that male victims of sexual abuse maybe be more likely to experience an increased in self-esteems and a decrease in isolation if they encounter a positive response and support from others, as this may change some of the negative self-attributions that victimization (or poor attributions overall) may produce. Lambie and Johnston (2016) state that these positive interactions can also increase adaptive coping strategies, empathy, engagement in prosocial behaviors, and help to build resiliency – this is an important step, as individuals with higher levels of resiliency will engage with social support more regularly and more types of social support, which may then help decrease the likelihood that a victim will become an offender.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to identify perceived barriers that male inmates may come across when considering if they should report sexual victimization that occurred while they were in prison. Male sexual victimization, in general, is under-reported (Richter et al., 2018; Kubiak et al., 2018; Zilkens et al., 2018; Ahlin, 2019) and under-researched (Forsman, 2017; Javaid, 2018; Richter et al., 2018; Budd et al., 2019), and male sexual victimization in prisons is less so. Research on male sexual victimization typically occurs in college or clinical settings (Cook & Lane, 2017) and often excludes any type of special populations (Kubiak et al., 2017; Porta, et al., 2018). One constant topic in research on male sexual victimization is the role of hegemonic masculinity as a toxic aspect of a male victim's psychological injuries, and possibly as a barrier to reporting. Future research should continue to examine the interaction between these topics, as it may help to inform and support changes in responses to male victims of sexual assault, as well as changes in social perspectives of gender and masculinity.

In this chapter, I describe how I used the qualitative research method to explore the experiences of the participants through open-ended questions presented in an interview with each participant. Qualitative research is used to try to better understand the experiences that individuals and groups live through and to interpret those experiences in a way that seeks to derive meaning from them. Qualitative data, collected through observation, interviews, case studies, and other methods, is typically not quantified in the sense that numerical data is, and therefore requires categorization of themes and

commonalities (Creswell, 2014). Accordingly, the researcher must consider what their role shall be, what type of data is being sought, and how that data will be coded, analyzed, and presented.

This chapter provided information on how the study was conducted, including research design and rationale (including research questions and rationale for how the research method was determined), the role of the researcher (participation in the research including any biases or ethical issues that may arise), an explanation of methodology (including criteria for inclusion, sampling strategy, recruitment information, and the collection and analysis of data), and issues of trustworthiness (including exploration of ethical issues). Additionally, this chapter included a discussion of the population from which the data was gathered and the considerations that were necessary when working with such a population.

Research Design and Rationale

This research used a phenomenological qualitative research design. With this type of design, a researcher seeks to understand phenomena through the experiences and perspectives of research participants; in my case, I interviewed formerly incarcerated individuals (Creswell, 2014). This portion of the research contained open-ended questions designed to elicit responses about reporting behaviors, perceived challenges to reporting, and gender identity. I included an opportunity for participants to identify reasons why they did not report sexual victimization, if any, and how they were subsequently impacted by their experience of male gender and identity, gender role

stress, and how these aspects of their lives may have affected their willingness to report any sexual victimization.

The focus of this study was to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of males, who had previously served a prison term, regarding sexual victimization of males in prison. In addition, participants were asked about their views on reporting instances of sexual victimization in prison and whether they believe gender roles influence reporting. Further, participants were asked if they perceived other factors that influenced prisoners reporting sexual victimization in prison. The qualitative data collected was categorized and coded. Behaviors, themes, key phrases, and patterns were identified and connected with barriers to reporting and facets of hegemonic masculinity. Participant demographic information was collected verbally during the interviews. Information requested included the participant's age, gender identity, sexual orientation, educational level, ethnicity/race, prior sexual victimization (if any), custody level when sexually victimized, and previous incarcerations (if any).

Role of the Researcher

In qualitative research, Creswell (2014) explains, the researcher has a unique role as instrument for data collection, as well as the analyst of any themes or patterns that emerge. The researcher, directly engaging with the participants, can provide clarification or information directly, but also can work to build rapport with each participant. This rapport could then have an impact on the participant. The researcher must also keep their own assumptions, opinions, and biases in check, since beyond interfering with participant relationships, this can impact the categorization and analysis of data, thereby impacting

the interpretation and generalizability of the information collected; the researcher must be careful so as not to skew the data or results in such a way (Creswell, 2014).

Another threat to research occurs when participants are aware that they are a part of research, and alter their responses due to either wanting to please the researcher (participant bias) or in some way influence the results (response bias); the latter is particularly salient in the current research, as the participants may have sought to somehow impact prison reform by altering their responses in some way (Creswell, 2014; Clark & Veale, 2018). This can then have a possible impact on the validity and generalizability of the results. It is difficult to tell if the participant is being influenced by being a participant in a study and this threat to external validity may be difficult to address individuals (Creswell, 2014). Similarly, when participants want to appear normal or avoid being judged, they may display prosocial bias and answer in a way that reduces what they may perceive as negative perceptions toward them. In this current research, participants may have wanted to shield themselves from being a victim or otherwise falling outside of a dominant position, which would reflect elements of the research itself, by changing their answers to present themselves in a particular light (Creswell, 2014). It was tantamount that confidentiality is upheld. The Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (APA, 2002) address confidentiality (and respective limits), and I strictly adhered to these principles.

Flyers recruiting study participants were posted in local transition housing facilities, drug and alcohol programs, and other local nonprofit entities that provide services to persons who have transitioned out of prison at some point; individuals who

have only been to jail were not eligible due to the differences in settings and supporting research mentioned throughout this document. Anyone interested in participating was given an email to request more information. Once the potential participant responded to the email, an informed consent was emailed and a time to be interviewed scheduled. Reiteration about the study was covered in the scheduled meeting via Zoom or Skype. Participants were informed about their freedom to decline or discontinue participation at any point in the research without consequence or retribution. Potential risks and benefits were outlined before they began the study. Because participants may experience some level of distress while relaying their experience on a sensitive subject, I provided a list of local mental health resources in the information packets that each participant received.

Prospective participants received a 20-dollar gift card compensation for their participation. I had no relationship, personal, professional, or other nature, with any participant. The interviews took between 45 and 60 minutes. Interviews were electronically recorded for the purposes of integrity in transcription, potential coding, and analysis. Contact information for Walden University's Center for Research Quality was made available for queries about the research. Participant data is stored in a secure, electronic database that is accessible only to hegemonic masculinity and my dissertation committee chair. Per APA recommendations and guidelines, research data will be kept for and destroyed after 5 years from study completion. While not expected to be needed, contact information for Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) was made available for any participant who may have had questions about the study, and additional resources such as the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline (1-800-273-8255), was made

available. Due to the anonymous nature of the data collection, no identifying information for any participant was gathered or stored.

Lastly, the results of this study were thoroughly checked for accurate representation. A website was created to post the outcomes of this research. Information about this website was provided in the information packet provided to all participants. Authorization for the study was obtained from Walden University's IRB prior to any data collection.

Methodology

Participation Selection Logic

The desired population for this research were seven adult male participants who have been previously incarcerated. The target population from which this sample was be drawn comes from Washington State; as of 2019, the population in where this research will be conducted is approximately 805,000. Of those 805,000, the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that there should approximately 655 incarcerated individuals per 100,000 citizens, meaning that roughly 5,240 citizens of Snohomish County are incarcerated at any given point. Participants will be recruited by way of flyers posted at and near prison release housing facilities, local drug and alcohol programs, and other non-profits that provide services for this population in the County. Inclusion criteria required male individuals who were previously incarcerated and who were sexually victimized in some way or witnessed sexual victimization of others.

The number of participants in this study was 7 participants. as recommended by Creswell for phenomenological samples (2014); the proposed study did not reach data

saturation, the point at which more data no longer yields new information or insights but seeks to address the gap in literature with current, pertinent, and possibly significant findings (Creswell, 2014).

Instrumentation

The study used a semi-structured, one-on-one interview to record and examine the lived experiences of the participants. Initially, the interviews were going to be conducted in person. This style of interview allows the researcher to follow an interview guide developed specifically for this research with the freedom to elicit pertinent information through flexible and adaptive interviewing. The interviews took between 15 and 45 minutes, and were recorded electronically for transcription, coding, and other analysis. The research questions were centered on the sexual assault characteristics and the participant's responses (cognitive, emotional, physical, behavioral) in conjunction with whether or not they reported the incident, including their explanation of why they did or did not report it, or for non-victimized males, to identify reasons that they would not have reported the event(s). The interview questions, conditions, and demographics were documented for the purpose of study replication. The qualitative data collected was categorized and coded. Behaviors, themes, key phrases, and patterns were identified and connected with barriers to reporting and facets of hegemonic masculinity (socially performed gender behaviors).

It should be noted that while the participants provided, to the best of their ability, descriptions of the events, these will be subjective and possibly misremembered descriptions, thereby impacting the validity and generalizability of the findings.

Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

Convenience sampling was used to find seven participants in western Washington. Flyers calling for participants, with permission, were displayed at probation offices, housing units (halfway houses, transitional housing, post-release housing) and facilities (retail stores, coffee houses, staffing agencies) that are located near the probation offices and housing units. Flyers include general information about the study and needed participants - males who were previously incarcerated. The flyers contained information for the participant to sign up for the research interview.

The seven participants were interviewed about both their own lived experiences and experiences they witnessed during incarceration. For participants that do not report a history of sexual victimization during a previous incarceration, they were asked about what they witnessed, heard, or thoughts about sexual abuse in the prison. Their reasons will be listed separately, but they will undergo similar analyses for trends and themes.

Informed consent included the researcher's contact information if the participants have further questions or would like to see the outcome of the research. A website was developed where participants were be able to log in and review the overall results of the study. No follow-up procedures were necessary, and information about how to access local counseling resources was provided if the participant(s) feel distress during or after the study.

Operationalization of Constructs

There were several concepts that needed to be operationalized for this research, including those to be measured. The first of these is male sexual victimization, which is

defined by the PREA (Public Law 108-79, 2003) to include: all unwanted sexual contact, coercion, or content, including but not limited to unwanted and nonconsensual: rape; sexual assault (touching) of any kind; aggravated sexual assault (exchange of bodily fluids or penetration of any type); sexual harassment (verbal) of any kind, including comments, innuendo, sexual drawings/writings, threats, demands, comments, promises/deals, and/or coercion, of any kind, that are sexual in nature; stalking for sexual purposes/voyeurism; and/or the use of any substance to induce within an individual a state of defenselessness against any of the aforementioned actions; all of these actions including being penetrated and being made to penetrate.

Hegemonic masculinity is the second concept that needs to be defined here. According to Connell (1987), hegemonic masculinity is the performance of the male gender, by dominant males, that seeks to dominate and subjugate females and other males that are considered to be weak in some way, such as homosexuals, and, in many cases, males that belong to various minority groups. In essence, hegemonic masculinity is the socially constructed concept that males, by virtue of being male and displaying stereotypical male attributes; the hegemonic ideal of a male is one that subjugates and degrades other male presentations, as well as non-males and any other gender construction, identity, or expression that does not live up to the hegemonic ideal which perpetuates a patriarchal sense of control and way of knowing and being. Though only enacted by a small portion of males, hegemonic masculinity was and is normative, celebrated and continually practiced, and (ultimately) a type of social ascendance (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). As an ideal, masculinity necessarily became

masculinities, became hierarchical, and became volatile, exclusive of any relationship between masculinity and non-masculinities

The third concept was gender role stress. A simple way to look at gender role stress is how much stress the individual feels from identifying as male. Moreover, gender role stress is a mechanism by which a male may experience a given situation, feeling, or cognition as stressful due to gender role socialization" The experience is viewed as a threat to the male's gender identity or their competency as a male, due to a violation of the "male gender-role cognitive schema (which) includes culturally mandated standards for appropriate masculine behavior as well as rules against engaging in non-masculine behaviors" (Copenhaver, et al., 2000, p. 406).

Data Analysis Plan

The proposed study utilized a phenomenological approach to elicit and explore the lived experience of seven previously incarcerated male participants. Such an approach does not rest purely on theoretical foundations, but rather begins there while traversing the shared experiences of the participants through their own history and categorizes the information contained in that history. In the proposed research, the researcher will identify participants and interview them as to ascertain relevant information from those histories and organize it according to themes that emerge from it. More specifically, *empathic hermeneutic* interpretation is sought here, as it looks for meaning and patterns that are taken from the account of the participant (Willig, 2017).

The proposed research was conducted using a secure video conferencing application to be determined and later named. The interviews were openly and

electronically recorded for later transcription, thematic coding, and overall analysis. These interviews attempted to capture the participant's account and reasoning for why they did or did not report being sexually assaulted (or why they did not report witnessing someone else being assaulted); part of this included elucidation about gender- and carceral-specific implications for the reporting behaviors. These interviews are estimated to take approximately 45 minutes to complete. Subsequent data did not include participant name or identifying features for participant privacy. The data was be coded into different thematic concepts (i.e., gender role stress, barriers to reporting, perceived cost of reporting) and then an interpretive analysis was conducted to identify a narrative of why incarcerated males may not report sexual victimization that they have experienced or witnessed. The narrative was then be compared against the existing research reviewed in this discussion to identify overarching themes, implications, and opportunities to increase sexual victimization reporting in incarcerated males.

Issues of Trustworthiness

The proposed study included a small, specific set of participants who are most likely to provide relevant accounts of experiences that encapsulate the main topics of interest in the study. This participant set (and respective geographical setting and cultural issues) may directly impact or limit any findings that the research may yield, including generalizability to a larger population - in this case, the relatability and applicability of the findings to the lives of non-participants may be low, specifically because of incarceration and sexual victimization, and the likelihood that the reader is male may not be particularly greater or less than the likelihood that they are female.

Additionally, replicability of research is pertinent if it is to be trusted, and as such any relevant recruitment and research information was made available to this end.

Ethical Procedures

IRB approval was sought from Walden University (The Walden University IRB approval number will be 04-06-21-0645392). Anonymity was maintained, and an informed consent signature page was given to each participation. To maintain anonymity, no identifying information was gathered in the research (such as or names, contact information, physical appearance/features).

Additionally, the participant received a packet before beginning the interview. The packet included a full explanation of the research being conducted, an informed consent sheet, information about seeking psychological counseling or help if the participant experiences psychological distress from the study, and contact information for the researcher in the event that the participant wishes to contact the author/research for more information about the study. The participants were able to exit the study at any point and their information/responses were not be kept or utilized.

Summary

The proposed study employed a qualitative research method to elicit narratives of the reporting behaviors of males who were sexually victimized while incarcerated. Specifically, the research proposes to talk with males who were and were not victimized and why they did or did not report what they experienced or saw. This study was approved by Walden University's IRB. This research adhered to all relevant ethical principles, such as those put forth by the American Psychological Association (2002).

The research will consist of semi-structured, phenomenological interview conducted by the researcher with seven male participants. Supporting data and research for the interviews and justification for this research has been presented in the initial three chapters of this overall body of research. As Walden University emphasis social change, this proposed research will hopefully produce applicable research that can help improve the lives and services accessibility of males who have been sexually assaulted while incarcerated. This chapter laid forth the proposed research design and justifications as well as data analysis, instrumentation, and ethical and validity considerations. The researcher who conducted the study was both responsible for the reasonable safeguarding of participant identity as well as providing resources to those participants in case of psychological distress experienced by the participants. The researcher also engaged in a scientific and respectful dialogue with the participants and put aside any personal beliefs or biases that may skew the data or participant responses. The research was conducted with scientific rigor and the researcher ensured that the results were appropriately coded, themed, and organized according to any potential patterns emerged.

The interviews were conducted with questions developed by the author based on the reviewed literature of previous research. The researcher worked to build rapport with each participant and support them in relaying what was an emotional and difficult interview, intending to do so in a manner that derives a thorough narrative over approximately 45 minutes. The narrative was parsed out for themes, categories, and analyzed for data that was relevant to this study. Participant names and identifying

characteristics were not included. Follow-up interviews or debriefings will not be included in this study.

This research study aimed to address a significant hole in the body of research concerning gender role stress, male sexual victimization, and the experiences of male inmates. Results and interpretations of the study are discussed in Chapter 4 of this research and the results from the interviews will be posted on a website for participants to review. Subsequent chapters contain the conclusions, recommendations, and overall discussion of the proposed research and its findings.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to determine whether incarcerated males experience any perceived barriers to reporting sexual assault within prison and what factors, if any, affect their decisions to report or not. For this purpose, one-to-one interviews were utilized with seven participants to obtain their perspectives on prison communication, prison identity, and reporting factors of male inmates during incarceration, all with the intent of answer the research questions.

RQ 1: What roles do stereotypical/hegemonic masculinity traits play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration?

RQ 2: What role does gender role stress/conflict play in the reporting of sexual victimization in males who were sexually victimized during incarceration?

RQ 3: What impact does identifying as male have on individuals who are sexually victimized during incarceration?

RQ 4: What other aspects of identity might prevent the individual from reporting the victimization?

This study was designed to gain understanding into the reporting considerations of males who have a history of incarceration, and effect change through eliciting some insight into this phenomenon, with the intent to understand it through the experiences and perspectives of the research participants. The interviews contained open-ended questions designed to elicit responses about reporting behaviors, any perceived challenges to reporting, any resiliency factors (factors that helped them report), and gender identity.

This research used phenomenological qualitative research design. This type of design seeks to understand the phenomena through the experience and perspective of the research participant through a direct interview (Creswell, 2014). This portion of the research contains open-ended questions designed to elicit responses about reporting behaviors, perceived challenges to reporting, and gender identity. This includes an opportunity for participants to identify reasons why they did not report sexual victimization, if any, and how they were subsequently impacted by their experience of male gender and identity, gender role stress, and how these aspects of their lives may have affected their willingness to report any sexual victimization.

This chapter is presented in five sections: settings (where and how the research was conducted), demographics (participant characteristics during their incarceration and during their interview), data collection and analysis (processes and findings), evidence of trustworthiness (analysis methods, credibility, dependability, confirmability, consistency, and reflexivity), and results, and will be summarized in the conclusion.

Setting

The setting for the conducted research was of utmost importance to help establish confidentiality and privacy, made more important by the nature of the study itself. From the beginning, participants were informed of and reminded about the nature of the study, the anonymous element of the interviews, the ability to stop participation at any time, and the ability to engage in interview over video conference, telephone, or in-person if the participant was comfortable or had no other options. All seven participants opted to meet in-person in a secure location (an office space secured by the author). All interviews were

uninterrupted and continuous, except for the first (the participant received a 2-minute phone call). No other surveillance or recording equipment was present, nor were other individuals present (one participant did point to his son waiting in a hallway, but the son was not in the interview room).

Demographics

Inclusion criteria for participation included males who had been incarcerated in a prison setting and who were at least 18 years of age; all seven participants met these criteria. The sample size was determined per Creswell's (2014) recommendation for phenomenological interviews. Convenience sampling (physical flyers and social media) was used to find participants in the Pacific Northwest who were provided with informed consent handouts (the same information was also available prior to the interview) that also included steps to find resources if they experienced any psychological distress during or after the interview; this included contact information for me and Walden University. During the interviews, none of the seven participants expressed that they were experiencing any distress, nor did I observe what I would have interpreted as distress.

Data Collection

In-person interviews that lasted between 15 and 45 minutes were conducted with the seven participants; participants were given 60 minutes to respond to research and demographic questions and to elaborate on their answers as necessary or requested by the researcher. All seven participants verbally acknowledged that they were willingly participating in the research and that they had received a packet with informed consent information, including legal and ethical limits to confidentiality. Each participant was

reminded that their participation was voluntary and could be terminated by them at any time, that no personally identifying information would be documented or kept in any way, and that the audio recordings would be kept secured and locked, and to which only I had the key. Additionally, their responses to interview questions were coded and I ensured reported findings could not be attributed to individuals. Each participant chose the method and location of the interview and was reminded that electronic data and written records would be stored securely for a period of 5 years as required by Walden University, at which point they will be destroyed in accordance with best practices and legal standards.

The interviews were recorded using an Olympus Pearlcorder J500 microcassette recorder and Sony ICD-BX140 digital recorder. These devices are handheld and small, allowing for use without drawing attention while still being powerful enough to pick up the conversation. After each interview, the sound files were manually transferred from the recorders by transcription into a Microsoft Word file. Crosschecking sound and transcription files allowed me to accurately document and analyze interviews, files, and findings. All information was kept behind several locked doors and within a filing cabinet that was also locked. The laptop used for the electronic storage was password protected. All demographic information was manually recorded to separate it from the recorded interviews and was taken down with a master demographic questionnaire sheet, which was not kept with the interviews or the manually recorded demographic information. The storage and transcription of the demographic information is the same as the information

described above. No direct reactions or thoughts from me were kept in any form outside of this document.

Data Analysis

Any outcomes in this research are entirely based on analysis of the data acquired from interviews of the research participants. It is expected that other researchers may pursue their own interpretation of the findings listed here or those of subsequent research projects, possibly with a larger sample size or in a different geographical region, which may yield different results. The interviews in this research utilized questions that were cohesive with the thematic elements of the research, designed in a method intended to elucidate possible explanations for why male inmates may or may not report sexual assault. Phenomenological analysis of the interviews helped to reduce information to what this researcher believes are the core components of the researched topics. No interview diverged from the topics being studied or were conducted in any manner other than what has been noted here. The study's phenomenological approach does not rest purely on theory but incorporates the individual and shared experiences of the participants (both lived and observed); specifically, empathic hermeneutic interpretation, which pulls meaning and patterns from given accounts (Willig, 2017). The researcher will also add analysis of the results based on the literature review in conjunction with the participant responses.

A transcription software program was utilized for consistency and accuracy review (NCH Express Scribe Transcription Software Pro version 9.11), which allowed for comparison of written output for each interview; any incorrect output consisted of

spelling errors or homophones and were corrected. Transcripts of the interviews were imported into NVivo 12 Plus (a software program designed to conducted data analysis) to assist in identifying and organizing patterns in the participant's feedback. Participants shared a breadth of information about their experiences and observations, and addressed each of the research questions directly, offering some elaboration on the topics at hand. This helps to identify common terms, phrases, patterns, and trends in the participants' feedback, and then extracts and separates these components into superordinate and sub-categories for analysis.

Ultimately, the answers to the interview questions produced the five themes listed in the table below (which emerged as superordinate themes: Prison Identity, Prison Communication, Gender, Sexual Assault, and Reporting & Change. While these were discussed in the literature review section in Chapter 2, the information shared by the participants highlight these themes in profound ways. Each of these themes will be discussed below.

Table 1

Superordinate Themes

Categories	Themes
Superordinate Theme 1	Prison Identity
Superordinate Theme 2	Prison Communication
Superordinate Theme 3	Gender
Superordinate Theme 4	Sexual Assault
Superordinate Theme 5	Reporting & Change

Evidence of Trustworthiness

The research conducted here utilized the lived and observed experiences of individuals who had opportunities to experience the stark reality of the topics being examined. The seven individuals and the geographical region within which they were interacted with, however, may directly impact or limit any findings that the research may yield. This may include generalizability to a larger population specifically because of gender, incarceration history, and history of sexual victimization. Additionally, the replicability of research is necessary for empirical findings and application, and as such any relevant recruitment and research information will be made available to this end. Furthermore, the research was audited and read by knowledgeable and experienced members of the researcher's institution to look for errors, ethical or reflexive concerns, and even general editing for presentation and organization purposes.

Credibility was established by selecting a data collection method with which to address the research questions of this study, which allowed the researcher to examine the lived and observed experience of formerly incarcerated males. This method allows the researcher to find common themes and connections between participant responses and the theory and relevant topics addressed in this discussion thus far. The interview, transcription, and recording processes were secure for the protection of the participants and the purity of the information. Transcriptions were between five and ten pages in length, each requiring between 45 and 75 minutes to review.

Proofreading and reviewing each documented included checks to ensure: (a) the accuracy of what was recorded and of topical alignment, (b) that the interview questions addressed the research questions, and (c) that the research questions allowed for individual and collective experiences that may have been both or either shared or unique amongst the participants. Shared and unique phrases or patterns were identified and analyzed further for the purposes of this research and grouped into super- and subordinate themes. The researcher also made note of his own assumptions, biases, and other reflexive considerations.

This research also sought to establish elements of dependability and confirmability, so that subsequent researchers would be able to reasonably replicate this research and arrive at similar conclusions to a study done in a similar manner. To help ensure the consistency of interviews, the researcher developed a list of interview questions that were determined to be appropriate for the interview, and focus on elements of the participants' responses, including their unique and shared experiences and contexts. The questions were designed to be open-ended and allow participants to share as much as they felt was relevant to the questions being asked, and the researcher would ask the participant to elaborate or clarify as necessary. Such interview protocols are necessary for thorough administration of the interviews and accurate manipulation of the responses. Moreover, all these elements of trustworthiness were reinforced through repeated review and audit by the researcher and experts on the subject matter and statistical procedures. And again, the researcher examined matters of reflexivity in the

analysis of the provided information to allow for as much objectivity as may be found in empirical research.

Results

The seven formerly incarcerated males who participated in this study shared some of their experiences and observations from their time in prison. The experiences and observations that were shared had to do with male identity, prison identity, prison communication, sexual assault in prison and reporting behaviors of incarcerated males. The research interviews were candid and allowed the researcher to gain insight and information into the world of the male inmate. The information that was shared was similar across six of the seven participants, with one having a notably different experience and opinion than the rest; otherwise, there was thematic cohesion that also reflected what much of the existing literature found in other circumstances concerning both the male identity and the reporting behaviors of individuals.

Research that has investigated the reporting behaviors of male has been sparse and suggests that males are being assaulted at higher rates that currently known, and that what is known, overall, is largely misunderstood reported (Hohl & Stanko, 2015; D'Abreu & Krahe, 2016; Elkins, et al., 2017; Forsman, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Richter, et al., 2018; Zilkens, et al., 2018). Furthermore, while there has been research into the reporting behaviors of female inmates and sexual assaults by staff, the topic of male inmates sexually assaulted while in prison has not yet been researched, partially due to limited access, ethical concerns, and the secretive nature of both prisons and sexual assault.

Superordinate Theme 1: Prison Identity

One of the first major themes that emerged from the interviews was that of prison identity. This is significant because it represents a demarcation from a person's pre-incarceration life and stands in dark contrast to some of the research behind the concept of *importation*, or what an individual may bring into prison with them (Hefner, 2018). The importance lies in that the change an individual experiences in prison may be the cause of distress and subsequent hesitance to report negative experiences (Ricciardelli, 2015; Shermer & Sudo, 2016). Participants were directly asked to share their thoughts on individual presentation in prison contrasted to public life. General perceptions of prison in popular culture reflects that a prisoner must act in certain ways and the participants' answers supported this idea.

Participant 1 (P1), who was incarcerated at the federal level, stated that he remained the same and did not act differently in prison, but also stated "many people don't think that way" and do present themselves differently to get by. He emphasized that this presentation could either be to establish a "tough" persona or to attempt to align with a group or gang to be accepted (into it). P2 and P3 made supporting statements, stating that people who would "break (appear) weak" and would get picked on regularly, sometimes getting physically assaulted or targeted, especially when first arriving to an institution. For P2, this could include inmates who seemed "nicer" or "quieter" and less likely to fight back or resist.

For P3, the younger inmates were usually more brash and loud about themselves, but this could draw negative attention as well, causing other inmates or prison staff to

focus on you more or target you, or possibly even shun someone out of distrust or because of all the attention. P3 said “I didn’t want any attention, I just wanted to get by and do my time. All those guys weren’t going to get that”. P4 had a similar thought and offered that people will make themselves seem larger, more important, or tougher, often “self-aggrandizing” to try to build an image or be left alone. P6 stated that even though this does happen, most people are already known “before they even get there”. The individual’s identity prior to an incarceration, including their crimes, somehow makes it into the information networks of the inmates; a seeming necessity to know who is in prison with you. This can help to build your identity within the prison walls.

P6 suggests that identity is backed by action: “You are going to apologize to someone if you bump them” and “you ain’t gonna cut in line at mealtime or store” due to the “consequences and repercussions” that may follow (predominantly, such actions will result in physical assaults). P5 shares the same observation, stating, “You’re not going to just cut in on them when it’s time for store or time to eat. You’re not gonna cut in when the package deals (holiday packages) get there.”

P6 notes the differences people display in prison and on the street, stating that he may see someone begging for coffee in prison, but “you see him on the street in January, he’s gonna be acting like a bigshot, a baller.” P6 sees non-incarcerated individuals as an entirely different group of people: “The people on the outside are on the outside. When I went in, I had no respect because they didn’t know my background. But they’ll come and stand in front of you and test you, find out what you’re about. You don’t just tell them; they don’t just tell me. I learned this in prison too. You gotta have patience, a lot of

patience." P6 felt that he had an advantage in prison: "I'm not going to do any of that. I'm not going to lie to you. I'm not going to steal from you or nothing. I'm not dumping on them guys (new inmates). A lot of cats in there do that, they specialize in that. Getting stuff from new inmates." This can draw attention to you while you try to bolster your identity and there is no guarantee identity that your actions will protect you.

P1 suggests that the violence and politics of prison keep people engaged in hierarchies and thus assaulting others to keep power and keep others down: "What are you going to do differently? People will find out from other inmates, guards, whoever. Then you're a snitch and a target". P1 also shared that he knew of a prison officer husband and wife that were raped during a riot, which was never reported either, simply because "...nothing is ever done. Ever. Ever." To this end, P3 feels that many people "click up with a gang" or other protective group, such as a Christian group or Skinheads. This afforded protection, information, resources and more. P3 feels that younger guys who are still figuring out who to be are independent at first but will find a group. P3 states he eventually joined up with a group of Christians, because "you could kind of be yourself when you're with them", as opposed to other groups that may have had a clearer agenda of power.

P5 echoes P1 when talking about "being yourself", which can be seen as a challenge to prison identity, but it seems that the people most likely to act as themselves are willing to fight if needed to protect the identity that they imported into the prison, as P1 and P5 believe they did. Demonstrably, P5 felt that the people who were acting tougher, such as the new/young inmates, may "sound like a fucking earthquake" on the

tiers to “try to prove something to the older guys who are more laid back”, as that image of being more laid back may appear to be a kind of dominance. Interestingly, this may then have negative attention drawn to them, resulting in the younger, brash inmates become targets or absorbed into the hierarchy in some other way. P6 doesn’t disagree with this directly but shares that his experience was largely based on being tested by others and having to prove things, not because of his age but to “understand and deal with things that go on inside.”

P1 states that the hierarchy in prisons means that individual who is assaulted or raped “is the faggot, the other one is a badass. Keep in mind who they (the assailant) are hanging out with (like-minded people)”, and this is one component that perpetuates the cycle. P5 observed victims and reporters of sexual assault to be viewed differently by other inmates as well. The reporters were snitches, as commonly thought, but the victims were looked down upon even though their friends may console them. Victims, as far as P5 knows, did not reach out to each other.

Superordinate Theme 2: Prison Communication

P1 states that communication in prison is “like a whole new language”, attributing this to the geographic and ethnic mix of inmates that comes and goes, in addition to things like group communication traits (gang codes, assorted prison politics, etc.). Communication is not just how people talk to each other, but also has specific purpose: P5 feels that communication in prison is “more straightforward” and that, overall, is subdued, unless someone is a “shot caller”, since they have to put up more of a front and keep things organized. To some degree, this helps to keep communication at a lower level

and necessary for the functioning of the inmates, but it also then highlights when inmates are communicating in a way generally not accepted, such as snitching or when inmates lower in rank are “running their mouth” or “trying to act tougher/bigger”.

Politically, communication may have a presence and a cadence to it, but at the personal level, a different experience is had – both P2 and P4 feel that other inmates are secretive, stating that they (other inmates) “don’t tell you anything. You know, you don’t really know who they are. They keep it all to themselves.” (P4) and that “People are just trying to watch out for themselves, they might be too scared to talk” (P2). This seems to function as a protective feature since you are then left with less leverage over them, or even ability to hurt them by accessing information about them on the outside. Additionally, if all you know about someone is what they show you, you either have to accept it or challenge it. P4 adds that in his “...world, people want you to think wrong. They secretly want you not to know them.” P6 took steps to this end exactly: “But I don’t want no phone. I don’t do none of that. They (other inmates) inquisitive. They want to know your contacts, your brand. They got a couple of girlfriends, now I can use that.” As will be discussed below, information about the outside lives of other inmates is valuable as leverage.

P5 notes that one facet of communication he notices most is displayed on the outside of prison as well as inside – sexual threats (“I’ll make you suck my dick”) can be heard on the street as a reflection of the violent currency used by some during incarceration. P5 was not sure if these threats were followed up on, but their aggressive and announced quality served as a warning to others. P5 states that he saw other inmates

adopt these speaking patterns and supposed that this way of speaking may be adopted or amplified by a person during their time: “This is part of the life inside. Violent, sexual threats but also just making yourself look stronger.”

Superordinate Theme 3: Gender

P1 felt that while he doesn’t “know it (being male) from any other way”, he assumed that being male had something to do with reporting an assault. He felt that the public conception of being male reinforced gender themes, hearing people on the inside and outside referring to victims as “bitches”, “chumps”, “homos”, “weak” even though the victim probably had “no choice in reality” and that they may “be a little bit stronger because they let it happen so his family would be safe (on the outside).”

P1 reflected on “being a man”, stating that he feels a person is not weak if they are sexually assaulted or raped – “How strong do you feel after that (as a man who is raped)? Why didn’t you stop it? Why don’t you just kill him after?” P1 emphasized that size and weight and fighting prowess were often irrelevant in these situations because power is not just physical in prison, which is a blow to stereotypes. P6 shared similar thoughts, that it isn’t someone’s fault for being raped but that person still doesn’t want anyone else to know so he doesn’t look weak. “People might look at the person and feel bad for him. They may come to him, let him know they feel bad, that he’s ok... They may tell him that they’re similar, (meaning they may have also been victimized) to try to help him feel like he ain’t alone.”

P6 summarized his thoughts by stating that he feels gender/being male had an impact on victims because they think they are “too macho for this (being victimized). I’m

not telling anybody or anything like that." P5 agreed and shared that he observed "a lot of guys actin' macho/are naturally macho" and decide not to report sexual assaults, violent assaults, or other transgressions they've experienced from others in the population. That observation itself is reflective on the stereotype that males being "naturally macho" may change how they act. However, P5 also noted that he knew of someone who did talk about being sexually assaulted and that the individual "wasn't afraid to talk about it...it's kind of healing" but unlikely to occur in prison or be viewed in such a way. For P5, the risk of sharing it in prison "outweighs things (the chance to heal) because there is too much violence."

By way of contrast, P2 and P4 shared that they did not feel like anyone in prison expressed things differently just because they were male, or at least not explicitly. P2 felt that people communicated based on whether they were "weak" or "tough" (scared or not scared) but not because of being male (P2 did not express any connections between being weak or tough and being male). P4 felt that being male was not connected to how people presented; presentation was more based on personality traits, as documented in other areas of this section – inmates do not want others to "know" them and would be inherently secretive so they could be left alone.

Superordinate Theme 4: Sexual Assault

P1 shared that he was aware of an inmate who, around 2011 or 2012 was "tied up in his cell for like four of five days", during which time the inmate was raped repeatedly by other inmates. P1 says that staff was aware of it and did nothing, adding, "Nothing happens if it is something small or big like that guy who got tied up." In P1's experience,

sexual assaults were not an uncommon part of life even if they weren't happening every single day; they were enough apart of incarcerated life that you were unlikely to be aware of them. P2 and P3 echoed this experience, though both admitted that they tried to ignore or pay less attention to them and "couldn't tell ya how often they happened" (P2). P3 felt that focusing "on those types of things never led to anything good, so most people couldn't tell you how many happened or details. They'd just keep going with their business."

An additional power of assaulting someone was that it appeared to keep others quiet. P1 shared that the inmate that was tied up reportedly did not resist much because his assailants "knew him from the free world and would threaten (to hurt) his family." P5 also stated that sexual assaults could happen willingly (for protection or items) or unwillingly – "guys who look sweet (inmates who look or act stereotypically homosexual or are otherwise generally attractive) ...get targeted." P5 felt that his experience growing up in a different state as well as experiencing homelessness have "hardened" him to the regularities of (sexual) assault. "It happens and that's it. Some guys want it, some guys want it for what it gets them (protection or items). Other guys don't want it but it happens anyway." P5 did not offer even a subjective frequency but stated that it "happens a lot, yeah. It feels like it was happening a lot but people don't talk about it so you don't know for sure." Sometimes, it seems, that allowing an assault to occur, as the victim or a witness, feels necessary for the security of everyday life.

Echoing some of P5's statements, P6 stated that the assaults did offer opportunities for some inmates, "It becomes an arrangement. These guys can give it up

and get shit that they didn't have; more store, more time on the tablet (a device used by inmates for music and some email/communications), some protection. They get comfortable with it." P6 stated that other opportunities for sexual assault may have come from something as basic as a card game (loss) or a debt; for P6, it was all about leverage over others, "whether they actually want the sex or not."

Following this thought, many of the participants hinted that even if someone appeared willing to have sex for protection or goods, it still had a negative impact on them. P1 opined that the inmates (and possibly staff) would probably know if they came across someone who was (recently) sexually assaulted or raped, stating that "You could see that they went through something, and it was weighing on them. They don't come out anymore, they don't sit with everybody anymore. They don't communicate like they used to." P1 suggests that homosexual men have it tough, since "they just had sex willingly with a man, so they've got it worse." This reflects P5's statement about "guys who look sweet".

However, P1 offers that the victim's friends or gang may go after the assailant, and this is the consequence that the assailant faces in lieu of formal consequences denied by the lack of reporting. The assailant "probably won't do it again, at least not for a while, but it will happen, eventually somewhere else, some other way. It is kind of never-ending in a way." Even with consequences, legal or violent, sexual assault is not deterrable in the eyes of some. P4 shared that it was common that "You could hear it physically happen. You could hear all the assaults." P6 builds on this by stating that "You can't ever get that sound out of your head, the screaming. It's like the smell of death, you

never forget it." The sound of assaults is amplified by the silence of the inmates, and as touched upon here, sexual assault takes on an omnipresence that colors daily life.

Superordinate Theme 5: Reporting & Change

P1 summarized things well - "It's not like you can report it and then have nobody find out." P1 insisted that prison staff "are not on your side" and "if they see a weakness, they can play on that. They're going to use it for control". P1 suggested that other inmates can also gain power and advantage from the lack of anonymity. P1 feels that around 90% of sexual assaults go unreported "even with the PREA system in place. We make *fun* of it and the class you have to take. Literally, we're laughing at the whole thing. The staff are just sitting there and some sleep during the class." P1 felt that threats of harm to the individual or their family on the outside are the biggest reason that no one reports any sexual assaults and will allow some to happen, so that other people remain safe (as stated under Superordinate Theme 4). P1 feels that reporting is "never anonymous" (Due to all this, P1 expressed that, "In 30 years, I don't think I've ever even heard of someone reporting it (sexual assault)." P3 added that his own experience was one of ignoring the assaults as well, primarily to get by without any additional trouble: "The assaults would be bad. I didn't nothing about it. I just looked the other way. I know things have changed by it was pretty crazy back then (2002 or 2003)." P2 also stated that he had not reported anything himself, trying to "just get through it" and finish out his time. P3 echoes this stating "if you report something, they (other inmates) find out. They will. And you get a mark on your head. So, you become a target." P2 also felt that he never heard of others reporting sexual assaults.

P1 also suggests other risks of reporting are a factor: If you report, you are likely to be moved into protective custody. While there, if you "refuse to program" or if others "know why you're in there" (which, as suggested by several participants, it is likely that they do), complications may arise: you may get assaulted, you may have to stay longer due to refusing to program (if you don't want to leave your cell to participate in the PC program). P5 adds that individuals who he knew of that did report some sort of sexual assault were put into Protective Custody which, to observant inmates, may indicate that they have reported something about the event to staff or other inmates.

P6 stated that knowing of assaults is different than reporting it: "It's not my place to report, but they do get raped." Even for the victim, they don't know what will happen if they report it, P6 says, and then they are stuck with it while they make the decision and reporting it does not mean anything gets better – they have to wait and wait and maybe nothing will come of this, and the person may get raped while they're waiting days for the process to run its course. "It's bothering the guy that knows about it. If you tell, you fucked up, if you don't tell you, you feeling fucked up." P6 estimates that 20% of assaults get reported, but also feels that the staff will take the process seriously because the prison/unit will get shut down if not.

P1 ultimately admits his choice to not report weighs on him, especially due to his own values. P1 also states that despite all of this, his "dislike for bullies", the culture of harming each other, he would never report if he knew of an assault because he would have been at risk. If he reported an assault while in prison, he would have to go into protective custody and "everyone would know why I was in there. I couldn't come out

and be safe...There's no, there's no safe. No safe." P4 shared a stark observation that carries this concept of no safety further: "You can't get rid of the behaviors from prison. One (of the behaviors) is their sexual habits. Yeah, it's difficult, its fear based. You can't do that stuff the same..."; suggesting that even after leaving an institution, victims of sexual assault may not be able to perform, sexually or psychologically, as they did before.

P1 feels that if the reporting were handled by trained staff and someone like a psychologist who specialized in this type of system (reporting in prison) then those professionals could best figure out how to make the reporting system work. P3 also suggests that there is no easy amount of time left that he feels would make someone more likely to report, because just as he chose to remain silent to finish out his time in an easier manner (and due to health issues), others feel the same as well. P3 feels that better enforcement of the PREA system is necessary. As shown here, most of the participants feel like the reporter being segregated results in them being singled out as a target. P5 agreed with this, stating that reporting somehow causes the reporter to be "marked usually after they report, so most guys don't (report)", even though it may be healing. P5 feels that changes are unlikely to change reporting because "It stands the test of time. And it ain't going to change. It's a tough cookie (process) and snitches are always snitches. If you tell, you better be ready (for consequences). Even staff will snitch you out. People are just too afraid to tell." P4 offers another dimension to consider as well, that "you don't want anybody to rat you out either", for anything, so you may be less likely to report a sexual assault even if you could offer key information about the assault.

P7's Experience

P7 had a notably different experience than the other six participants. P7's time in prison was not mandatory, as he was initially sentenced to a year in a jail but elected to serve a year and a day because he was told by former inmates that the food and overall living conditions were better in prison than jail. His experience was also difference because his time was spent in a sorting facility which functioned as the prison that inmates stayed at initially while they are being processed and their permanent housing situation is being considered. His reported experiences and observations were prefaced with comments like, "There were too many guards for that". He notes that when he was placed there, people "just walked and talked the same, like on the streets."

P7 also focused on his own behaviors and criminal status, talking about felony points and trying to "stay out of trouble inside". He emphasized the need to accept his situation, stating "you couldn't be a pussy about anything you lost on the outside, oh well, it is gone". P7 states that he "never heard anything about anybody getting raped or assaulted" and that "you don't want that kind of thing going around, of course you're going to report it. I hope others report it." P7's experience was unique to the individuals interviewed in most aspects except that he feels, contradicting himself somewhat, that reporting wouldn't matter since "staff and inmates are not willing to listen to you or others."

Summary

The results of this study's interviews are presented here in Chapter 4. This study intended to examine possible reporting considerations of males while incarcerated. The

interviewer surveyed males who have a history of incarceration with the intent to understand some of those possible considerations. The lived experiences of the seven participants were examined using a phenomenological approach and several superordinate themes were discovered through analysis of the interview responses, which were elicited through a semistructured interview, used in accordance with an interview guide. The topics addressed in these interviews were evoked by the research questions formed from the literature review in this current study, and subsequent interview questions which were created from the totality of the current study up to this point.

The findings of this research revealed several key commonalities in the lived experience of incarcerated males, specifically their perspectives and observations. The experiences of incarceration are unique on numerous levels, and the presence of sexual assault as a potential constant and as leverage is one of the most unique features. That male inmates appear to have to make such considerations is a terrible phenomenon that needs such investigation to help address it and keep male inmates safe. This chapter included participant experiences of the reporting process as they have observed it and their opinions on how to address and improve it. In six of the seven interviews, the participants felt that sexual assaults were a part of daily life for incarcerated males, and a majority of the participants felt that gender and gender stereotypes played a role in the existence of sexual assaults. The majority of participants also seemed to feel that how male inmates presented themselves was a notable component of prison life but were divided on the role that presentation may play in sexual assaults, if any. Each participant had the opportunity to share these thoughts and offer some insight into how they feel the

reporting process of sexual assaults can improved. From the seven interviews, five superordinate themes surfaced from the NVivo analysis of the interviews: prison identity, prison communication, gender, sexual assault, and reporting & change.

At the conclusion of data collection and analysis, it became apparent that despite their different experiences, six of the seven participants had faced the grim reality of sexual assault within male prison facilities. Additionally, those six participants had differing opinions of the sexual assault reporting system but ultimately felt it was ineffective against the prison culture and unwritten rules of prison life. Furthermore, several opinions of the role of prison staff in the entire process were negative and illuminated a potential opportunity for change through the training of prison staff.

It is worth noting that P7's interview was the shortest of all seven but seemed earnest. He did not appear to be indifferent to the idea of sexual assault or the need for reporting, just as he did not appear to be ignorant to how people present themselves, but his perspective was colored more by time on the streets than in prison, and his prison experience sounded as though it was different in part because of the sorting facility he was held at and the regular changing of inmates at that facility. This may have made it harder for people to build reputations, create debt, memorize the layout or routine of the prison and its staff, or a number of other factors. Almost in complete opposition to the six other interviews, P7 was nearly confident that sexual assault could not happen and that reporting it is a necessity for the safety of the inmates, even if he did not feel that a report would be believed by staff or other inmates.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify potential barriers that male inmates may face when deciding to report sexual assault during incarceration. Based on the interviews with seven participants, aspects of gender identity and prison culture appear to influence an individual's decision to report being sexually victimized. This current study has relevance in increasing trends in gender and social identity, as well as social reform, and adds to the limited research available on male reporting behaviors.

Chapter 5 consists of themes and findings elicited from the phenomenological interviews conducted that explored the lived experiences of the seven participants. An interpretive phenomenological approach was used to obtain, explore, and analyze the responses of the participants, and thus allowed me to interpret the responses, with the help of the NVivo qualitative research data analysis software. The software also aided me in identifying patterns and themes in the responses given by the participants. Further discussion concerning the participant interviews, underlying theoretical framework, and existing literature will subsequently provide justification and support for the conclusions found hereafter. Chapter 5 will, additionally, provide a summary of findings. Chapter 5 consists of the following sections: (a) introduction, (b) interpretations of findings, (c) limitations of the study (d) recommendations, (e) implications, and (f) conclusion of the study.

Introduction

This study was developed based on the extensive literature review that was conducted, leading to the research and semistructured interview questions. From this, it

appears that there are some factors that are perceived by male inmates as obstacles to reporting sexual assault (experiencing or witnessing) during incarceration according to the answers provided by the seven participants who were interviewed. These obstacles were aspects of prison culture and male gender identity, as well as the reporting process itself. While some of the responses offered varying or contradictory opinions, these obstacles were predominantly held as observed practices; a few of the responses also felt that the problem was getting better thanks to PREA, but this was not a majority viewpoint. Prison identity and communication limited what males were allowed to safely talk about, according to the participants, and sexual assault is utilized as a multifaceted tool by some inmates. Additionally, the participants feel that staff and other inmates may sometimes ignore the assaults or use them to criticize and belittle the victim, which is an occurrence outside of prison as well (Fisher & Pina, 2013; Ng, 2014; Hammond, et al., 2016; Hlavka, 2017; Ahlin, 2019). The reporting process as it stands now, most of the participants felt, is either ineffective or dangerous or both, similar to public spaces (Hines & Douglas, 2016; Porta, et al., 2018).

As males import some harmful aspects of gender identity and stereotypes into prison, the aspects are amplified by prison culture, by the refusal of others to intervene, by the control sought by other inmates, and a seemingly ineffective reporting system. Prison culture may be heard of prior to entering prison, but it is made clear that it is ubiquitous and can impact an individual both before and after they leave the prison, sometimes causing significant risk due to this (Ricciardelli, et al., 2015). This power of the threat and use of sexual violence does not seek to harm simply through physical

means but by degradation of the individual's psyche and identity (Michalski, 2017). As Nayak (2006) expounded, males "accrue a body capital that has a currency and a local exchange value within the circuits they inhabit." In other words, there is value in what a body is and what is taken during a sexual assault.

As the inmates continue to propagate this cycle, the participants felt that the staff were also aware of these events and would either disregard them in many cases, or possibly use the events to further harm the inmates by allowing the events to happen. According to the participants, staff did not always keep the identity of a victim safe during the PREA reporting and separation, either on purpose or by accident, and therefore may endanger the victim further (Hammond, et al., 2016; Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Leith, 2017; Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018). Furthermore, the participants were mixed on whether PREA was effective, or at least effective enough.

Interpretation of the Findings

Theme 1: Prison Identity

The first theme that emerged was the concept of prison identity. For most of the individuals interviewed here, prison identity meant acting in ways that were not natural to them. But even for the participants who stated they did not change how they acted, it was something that they acknowledged and even saw people export to the streets upon their release. Prison identity was not a natural state of being for most – it involves behaving in ways that are intended to convince other inmates that the individual is both within expected norms of the prison culture, but also that they are not to be trifled with (Ricciardelli, et al., 2015). Participants noted that some inmates made themselves more

notable through noise and posturing, while others tried to remain quiet and off the radar of others, but neither method was a guarantee of safety.

The participants shared that many individuals were likely to keep to themselves for the most part, following their own routines and meeting up with others for socialization that occurs predominantly in prison – some communication about superficial topics or prison politics, shared values amongst those who find similar personalities, lifestyles, or situations. Gang members or inmates with various affiliations (such as religious) may meet up to discuss those matters. Inmates looking to make deals or trade items with each other or those wishing to play sports are likely to interact with each other. It is possible that some inmates, looking for protection or to gain extra services, may reach out to offer intimacy to other inmates.

Prison identity could also mean, however, that there is little communication or interaction with other inmates. This could be for protection, for a better chance of being left alone or going unnoticed. Perhaps the inmate is new and has not made connections or does not yet know how to present themselves in the social dynamics of incarceration. Conversely, the individual may be new or young and act brashly, presenting themselves as reckless or tough, trying to intimidate other inmates or the prison staff. Coincidentally, some of the older inmates, or those who had been incarcerated longer may not act in such a manner, understanding that it does not represent power or legitimate threat (Ricciardelli, et al., 2015).

Prison identity is a new presentation of identity, though, since the person's preexisting identity is largely removed from them upon entering the prison - per the

interviews, this is not always the case, nor does the imported facet always remains. Prison identity may be inherently more dangerous, as you may be viewed poorly by others due to crime (such as pedophiles) or the identity that others place upon you (such as how homosexual inmates may be viewed). Additionally, the new dynamic of possibly being looked down upon and being treated differently by prison staff emerges; and even if there is no trouble with staff, the inmate must ask permission for many things, no matter how personal, even being strip-searched as part of routines operations and safety checks.

Another part of identity seems counterintuitive – to sexually assault, rape, or receive sexual service from other inmates does not mean you are homosexual or bisexual, but rather that you are dominant over the person harmed or providing the sexual service. The participants also shared that once released, these threats or actual violent moments may stay with individuals, who may then use them, as tools, against others once back on the street. Conversely, the victim is seen as the "faggot" or weaker person, despite their size, circumstance, or other factors. This may have lasting effects, as stated by previous research and the participants, and the assault and lasting effects may then be aggravated by the conditions and perceptions of segregation, potential subsequent threats or assaults, treatment by staff, or it may never be known by others, leaving the victim to suffer in silence.

Theme 2: Prison Communication

Though closely linked to prison identity, prison communication appears to have some of its own mechanics that separates it from prison identity or keeps it from being a subtheme. This appears to be, at least in part, a mechanic of gender and socialization of

males, but also due to the reduction of power in all incarcerated individuals as well as the use of communication as precise tool and occasional weapon within the prison walls – P4 noted that not sharing about yourself kept people from knowing you, from getting some sort of leverage on you. Inmates are subject to staff orders and institutional expectations, which may also have some impact on why and how communication occurs within prison, including the transmission of information through the prison (on kites or by prison sign language, for example). Moreover, communication is limited and scrutinized in prisons, as all incoming and outgoing mail is subject to examination in prisons, and documented communication can be held for legal use as necessary.

But the communication is certainly not just written communication – again, the way individuals present themselves across a myriad of situations involves a substantial array of social behaviors, some implicit or explicit, some as deception or some as truth (such as assaults against rival gang members). In fact, presentation in prison, as described by the participants and in previous literature, appears to be akin to physical presentation in the animal kingdom, with posturing and gestures being a large part of things; this includes visible silence and calmness displayed by leaders and shot callers, as a measure of confidence and dominance (Vigoya, 2001; Shermer & Sudo, 2016; Hefner, 2018). Meanwhile, somewhat outside of inmate-inmate communication is the communication by the staff, sometimes demeaning, sometimes negating, but always representative of power over the inmates. The participants did not share much on staff communication, but it seemed to be largely negative when they did. So then, communication in prison seems to be mainly for other inmates, not the staff.

Interestingly, this may be the most important theme to have emerged, as communication is the central theme to this research – what barriers may exist to communicating an assault has occurred? Existing literature is rife with documented barriers for males (and females) in the public, but regarding males specifically, outpatient clinics, colleges, and other specific situations reflect some of the same challenges with reporting that can be found within prison. However, the participants noted that the PREA reporting system (as well as the general reporting system) in prisons is ineffective and can even become a threat to the safety of the individuals reporting any negative events have occurred, from threats to full assaults that have occurred.

Perhaps worth noting is how prison life is communicated to the outside world as well. As discussed above, prison sexual assault is publicly accepted as material for jokes in pop culture of all sorts, and many people feel that prisoners deserve whatever happens to them within the prison walls (Fisher & Pina, 2013; Brenner & Darcy, 2017). This communication goes both ways and is, perhaps, part of the reason that PREA and other reporting are challenging systems to use safely and effectively. After all, males are told that they should act certain ways, as are inmates, so male inmates are supposed to act in certain ways and deserve what happens to them (Fisher & Pina, 2013; Brenner & Darcy, 2017). Communication in prison appears, according to some participant answers, to be based on necessity – secrecy, at first, but then threats, security, or an attempt on dominance, perhaps. This small sample may have yielded enough insight to warrant further investigation into prison communication in and of itself.

Theme 3: Gender

This theme was heavy in the existing literature but seemed to appear less in the responses given by the participants, at least in a direct way. The current research is not exhaustive but that each participant did not call out gender as a major force in the non-reporting seems to be unexpected. However, most of the participants did make mention of gender in some regard, as several talked about gender either in the public or part of an individual's personality, rather than as a concrete and observable thing - this could be one of the primary areas of future research. For the participants, being male seemed to be a negligible piece of prison existence by itself - gender seemed to be a burden, as beliefs about what it means to be male where attacked when the sexual assault occurred.

With previous literature discussing male socialization, male stereotypes, the proclivity of violence in males, toxic masculinity, and the spotlight on these topics cast by the #MeToo movement, it seems difficult to refute that gender has a role in this current research, but what that role is seems to be up for debate. It is possible that the participants' own experiences, perspectives, or even their understanding of gender are different than that explored in the existing literature, which makes sense since compiling a solid foundation upon which to conduct this current research was not an easy task. If that is the case, then it may be worth exploring perceptions of gender in other ways generally as well. There was some direct thought on how being male in prison may impact the individual, but again this was only in a negative way: P1 illuminated this in his reflection on a stereotype - "How strong (as a man who was just raped) do you feel after (being raped)?" P6 felt that the weight of being male was in denial of being sexually

assaulted; both P5 and P6 felt that this may have been the largest obstacle to reporting or sharing the event with others.

Notably, gender was discussed more when looking at how it could be used to hurt someone else, such as the psychological damage caused by a sexual assault. This current research was not able to parse out the damage as it relates directly to gender and identity, but most of the participants did note that the hegemonic gender attributes are used as representation of power over others and the use of sexual assault in forcefully reducing others as it applies to gender. To some degree, the participants seemed to waiver or feel uncertain about the role of gender, at least in their perception of what others go through and in their own experiences.

Theme 4: Sexual Assault

While every theme inherently deals with this topic, it was something that had a stark presence in the first six interviews. Each of the participants knew it existed and talked of it like it was haunting the facilities they were in – each participant's voice changed, becoming lower, and their eyes became fixed on whatever was in front of them during these moments. They were each aware of it and each seemed to know that it would not be reported even before being asked about it. The first six participants shared various thoughts on what they saw other inmates go through, the behaviors of the officers regarding assaults (and reporting) and the silence that followed the assault, even if the assault was on staff (in P1's response). The participants did not reveal if they had experienced the assault, but each spoke as though they had some conception of the

horror. The responses also indicated the lasting impact of the sounds of the assault, or the look on the victim's face.

The first six participants shared their thoughts on possible reasons why an assault would not be reported by the victimized inmate, by other inmates or the participants themselves. They shared their perspectives on the impact that the assaults could have on an inmate, including effects that may possibly occur outside of the prison walls. The participants suggested that snitching or reporting of any kind was looked down upon by the inmate community, and that this information was potentially passed down to new inmates shortly after their arrival. The participants also discussed the aftermath of an assault, sharing that the victims were likely to shut down, and did not regularly receive support unless acquaintances or friends were able to express some sympathy, somehow knowing what the individual went through. Staff, according to the participants, were less likely to do anything unless directly approached by an individual who had been victimized.

Each of the first six participants discussed different dynamics of sexual contact at the prison, and the use of sexual assaults as power, to demean others, and as leverage (to obtain goods). Some responses indicated that these events were worse for inmates assumed or identified to be homosexual. It was also acknowledged that the impact of the assault transcended a person's size, ability to react, and that the victims were routinely sent to protective custody, which could result in assumptions that the individuals reported the event or the assailant.

There was an interesting line of thought that also emerged – inmates were labeled homosexual (whether true or not) or "sweet" looking were targeted or specifically observed because it was assumed, according to the participants, that the perpetrators would go after males who were attractive or who willingly had sex with other males, as though they (the perpetrators) were trying to make the assault more convenient or easier on themselves in some way. This is another area that may require more examination.

Theme 5: Reporting & Change

This theme may have been one of the most challenging to process and analyze because the first six participants had numerous negative things to say about the reporting process, including PREA, and had little optimism for any change coming from reporting or efforts to change this system. These are obviously subjective reports, but to contrast this negative outlook with the seeming need for change makes examination of the topic difficult. P5 and P6 felt that gender played an important role in decision to not report an assault, but the dominant thought was that reporting did not occur because prison culture determined that it was snitching, a betrayal of the code of secrecy (interestingly, society talks of tattling as a negative thing in childhood). Inmates who were not assaulted may not report due to risks to their own safety, so many individuals inside the same unit may know that an assault occurred, but no one will report it out of fear and concern for themselves. When it is disclosed, the victim is separated, at risk, but not the assailant, whose very presence threatens others.

An interesting point, and second most prominent, in the responses was that of the staff's involvement in the reporting process. Some participants felt that staff would take

the reports seriously, others that the staff may look down upon the person giving the report. Again, this was odd considering the other reports of non-reporting behaviors that the participants shared were common outcomes of sexual assault. Staff have a duty to report sexual assaults, legally and at a federal level, yet their attitudes about such event seem questionable, morally, and legally, if the participants responses are accurate. If reporting does not occur, then how do the participants create an idea of the efficacy or attitudes of the staff? Moreover, PREA was created nearly 20 years ago, and the participants (overall) feel that is has done very little to change the situation within systems of incarceration.

The participants discussed PREA and reporting in general, stating that most or all of assaults will not be reported and even if they are, the current PREA system is not adequate. Part of the problem is how to prove such an event took place and how to prove that the named assailant was involved. Additionally, how do you protect the victim and potentially the victim's family? It is complex to think that it is potentially prison code, not gender, that results in non-reporting while the assault is intended to reduce the individual due to their own beliefs about gender. If this is the case, the victim feels de-masculinized because of gender stereotypes and keeps to themselves because of the prison code and possible retribution. Some inmates may suffer this fate to keep their family safe and it is possible that their family never knows about it, which is compounded as the event is kept secret by the individual, who leaves prison changed and possible unable to perform sexually, or at least as they've been accustomed to.

What these revelations show us is that when at inmate is assaulted: they are indirectly instructed to keep the event to themselves and suffer more; other inmates must also remain quiet, or risk being assaulted (or possibly ostracized) themselves; no one speaks up. Additionally, there is no incentive, in the perception of the population, to report because of the staff or the process itself. Lastly, gender is perceived to play a role in choosing not to report, but it is not possible to determine how it is weighted or prioritized in the decision.

Discussion of Participant 7's Responses

P7's responses introduce an entirely new dynamic to this research. While P7 ultimately chose to go to prison rather than jail, P7 was also housed at a sorting facility, which changed some of the variables in his own experience. It was less likely that most of the inmates would be there long-term, less likely to form close connections with others or create any sort of dominant social position (unless, perhaps, they were already in such a position, but it is not possible to know what effect this would have at this time), less likely that inmates would be able to know the facility or routines of the staff nearly as well as a facility wherein they were housed for over a year, or a number of other factors that could potentially influence the likelihood that an inmate will be sexually assaulted.

Additionally, P7 stated that he had never heard of sexual assaults being a (common) part of prison life, which seems unlikely given the literature supporting these thoughts, but it is possible that P7 had never encountered such things, which is then supported by his experience, as well as his hopes that sexual assaults would be reported so that they were less likely to occur during incarceration.

Limitations of the Study

This study was designed to explore perceptions of reporting barriers, if any, within carceral settings. The participant responses were collected through the creation of interview questions that had been created prior to the interview itself, following an interview guide and literature review of relevant topics. The interviews were comprised of a priori questions and the responses were further elicited by interviewer rapport and open-ended questions asked to the participants, intended to gain more insight into the experiences of the participants. Overall, the literature reviewed for this current research indicated that individuals experiencing sexual assault were not very likely to report it, that males who experienced sexual assault were less likely to report it, and that aspects of prison life altered communication and restricted an individual's perception on the value of reporting any kind of affront.

The first limitation worth looking at is the small sample size of seven participants. While the sample was determined to be appropriate for this study, seven participants are far fewer than the millions of males in American that are incarcerated. Furthermore, this sample was collected in one corner of the country, and while the inmates may have been incarcerated in other areas, there are geo-cultural considerations that may have influenced the perspectives of the inmates or influenced their perspective during the interview. A sample is meant to be representative of a given population, and while the majority of the responses were similar or connected in some way, it is also easy to see some notable differences.

A third possible limitation are participants responses themselves. As mentioned, this topic is not lightly or frequently discussed in the public, and this restriction is compounded by the gender of the participants, as well as their experiences as inmates, which may possibly have impacted on the individual relates to others on the outside. The research included a gift card worth 20 dollars, which may have also made for an opportunity for some individuals to finish the interviews as quickly as possible without offering accurate information or responses.

A possible limitation that arose as well is that many of the responses evoked many more questions, which may be positive in scientific research but may limit generalizability; an example of this is the perception that gender may play a role in non-reporting, but the extent or psychological ordering of it is difficult to tell. As such, it remains difficult to know how to address it along the process, and what changes to prison life will be required. And while research sometimes seeks to develop more questions, this area is already understudied and under-researched, the population is considered to be a vulnerable population, and it is inherently a topic that is shrouded in secrecy – the research may only highlight the need for more research.

Lastly, confirmation bias, or personal bias of any kind, is always a potential threat to the quality of the data collected. While the interview questions were designed to avoid this as much as possible, and were approved for use, it should be noted that the researcher has previous work experience at a prison, which may have informed some of the thought that went into constructing the questions, or possibly even made it difficult for the researcher to think of questions in a different way.

Implications

There are several layers of implications to this study. Even P7, who reported that he did not observe or know of any sexual assaults, noted that "you don't want that kind of thing going around." What emerges, from the responses given here, is that sexual assaults in prison: seem to occur as a regular part of prison life (though the frequency is not reflected in the responses here); are not likely to be reported for numerous reasons; inmates view the staff and reporting process as ineffective, and that the use of sexual assaults on male inmates is a deliberate and effective means of psychologically harming and controlling other inmates. Most significant, non-reporting behaviors seem to be ingrained into gender and prison culture as a protective behavior, possibly to also disconnect life inside the prison from life outside of it (through protection of others and self-identity).

If the implications of this current research are combined with previous research, a grim picture emerges. Some of the responses here support previous literature (Artime, et al., 2014; Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Lambie & Johnston, 2016; Forsman, 2017; Parks, 2017) that examined the psychological impact of sexual assaults: male inmates who have been sexually assault will become notably more isolated and appear depressed. The victim may feel shame or humiliation, powerlessness, emergence or increase in anxious, depressive, or traumatic stress, and may also suffer from ongoing identity or sexual issues. Additionally, sexual victimization can be a predictor of future mental health outcomes and revictimization (Leith, 2017; Hines & Douglas, 2018). We may not yet know the breadth and depth of the harm done to an incarcerated person, how frequently

they are assaulted, the severity of the assaults themselves, the responses by the prison staff, or the legal outcome of any assault, but they occur with an unsettling prevalence, appearing to be less than rare.

But if sexual assault occurs in prison so much so that PREA was created to address it then it is also clear that prison staff is aware of it. How it continues to happen, at any rate, is not well understood. Some of the participants here stated the guards are aware of it, and previous literature found that sometimes prison staff or volunteers are the perpetrators of it (Belitz, 2018). From these perspectives, and statements that the incarcerated individual deserved the assault (Fisher & Pina, 2013; Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Cook & Lane, 2017b), it may be possible that the assaults are allowed to occur, which is a stark implication but one that must not be ruled out, lest a dangerous practice be allowed to continue to hurt the incarcerated population. The inmates who commit the assaults clearly use them to achieve power or dominance over others, whereas some inmates are assaulted in order to protect themselves or others or gain resources that they may prefer to gain in another fashion. All of these factors indicate that sexual assaults in prison are desired by some.

Financially, there is a cost to investigate such events and to care for individuals (Hines & Douglas, 2018) mentally and physically, as well as further protect them from possible inmate retaliation (if the victim is assumed to have reported something). It is also possible that the individual may be revictimized, either outside of prison or if they reoffend and thus return to prison (Cook & Lane, 2017b). As such, to reduce and better address incidents of male sexual assault inside prisons can help society overall by

reducing financial costs to taxpayers, though clearly the element of human suffering can never been measure in money.

If sexual assault is looked at on a larger scale, then a similar picture emerges. Due to the effectiveness of sexual assault on others, the United Nations has had to declare the sexual assault of males as a growing concern in war-type conflicts (Gorris, 2015). The world must grasp that this is a targeted attack meant to inflict significant psychological (and physical) harm against another person. As the *#MeToo* movement has recently pushed into the public mind, sexual assaults are used purposefully for gain over another person at the expense of their well-being and, apparently, using the psychological damage to harm and subdue the victimized individual and their response.

The perceived ineffectiveness of the reporting system overall is another major implication. Even though some of the participants noted that the prison staff must take the report and enact certain measures after the report happens, most of the responses indicate little faith in the system overall, even if it is used. This echoes, to some degree, findings in existing literature about the efficacy and impact of the reporting process in the public – if it is a negative experience, this could exacerbate the impact of the assault (Hammond, et al., 2016; Brenner & Darcy, 2017; Leith, 2017; Porta, et al., 2018). It is possible, based on the responses given here, that the staff are not trained adequately (a perception of several participants) and that reporting system does not adequately address the need of incarcerated individuals needing to report a sexual assault. Or, as suggested by Porta, Johnson, and Finn (2018), there may be a number of factors, and the intersectionality of those factors make for a complex net of barriers, beyond just the

system itself; these authors also point out another possibility, that help-seeking behaviors of individuals are not reinforced, through life experiences, and are seen as detrimental in this environment.

A final implication is staggering – the social culture of gender must be changed in some way for the possibility of changes in these topics to occur. If gender carries so much negative influence on prison (being used to harm others and interfering with help-seeking), not to mention what the impact of gender dissonance appears to cause in psychological sequelae and behaviors once released, it becomes a construct that is not just a weapon but also a prison. Vescio, et al., (2021), also found that empathy is "a cognitive inhibitor of interpersonal aggression" and that it may thus be ignored by males, as it reduces their ability to act in (aggressive) ways – which may then limit survival choices in prison. The literature reviewed in this study revealed these possibilities; the participant interviews highlighted them.

Recommendations for Social Change

It is worth revisiting part of a quote from Connell (2016b): "Knowledge is not a substitute for action." The purpose is not a neat summary, but to illuminate the heart of this research – the questions posed here lacked answers, thus societies have lacked some knowledge, which compounds the lack of, or incomplete, action. Federal law and international convention have addressed the problem of rape in prisons, yet it remains a complex problem. Stepping even further back, we can see that the problem is not just prison, but gender stereotypes and social teaching of gender norms. Definitions, policies, advertisements, homosocial spaces, and individual minds are full of gender stereotypes

and prescribed behaviors. Even at birth, gender is a priority and a reference for gifts and parental aspirations – this is where change must begin.

The Feminist movement did so much to drive reform for females, and equality overall, but no such thing has occurred for males and for any people, males were seen as perpetrators, not victims (Leith, 2017; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). While the transition from the Feminist to the LGBTQ movement may have offered some benefit to male victims, it was not enough overall (Leith, 2017). Ahlin (2019) states that, specific to correctional institutions, we need to identify the risk factors (as well as protective factors) that relate to sexual violence, and that psychological pain in this context comes with medical pain, which needs to be an additional driving factor for those in charge of the care of others. Lack of this type of data can also increase disease transmission and overall poor public health (Parks, 2017), and can result in delays in the delivery of care as well as recognizing what needs to be a priority in delivering that care (Porta, et al., 2018). These ideas apply to male victims of sexual violence, and certainly to all victims, but the moral, ethical, and medical obstacles (to name a few) of correctional institutions place an immediacy on this matter. Kapur and Muddell (2016) urge us to consider that transitional justice cannot move forward without accountability, and sustainable, positive outcomes are not possible without work in these contexts and settings. The male body is caught in the middle of this, both a currency and a target.

Continued research on decision making by male survivors, including disclosure to formal healthcare – information about questions victims may have after the assault (Porta, Johnson, & Finn, 2018). Nielsen (2017) argues that society will experience a

benefit from the reduced violence (sexual and associated) from more research, attention, and change to policies and practices. Additionally, Nielsen asks us to consider that an individual in prison, for example, does not typically remain there, but will reenter society and sometimes reenter prison, and that a positive impact on time spent incarcerated and/or the transitional experience can change patterns of behavior in these individuals, patterns which may include future violence, which can impact recidivism, sexual inequality, and the lives of thousands or millions. Moreover, these changes may be able to reduce the psychological sequelae experienced by victims (Kapur & Muddell, 2016; Forsman, 2017; Parks, 2017; Hines & Douglas, 2018).

Some researchers suggest that increased efforts to challenge or remove rape myths (and related thoughts), along with improving services, can help decrease the overall psychological and existential impact of victimization, as well as increase the speed of getting connected to support and recovery (Ioannou, et al., 2016). This can be a vital component of the experience for male victims – if positive messages and reasonable expectations are provided to the individual, then males will be better able to integrate all parts of their identity in a more stable and healthier process (Elkins, et al., 2017). For some researchers, cultural perceptions of the individual (which are likely assumed by the individual themselves) have hurt the services and policies for male victims of sexual assaults (Ng, 2014).

In 2013, Fisher and Pina put forth that male sexual assault needs to be taken as seriously as female sexual assault before males see a notable change to their experiences. Obviously, all people should be supported in the wake of such an experience, but as

Lisak (1993) stated 20 years prior to Fisher and Pina, male sexual victimization may be in a cultural blind spot. As such, how does a society address a problem it cannot see? Moreover, if a society still accepts male sexual assaults in prison as material for jokes, what will convince the society to make a change? Continued research on decision making by male survivors, including disclosure to formal healthcare – information about questions victims may have after the assault (Porta, et al., 2018). Nielsen (2017) argues that society will experience a benefit from the reduced violence (sexual and associated) from more research, attention, and change to policies and practices. Additionally, Nielsen asks us to consider that an individual in prison, for example, does not typically remain there, but will reenter society and sometimes reenter prison, and that a positive impact on time spent incarcerated and/or the transitional experience can change patterns of behavior in these individuals, patterns which may include future violence, which can impact recidivism, sexual inequality, and the lives of thousands or millions.

It is worth going back further to Burt (1980) as the foundational research on male sexual victimization. For Burt, the ingrained attitudes of the individuals (in conjunction with the society in which those individuals live) will determine much about how any kind of sex is experienced: “Only by promoting the idea of sex as a mutually undertaken, freely chosen, fully conscious interaction…can society create an atmosphere free of the threat of rape” (p. 229). Mahatma Ghandi is widely known as the person who surmised that a society can be judged by how it treats the vulnerable members within itself; if a society is largely blind to male sexual victimization, looks down upon incarcerated

individuals, and continues to make jokes about prison rape, even now in 2022, the judgement of that society cannot be favorable.

Fisher and Pina (2013) urge that society must acknowledge that male sexual victimization exists, is harmful, and beliefs and attitudes around it must be challenged. Similarly, Hammond, Ioannou, and Fewster (2016) feel that a better reporting system is not only necessary but will likely play a major role in eliminating barriers; it is possible that this may also increase help-seeking behaviors if the individual knows that the system is better prepared to help them. This is also necessary if the words of the participants in this study hold true: most of the participants in this study stated that reporting will have you labeled as a rat or snitch, and you will be found out, which then leads to possible threats or actual physical harm. Additionally, almost a lot of the participants felt that the reporting system was going to be ineffective for anyone who report, or that the report would not be listened to, which matches some of the concerns that participants in previous studies had regarding barriers to reporting.

The participants agreed that a better system was necessary, staffed by professionals more knowledgeable about sexual assault and prison culture, and the process of segregating victims needs to be changed as well, since this almost directly puts them at risk of being labeled a snitch. Burt's research in 1980 cannot be overstated in its relevance and needs to be revisited once again, as it directly addresses the issue that the participants discuss:

> Rape is the logical and psychological extension of a dominant-submissive, competitive, sex role stereotyped culture... The task of preventing rape is

> tantamount to revamping a significant proportion of our societal values. Developing an accurate theoretical understanding of rape attitudes and assaultive behavior will help make social change efforts more effective (p. 229).

Change can only come about if individuals, and thus societies, are aware and informed about the problems. And yet if male sexual victimization is in a cultural blind spot, if it is not accepted as a problem, if it is supported by the actors in a system that embraces male sexual victimization as a tool, known by the professional overseeing the system and underestimating the problem (Belitz, 2018), then change is not yet possible. Ashmont (2014) noted that half of all males who were sexually victimized while in prison reported the event, but only 3% of the reports resulted in disciplinary action. Ng (2014) found that the public feels that this acceptable, unless there is some form of serious injury, and the response to that does not demand justice. Caravaca-Sanchez and Wolff (2016) and Simpson et al. (2016) found that it was closer to 41% of inmates who were victimized, but also found that the research was faulty and may conflict with other studies, yet another sign that more serious research needs to be conducted. Ng (2014) puts incarcerated male sexual victimization rates at 30 times higher than non-incarcerated rates, with up to 50% of the inmates being assaulted by staff (Belitz, 2018), which again states that change is not possible in a system such as this. The research that has been discussed on assaults (of all kinds) in carceral settings has demonstrated that a change is necessary, and that PREA exists at all should be a signifier that this research needs to be continued and expanded.

Some researchers suggest that increased efforts to challenge or remove rape myths (and related thoughts), along with improving services, can help decrease the overall psychological and existential impact of victimization, as well as increase the speed of getting connected to support and recovery (Ioannou, et al., 2016). This can be a vital component of the experience for male victims – if positive messages and reasonable expectations are provided to the individual, then males will be better able to integrate all parts of their identity in a more stable and healthier process (Elkins, et al., 2017). For some researchers, cultural perceptions of the individual (which are likely assumed by the individual themselves) have hurt the services and policies for male victims of sexual assaults (Ng, 2014). If assumptions about gender, including that sexual assault does not happen to males, are allowed to continue and dominate, then the entire phenomenon is not investigated, males do not receive the services or protection that they need – how society sees males and sees victims of abuse will determine what is in place, ranging from immediate support and belief up to legislative support and societal catalyzation of reporting such abuse (Ng, 2014). Furthermore, each instance of sexual abuse is different from the next, and therefore male rape needs to be addressed as a unique and pressing issues (Ng, 2014).

If assumptions about gender, including that sexual assault does not happen to males, are allowed to continue and dominate, then the entire phenomenon is not investigated, males do not receive the services or protection that they need – how society sees males and sees victims of abuse will determine what is in place, ranging from immediate support and belief up to legislative support and societal catalyzation of

reporting such abuse (Ng, 2014). As Miracle (2016) reminds us, gender is an interplay of sociocultural factors which produces, but it doesn't have to be one of risk and bravado and self-destruction – the possibly positive aspects typically attributed to masculinity, such as self-reliance or responsibility can be tapped into, supported, and bolstered, in a way that can break stereotypes and help males access care (Miracle, 2016). These traits, Miracle (2016) states, can help to minimize stigma and create a more successful approach to changes gender dynamics, stigma, and interactions between and within genders. Healthcare and service costs increase if assaults continue, as does the suffering of the individual, incarcerated and public communities, and this is compounded by the length and the severity of the assaults (both continued assaults and poor system response). There is some specificity to male sexual victimization that cannot be ignored due to the societal beliefs that appear to support its continuation.

To leave the system untouched is also to see these traumatic responses as acceptable and this is an indication that the Eighth Amendment is not present in anything beyond the paperwork that the policies rest upon. Ahlin (2019) found flaws in PREA, it is worth asking if Deliberate Indifference and Cruel and Unusual Punishment are accepted and expected by the public and prison personnel. Carceral settings are supposed to be places of positive change, yet the jokes remain while people suffer in silence. As society nears larger acceptance of non-binary genders, one cannot hope that the negative aspects of masculinity will no longer remain, that stereotypes will no longer be taught, and it is imperative to remember that thousands have suffered and continue to do so because of these processes.

Conclusion

The inherent difficulty of the research discussed here is that it involved examining the perspective of people who had to opine about why other people may not report being sexually assaulted, an event that is documented to shut down a person's ability to think clearly and communicate their needs. Furthermore, it is unfathomable how much pain and suffering a person goes through once assaulted in a manor described in the literature here while they are also isolated from all natural supports and receptive parties. For the participants, negotiating these factors with the restraint of restricted communication seems to be a difficult task, one that has been largely overlooked by research and policy. It is a situation that, even though addressed by a federal policy, continues to exist because society and some of the individuals within allow it to by either joking about it, turning a blind eye to it, or participating in it. That the participants were willing to share their experiences is remarkable.

The interviews conducted in the study reflect several important points. The first is that prison culture is a shared space that views gender as a weapon and as a vulnerability; specifically, the social norms that teach males about gender identity make males vulnerable to attacks against that very identity. Within the physical environment, the bodies that inhabit it are subject to a culture that changes communication and relationships. Carceral settings are designed to take from the individual: freedom; choice; resources; supports; and identity, and there is little apparent effective effort to protect the individual from whatever fills these voids, though steps have been taken at least make a showing of effort.

Prison is a setting in which a person is reduced to the fundamentals of who they are, and in some ways beyond that. All the individuals incarcerated there have is the structure of the prison, the directives of the staff, the safety of the rules, and the relationships that they can forge with other inmates. What the reviewed literature has suggested, and what the interviews in this current research has demonstrated is that identity and the elements of the prison are all corruptible in the arena of hegemonic masculinity; or more accurately, weaponized. Gender may be a useful social tool, it may be a derivative of sexual identity, it may be the perception of another person's characteristics and qualities, but it may be a restrictive thing as well – in this case it can be a prison within a prison.

A person is whomever they are prior to entering prison, a collection of experiences, beliefs, values, interactions, and connections. For whatever reason they have been incarcerated, they retain those aspects of themselves. Whether or not they have embraced a hegemonic worldview, the aspects of who they are have been shaped, in part, because of the society in which they were raised and have lived. Upon entering prison, the carceral spaces are filled with hegemonic and oppressive forces, with which they must contend, and to some degree, obey. As a society, these are our determinations. But as a society we need to ask what the purpose of prison is, as well as what some of the unintended consequences are. For example, if a prisoner deserves to get raped for what they have done, are they then free from their incarceration? Do we accept that making a bad decision is then punishable by complete social and judicial negligence and ignorance, though the guise of responsibility and morality remains for both? So many questions and

implications are available to any who asks the questions that are prevalent in this research.

Furthermore, we are talking about something beyond incarceration - the entire concept of what is taught about gender roles and identity. These lessons remain even today, continually reinforced within the hegemonic manifold established centuries ago. As the world explores gender and identity more, it is possible that there will be change, but what this research shows is that thousands have suffered in silence because of societies lessons, and then some of the most vulnerable citizens suffer further and are punished if they try to heal. This is the grand lesson that any male inmate may potentially face.

References

American Psychological Association, Boys and Men Guidelines Group. (2018). *APA guidelines for psychological practice with boys and men*. http://www.apa.org/about/policy/psychological-practice-boys-men-guidelines.pdf

Artime, T. M., McCallum, E. B., & Peterson, Z. D. (2014). Men's acknowledgement of their sexual victimization experiences. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(3), 313-323. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033376

Ashmont, A. (2014). Raped by the system: A comparison of prison rape in the United States and South Africa. *Pace International Law Review, 26*(2), 54-80.

Associated Press. (2018, April 19). Male victims of sex abuse feel left behind by #MeToo parade. *The New York Post.* https://nypost.com/2018/04/19/male- victims-of-sex-abuse-feel-left-behind-by-metoo-parade/

Badenoch, K. (2015). Silent suffering: Supporting the male survivors of sexual assault. *GLA Conservatives.* http://legacy.glaconservatives.com/reports/files/Silent-Suffering.pdf.

Banner, F. (2014). Institutional sexual assault and the rights/trust dilemma. *Cardozo Public Law, Policy, & Ethics, 13*, 97-172.

Bartošová, M. K., & Fučík, P. (2017). Emerging adulthood, solo living, and changes in gender subjectivity. *Sociológia*, *49*(3), 265-284.

Beck, A. J. (2015). *PREA data collection activities, 2015*. National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice.

Beck, U. (1998[1992]). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Sage.

Beck, A. J., Rantala, R. R., & Rexroat, J. (2014, January). *Sexual victimization reported by adult correctional authorities, 2009-11*. National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice.

Beck, A. J., & Stroop, J. (2017). *PREA data collection activities, 2017*. National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice.

Black, D. (1983). Crime as social control. *American Sociological Review, 48*(1), 34-45.

Blum, S. (2016, November 29). *The hidden epidemic of men who are raped by women*. https://broadly.vice.com/en_us/article/kze8qn/the-hidden-epidemic-of-men-who-are-raped-by-women

Bosworth, M., & Kaufman, E. (2012). Gender and punishment. In J. Simon & R. Sparks (Eds.), *Handbook of punishment and society* (pp. 186-204). Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice: Cambridge studies in social anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.

Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. T. (2014). *Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization – National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011*. Division of Violence Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Brenner, H., & Darcy, K. (2017). Toward a civilized system of justice: Re-conceptualizing the response to sexual violence in higher education. *Cornell Law Review Online, 102,* 127-159.

Brenner, H., Darcy, K., Fedock, G., & Kubiak, S. (2016). Sexual violence as

occupational hazard and conditions of confinement in the closed institutional systems of detention and the military. *Pepperdine Law Review, 44*, 881-956.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. Simon and Schuster.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). *PREA data collection activities, 2016*. National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics. United States Department of Justice.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217-230.

Carberry, D. (2017). Masculinities, attachment theory and transformative learning: A discussion of some theoretical considerations for developing and emotionally secure teaching praxis. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry, 4*(2), 81-97.

Carrigan, T., Connell, B. & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society, 14*(5), 551-604. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00160017

Centers for Disease Control and prevention. 1991-2011 High School Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data. retrieved from http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/youthonline.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2012). Youth risk behavior surveillance: United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reports, 61*, 1-162.

Clark, K., & Veale, B. (2018, May/June). Strategies to Enhance Data Collection and Analysis in Qualitative Research. Radiologic Technology, 89(5), 482CT-485CT. Retrieved from https://eds-a-ebscohost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=b2934302-b922-4157-b124-b6d532fc642c%40sessionmgr4007.

Conley, A. H., Overstreet, C. M., Hawn, S. E., Kendler, K. S, Dick, D. M., & Amstadter, A. B. (2017). Prevalence and predictors of sexual assault among a college sample. *Journal of American College Health, 65*(1), 41-49.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Sydney Boston: Allen & Unwin.

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

Connell, R. W. (1999). *Der gemachte Mann: Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.

Connell, R. W. (2007). The Northern Theory of Globalization. *Sociological Theory, 25*(4), 368-385.

Connell, R. W. (2010). Lives of the businessmen. Reflections on life-history method and contemporary hegemonic masculinity. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 35*(2), 54-71.

Connell, R. W. (2015). Meeting at the Edge of Fear: Theory on a World Scale. *Feminist Theory, 16*(1), 49-66.

Connell, R. W. (2016a). 100 Million Kalashnikovs: Gendered Power on a World Scale. Debate Feminista, 51, 3-17.

Connell, R. W. (2016b). Masculinities in global perspective: Hegemony, contestation, and changing structures of power. *Theory and Society, 45*(4), 303-318.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859.

Conry-Murray, C. (2017). Children's distributive justice: the role of gender norms in

different settings. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 14*(1), 62-74.

Crewe, B. (2014). Not Looking Hard Enough: Masculinity, Emotion, and Prison Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(4), 392-403.

Crewe, B., Warr, J., Bennett, P., & Smith, A. (2014). The emotional geography of prison life. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(1), 56-74.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Retrieved from http://fe.unj.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Research-Design_Qualitative-Quantitative-and-Mixed-Methods-Approaches.pdf

D'Abreu, L. C. F., Krahé, B. (2016). Vulnerability to Sexual Victimization in Female and Male College Students in Brazil: Cross-Sectional and Prospective Evidence. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 45*, 1101-1115.

Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2011*). Intimate partner violence*. Retrieved from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=971 #summary

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012). Prevalence of Physical Violence in Intimate Relationships, Part 1: Rates of Male and Female Victimization. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 140-169.

Dirga, L. (2017). Body as a Project: The Relationship Czech Prisoners Have to Their Bodies. *Sociológia, 49*(6), 636-656.

Du Mont, J., Macdonald, S., White, M., & Turner, L. (2013). Male Victims of Adult Sexual Assault: A Descriptive Study of Survivors' Use of Sexual Assault Treatment Services. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(13), 2676-2694.

Dutton, D. G., & White, K. R. (2013). Male Victims of Domestic Violence. *New Male Studies: An International Journal, 2*(1), 5-17.

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine Gender Role Stress: Scale Development and Component Factors in the Appraisal of Stressful Situations. *Behavior Modification, 11*(2), 123-126.

Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine Gender-Role Stress: Predictor of Anger, Anxiety, and Health-Risk Behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 133-141.

Fisher, N. L., & Pina, A. (2013). An Overview of the Literature on Female-Perpetrated Adult Male Sexual Victimization. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(1), 54-61.

Forsman, R. L. (2017). Prevalence of Sexual Assault Victimization Among College Men, Aged 18-24: A Review. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work, 14*(6), 421-432.

Fortuin, B. N. (2018). Structuring dissident desire: representations of same-sex prison contact in contemporary South African culture. *Safundi,19*(2), 212-226.

Gbadamosi, N. (2018, December 21). *The all-male group tackling toxic masculinity*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2018/12/21/health/south-africa-male-group-toxic-masculinity-intl/index.html.

General Assembly resolution 39/46, *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, A/RES/39/46 (10 December 1984), available from undocs.org/A/RES/29/46.

General Assembly resolution 70/175, *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the*

Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), A/RES/70/175 (17 December 2015), available from undocs.org/A/RES/70/175.

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1961). The Characteristics of Total Institutions. *Organization and Society, 312*, 314-315.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from a Prison Notebook*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: Offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*, 806-810.

Hammond, L., Ioannou, M., & Fewster, M. (2016). Perceptions of male rape and sexual assault in a male sample from the United Kingdom: Barriers to reporting and the impacts of victimization. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 14*(2), 133- 149.

Hefner, M. K. (2018). Queering Prison Masculinity: Exploring the Organization of Gender and Sexuality within Men's prison. *Men and Masculinities, 21*(2), 230-253.

Hohl, K., & Stanko, E. A. (2015). Complaints of rape the criminal justice system: Fresh evidence on the attrition problem in England and Wales. *European Journal of Criminology, 12*(3), 324-341.

Ioannou, M., Hammond, L., & Machin, L. (2016). Male-on-male sexual assault: Victim offender and offence characteristics. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 14*(2), 189-209.

Javaid, A. (2015). The Dark Side of Men: The Nature of Masculinity and Its Uneasy Relationship with Male Rape. *Journal of Men's Studies, 23*(3), 271-292.

Javaid, A. (2016a). Feminism, masculinity and male rape: Bringing male rape 'out of the closet'. *Journal of Gender Studies, 25*(3), 283-293.

Javaid, A. (2016b). Male Rape, Stereotypes, and Unmet Needs: Hindering Recovery, Perpetuating Silence. *Violence and Gender, 3*(1), 7-13.

Javaid, A. (2017a). Moving Through Shadows: Police, Policing and Male Rape. *The International Journal of Human Rights, 21*(7), 1002-1022.

Javaid, A. (2017b). 'Walking on eggshells': Policing sexual offences against men. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice, and Principles, 90*(3), 228-245.

Javaid, A. (2018). Theorising vulnerability and male sexual victimization. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 51(3), 454-470.

Jewkes, R., Morrell, R. Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., Quayle, M., Sikweyiya, Y., & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 17*(S2), S112-127.

Johnson, C. A., & Hawbaker, K. T. (2018, February 15). #MeToo: A timeline of events. *Chicago Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/ct-me-too-timeline-20171208-htmlstory.html.

Juan, M. J. D., Nunnink, S. E., Butler, E. O., & Allard, C. B. (2017). Gender Role Stress Mediates Depression Among Veteran Men with Military Sexual Trauma. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 18*(3), 243-250.

Kapur, A., Muddell, K. 2016. When No One Calls It Rape: Addressing Sexual Violence against Men and Boys in Transitional Contexts. International Centre for Transitional Justice. Accessed July 18, 2017. https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ_Report_SexualViolenceMen_2016.pdf.

Kennedy, L. (2016). "He Must Learn What Being a Man is All About": Negotiating the Male Code at the Louisiana State Penitentiary. *Deviant Behavior, 37*(2), 151-166.

Kerr, B. A., & Multon, K. D. (2015). The Development of Gender Identity, Gender Roles, and Gender Relations in Gifted Students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 93*(2), 183-191.

Klann, E. M., Wong, Y. J., & Rydell, R. J. (2018). Firm Father Figures: A Moderated Mediation Model of Perceived Authoritarianism and the Intergenerational Transmission of Gender Messages from Fathers To Sons. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 65*(4), 500-511.

Kollmayer, M., Schober, B., & Spiel, C. (2018). Gender stereotypes in education: Development, consequences, and interventions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*(4), 361-377.

Kubiak, S. P., Brenner, H., Bybee, D., Campbell, R., & Fedock, G. (2018). Reporting Sexual Victimization During Incarceration: Using Ecological Theory as a Framework to Inform and Guide Future Research. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 19*(1), 94-106.

Kupers, T. A. (2017). Gender and Domination in Prison. *New England Law Review,*

39(3), 427-447.

Leith, J. (2017). Male Sexual Victimization: Victim Response, Reporting Barriers, and Treatment (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from https://www.bemidjistate.edu/academics/honors/wp-content/uploads/sites/73/2017/05/Male-Sexual-Victimization-Victim-Response-Reporting-Barriers-and-Treatment-2017-Leith-Jordan.pdf.

Liben, L. S. (2016). We've Come a Long Way, Baby (But We're Not There Yet): Gender Past, Present, and Future. *Child Development, 87*(1), 5-28.

Lowe, M., & Rogers, P. (2017). The scope of male rape: A selective review of research, policy and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 35*, 38-43.

McLean, I. A. (2013). The male victim of sexual assault. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 27*(1), 39-46.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2009). "Doing Gender": The Impact and Future of a Salient Sociological Concept. *Gender & Society, 23*(1), 85-88.

Michalski, J. H. (2017). Status Hierarchies and Hegemonic masculinity: A General Theory of Prison Violence. *British Journal of Criminology, 57*(1), 40-60.

Milner, M. (1994). *Status and Sacredness: A General Theory of Status Relations and an Analysis of Indian Culture*. Oxford University Press.

Minay, M., Reid, C., & Perrie, S. (2017, May 31). Men Share Their Heart-Breaking Stories Of Being Sexually Assaulted By Women. Retrieved February 28, 2018, from http://www.ladbible.com/mental-health/feels-inspirational-men-share-their-heart-breaking-stories-of-being-raped-by-women-20170422.

Moolman, B. (2015). Carceral Dis/continuities: Masculinities, Male Same-Sex Desire, Discipline, and Rape in South African Prisons. *Gender & Behavior, 13*(2), 6742-6752.

Moran, D. (2013) 'Between outside and inside? Prison visiting rooms as liminal carceral spaces', in GeoJournal.

Morgan, R. E., & Kena, G. (2017). *Criminal Victimization, 2016.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics. United States Department of Justice.

Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., and Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity/Ies in South Africa: Culture, Power and Gender Politics. *Men and Masculinities, 15*, 11-30.

Nayak, A. (2006). Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-Industrial City. *Sociology, 40*(5), 813-831.

Navarro, J. N., & Clevenger, S. (2016). Calling Attention to the Importance of Assisting Male Survivors of Sexual Victimization. *Journal of School Violence, 16*(2), 222-235.

Ng, S. (2014). The Last Taboo: Male Rape and the Effectiveness of Existing Legislation in Afghanistan, Great Britain, and the United States. *Tulane Journal of International and Comparative Law, 23*(1), 227-249.

Nielsen, M. C. (2017). Beyond PREA: An Interdisciplinary Framework for Evaluating Sexual Violence in Prisons. *UCLA Law Review, 64*(1), 230-280.

Oudekerk, B. A., & Truman, J. L. (2017). *Repeat Violence Victimization, 2005-14*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics.

United States Department of Justice.

Penland, M. (2015). A Constitutional Paradox: Prisoner Consent to Sexual Abuse in Prison under the Eighth Amendment. *Law & Inequality: A Journal of Theory and Practice, 33*(2), 507-536.

Penn, N. (2014, September 02). "Son, Men Don't Get Raped". Retrieved February 28, 2018, from https://www.gq.com/story/male-rape-in-the-military.

Rantala, R. R. (2018). *Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2012-15.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics. United States Department of Justice.

Ratele, K. (2013). Masculinities without Tradition. *Politikon, 40*(1), 133-156.

Ricciardelli, R. (2013). An examination of the inmate code in Canadian Penitentiaries. *Journal of crime and justice, 37*(2), 234-255.

Ricciardelli, R. (2015). Establishing and asserting masculinity in Canadian penitentiaries. *Journal of Gender Studies, 24*(2), 170-191.

Ricciardelli, R., Maier, K., & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2015). Strategic masculinities: Vulnerabilities, risk and the production of prison masculinities. *Theoretical Criminology, 19*(4), 491-513.

Ricciardelli, R. (2017). Canadian Provincial Correctional Officers: Gender Strategies of Achieving and Affirming Masculinities. *Journal of Men's Studies, 25*(1), 3-24.

Rogers, A. A., DeLay, D., & Martin, C. L. (2017). Traditional Masculinity During the Middle School Transition: Associations with Depressive Symptoms and Academic Engagement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(4), 709-724.

Rosin, H. (2014, April 29). Men Are Raped Almost as Often as Women in America. We Need to Talk About This. Retrieved February 28, 2018, from http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2014/04/male_rape_in_america_a_new_study_reveals_that_men_are_sexually_assaulted.html.

Santiago, C., & Criss, D. (2017, October 17). *An activist, a little girl and the heartbreaking origin of 'Me too'*. Retrieved from www.cnn.com.

Simon, W. & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual Scripts: Permanence and Change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*(2), 97-120.

Spivey, L. A., Huebner, D. M., & Diamond, L. M. (2018). Parent Response to Childhood Gender Nonconformity: Effects of Parent and Child Characteristics. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 5*(3), 360-370.

Stemple, L., & Meyer, I. H. (2014). The Sexual Victimization of Men in America: New Data Challenge Old Assumptions. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(6), e19-e26.

Strömwall, L. A., Alfredsson, & Landström, S. (2012). Rape Victim and Perpetrator Blame and the 'Just World' Hypothesis: The Influence of Victim Gender and Age. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 19*(2), 207-217.

Stroop, J. (2018). *PREA Data Collection Activities, 2018*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice & Bureau of Justice Statistics. United States Department of Justice.

Struckman-Johnson, C. (1988). Forced sex on dates: It happens to men, too. *The Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 234-241.

Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. *Sex Roles, 27*, 85-100.

Sykes, G. (1958). *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum-Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tatangel, G., Connaughton, C., McCabe, M., & Mellor, D. (2017). Preadolescent Boys' Investment in Masculine Gender Norms and Their Use of Body Change Strategies. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 19*(2), 291-297.

Turchik, J. A. (2012). Sexual Victimization Among Male College Students: Assault Severity, Sexual Functioning, and Health Risk Behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(3), 243-255.

Turchik, J. A. (2017). Sexual Victimization Among Male College Students: Assault Severity, Sexual Functioning, and Health Risk Behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(3), 243-255.

Turchik, J. A., & Edwards, K. M. (2012). Myths About Male Rape: A Literature Review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(2), 211-226.

UN General Assembly, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, 16 December 1966, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 171, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3aa0.html.

Vail, J., Wheelock, J., & Hill, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Insecure Times: Living with Insecurity in Contemporary Society*. London: Routledge

Valdez, C., & Lilly, M. M. (2014). Biological sex, gender roles, and Criterion A2: Rethinking the "gender" gap in PTSD. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research,*

Practice, and Policy, 6, 34-40.

Vescio, T. K., Schermerhorn, N. E. C., Gallegos, J. M., & Laubach, M. L. (2021). The affective consequences of threats to masculinity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 97*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104195.

Walsh, R. M., & Bruce, S. E. (2014). Reporting Decisions After Sexual Assault: The Impact of Mental Health Variables. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 6*(6), 691-699.

West, C. And Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.

Willig, C. (2017). Interpretation in Qualitative Research. In Willig, C., & Stainton-Rogers, W. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (pp. 276-290). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wilson, L. C., & Scarpa, A. (2017). A Pilot Study of the Impact of Sexist Attitudes on Male Survivors of Rape. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 18*(4), 409-413.

Appendix A: Annotated Bibliography of Core Research Informing the Study

1. Beck, A. J., Rantala, R. R., & Rexroat, J. (2014, January). Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2009-11. Retrieved November 11, 2017, from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/svraca0911.pdf. This document is one of the most up-to-date and thorough government documents on the sexual victimization of male prisoners available. Reports on victimization allegations and substantiations, inmate- and staff-on-inmate victimization, demographic information regarding victimization, and offers a gender-inclusive set of definitions about sexual victimization, based on the 2003 Prison Rape Elimination Act. This report also outlines how male victims of sexual abuse in prison may suffer secondary trauma in the way that their victimization is handled.
2. Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power: society, the person and sexual politics*. Sydney, Boston: Allen & Unwin. This is one of the first texts specific to hegemonic masculinity, from Raewyn Connell, who established Gender Order Theory. It is an examination of what the author refers to as "sexual politics", including the social role and identity of masculinity. It is fundamental in changing the way feminism views masculinity and does so through sociobiological lens. Additionally, Connell's concepts of masculinity discuss the fluidity of masculinity, most importantly across settings.
3. Groth, N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male Rape: Offenders and Victims. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 137(7), 806-810. Considered to be one of, if not the, keystone articles on male sexual victimization, Groth and Burgess examine 22 cases

of male rape. The authors discuss many important topics such as why the rape occurred and disruption of the victim's functioning from a male perspective. The authors also discuss the underreporting and stigma associated with being victimized as a male.

4. Javaid, A. (2016a). Feminism, masculinity and male rape: Bringing male rape 'out of the closet'. Journal of Gender Studies, 25(3), 283-293. Javaid, who is one of the leading modern researchers on male rape, male victimization, and other aspects of male victimization provides a solid argument for the way that feminism sees masculinity, and the role that feminism may play in either damaging males socially (via gender expectations) or slowing down the progress of viewing male victimization of a legitimate social problem that is not confined to one's gender. Argues for the idea that masculinity is a social concept, and not necessarily an inherent, static biological concept with serious implications.
5. Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., Quayle, M., Sikweyiya, Y., & Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: Combining theory and practice in gender interventions. Culture, Health & Sexuality, 17(2), 96-111. Jewkes et al. present a world-spanning look at Hegemonic masculinity that includes Sweden and South Africa, and ultimately the United States. These authors examine how to transition from Hegemonic masculinity into a broader spectrum of gender equality, including a look at what gender equality for men to other men looks like, through the lens of the harmful aspects of Hegemonic masculinity.

6. Lowe, M., & Rogers, P. (2017). The scope of male rape: A selective review of research, policy and practice. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 35, 38-43. As with some of the other influential work on male sexual victims, this recent research comes from the United Kingdom, and offers comparisons against similar incidents in the United States. The research by Lowe and Rogers also examines the under-reporting of male sexual abuse and the long-term consequences of such abuse. Lowe and Rogers also discuss the lack of literature in the United Kingdom, and close with discussions on male rape myths, the concept of homosexuality in male sexual victimization, and how male victims are not actually considered victims.
7. Navarro, J. N., & Clevenger, S. (2016). Calling Attention to the Importance of Assisting Male Survivors of Sexual Victimization. Journal of School Violence, 16(2), 222-235. This research focuses on the under-reporting of male sexual victimization, including a key concept of males being unable to identify that they may have been victimized due to social role and gender norms. Navarro and Clevenger also examine myths about masculinity and being male.
8. Nielsen, M. C. (2017). Beyond PREA: An Interdisciplinary Framework for Evaluating Sexual Violence in Prisons. UCLA Law Review, 64(1), 230-280. Nielsen also highlights the under-reporting of male sexual victimization, and does so from a legal point of view, which contrasts well against the predominantly psychological or psychosocial points of view offered in this discussion. Nielsen does not explicitly refer to hegemonic masculinity but does address and discuss the core concepts of masculinity in society, and their role in prison violence. Another key

point supported by Nielsen's argument is the aftermath of male sexual victimization; specifically, Nielsen argues that future sexual encounters by the victim may include other risk factors, such as the spread of sexually transmitted diseases acquired during the sexual assault.

9. Penland, M. (2015). A Constitutional Paradox: Prisoner Consent to Sexual Abuse in Prison under the Eighth Amendment. Law & Inequality: A Journal of Theory and Practice, 33(2), 507-536. This text provides a recent overview of the legality of staff-on-inmate relations; specifically, victimization (with an examination of consent in prison), as well as a discussion on various Eighth Amendment issues, such as Excessive Force, Cruel and Unusual Punishment, Deliberate Indifference, and relevant case law. Additionally, Penland's argument is from a legal context, adding an extra dimension to the psychological and gender-based research used here.

Appendix B: Interview Guide

Correlates of Non-reporting Sexual Victimization in Male Prisoners

Research Questions

RQ 1: What roles do stereotypical/hegemonic masculinity traits play in the reporting of male sexual during incarceration?
RQ 2: What role does gender role stress/conflict play in the reporting of male sexual victimization during incarceration?
RQ 3: What impact does identifying as male have on the reporting of males who were sexually victimized during incarceration?
RQ 4: What other aspects of identity might prevent the reporting of male sexual victimization while incarcerated?

Interview Questions

Five open-ended questions were formulated prior to the interview, each intended to address an aspect of the overall topic. The interview questions are categorized by key aspects of the research topic that are listed below. Additionally, each interview question is may be augmented by motivational probes that may be used to facilitate more discussion about an issue for the sake of gaining clarity or a deeper understanding of an issue. These "conversation continuers" shall only be used after a participant has not explored a relevant sub-topic even though he or she has been given ample opportunity to do so in this guided conversation.

Opening question: What are your thoughts on communication in prison? Do you feel it is different than in general society? If so, how?

Question Categories

- Prison Communication
- Prison Identity
- Gender Identity
- Sexual Assault
- Reporting Behaviors & Process
- Perceived Barriers to Reporting

Closing Question: Have we not discussed anything you think is important or is there anything you would like to add?

Prison Communication

Did any other inmates ever share their own experiences being assaulted with you? What are your thoughts on what they shared?
(If needed - Do you feel that, overall, staff is receptive to reporting these assaults? Do you feel that they are qualified to do in an effective manner?)

Prison Identity

Are there differences between how you present yourself in prison versus how you present yourself outside of prison? (If so – Can you share your thoughts on those differences)

Gender Identity

What was the impact of being male on your decision? What did other inmates say about the role being male played in their reporting decisions?
(If needed – How did being male impact your decision not to report?)

Sexual Assault

While incarcerated, did you witness any sexual assaults?
Did you report it/them? (If yes - What factors helped you to report an assault that you witnessed?)
Do you know if that person reported the assault? Do you know why or why not?Were you worried about reporting it/them? (Why or Why not?)
What are your opinions of the individuals who were assaulted? What did other inmates, or staff, say about the people who was sexually victimized?
What are some general opinions you have heard about sexual assaults in prison? Do you feel that these are accurate/applicable?
If you did witness someone who was assaulted, did you see how the person/people were impacted by the assault? Do you think their reaction is typical? (Why or why not?)
Did any other inmates ever share their own experiences being assaulted with you? What are your thoughts on what they shared?

Reporting Behaviors & Process

While incarcerated, did you witness any sexual assaults?
How did incarceration itself influence your reporting decision?
Do you feel your report was taken seriously? (Why or why not?)
What are your thoughts on the impact of your report?

Do you feel that you, in any way, benefited from reporting?
(If needed - How did incarceration itself influence your reporting decision?)
Do you feel that you, in any way, benefited from not reporting?
Are you satisfied with your decision to report or not report? Please elaborate.
What are your thoughts on the reporting process itself (to the best of your knowledge)?
(If needed - Do you feel that, overall, staff is receptive to reporting these assaults? Do you feel that they are qualified to do in an effective manner?)
What other factors, if any, influenced your decision to report or to not report?
What factors did other inmates share that influenced their reporting decision?
Are there any informal steps that may help inmates share their experiences with each other, even if they will not formally report it?

Perceived Barriers to Reporting

While incarcerated, did you witness any sexual assaults?
Do you think people typically report the assault? (Why or why not?)
What would you describe as barriers that stopped you from reporting a sexual assault of any kind? What barriers have other inmates shared, if any?
(If needed - Do you feel that, overall, staff is receptive to reporting these assaults? Do you feel that they are qualified to do in an effective manner?)
What other factors, if any, influenced your decision to report or to not report?
What factors did other inmates share that influenced their reporting decision?
Are there any informal steps that may help inmates share their experiences with each other, even if they will not formally report it?
What other steps or policies do you feel will help inmates in formally reporting an assault that they experienced?