

ETHICS SURROUNDING THE STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT



Anjali

M.Phil., Roll No.: 150595 Session-2015-16

Department of Psychology, B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur, India

E-mail: brajesh100877@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Recent studies (August 14-21, 1971) were carried out at Stanford University in which participants were asked to play the part of either a "prisoner" or a "guard" for a prolonged period of time within the context of a mock prison that had been constructed for the purpose of conducting

research. When it became apparent that many of the 'prisoners' were in serious distress and that many of the 'guards' were behaving in ways that brutalised and degraded their fellow subjects, the study had to be prematurely terminated.

Keyword: Stanford University, brutalized, prematurely terminated

INTRODUCTION

The original plan called for the study to take place over the course of two weeks. In addition, the emerging reality of this role-playing situation was sufficiently compelling to influence virtually all those who operated within it to behave in ways appropriate to its demand characteristics, but inappropriate to their usual life roles and values. This included the research staff, faculty observers, a priest, a lawyer, an ex-convict, as well as relatives and friends of the subjects who visited the prison on multiple occasions (for details see Zimbardo, Banks, Haney and Jaffe, 1973; Haney, Banks and Zimbardo, 1973)

This research is one of the most extreme experimental demonstrations of the power of situational determinants in both shaping behaviour and predominating over personality, attitudes, and individual values. The research was carried out by a team of psychologists at the University of California, Irvine. As such, it is an extension of the findings that Stanley Milgram's study on obedience to authority came to (1974). However, the ethical problems that have been raised in relation to Milgram's handling of placing subject-teachers in a conflict situation in which they thought (incorrectly) that they were injuring another person are considerably more obvious in this particular instance. Volunteer prisoners were subjected to physical and psychological torture on an hourly basis for many days, while volunteer guards were confronted with the newfound awareness that they loved being strong and had exploited this position to cause the suffering of other humans. Because of the magnitude and duration of this suffering, the Stanford jail experiment is particularly qualified to be subjected to serious analysis for potential breaches of the ethics of human research.

The purpose of this article is to: (a) Provide a summary of the experiment in order to acquaint the reader with its fundamental aspects; (b) summarise one set of critical arguments that have been levelled against the experiment (which invited my reply in this particular journal); (c) investigate the manner in which the mock prison study can be construed as unethical; and (d) present a body of information that is relevant to making a judgement on the ethicality of the study from a legal, It is less my purpose to take a defensive posture in favour of this specific study than it is to utilise it as a vehicle for outlining the huge difficulty of making judgements regarding interventions in human testing that are based on ethics.

THE STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT (SPE)

The Stanford Prison Experiment, one of the most well-known experiments in psychology, was carried out in 1971 at Stanford University by Philip Zimbardo. This experiment has stayed in the public eye from the early 1970s to the current day. However, over that time period, its scientific validity has been called into question on a variety of ethical, methodological, and theoretical grounds (e.g. Banuazizi & Mohavedi, 1975; Banyard, 2007; Carnahan & McFarland, 2007; Fromm, 1973; Gray, 2013; Haslam & Reicher, 2017). See Griggs for a concise explanation of all of these issues (2014). Surprisingly, considering the sizeable corpus of criticism, beginning psychology textbooks (Bartels, 2015; Griggs, 2014) and introductory social psychology textbooks almost seldom, if ever, discuss any of these objections (Griggs & Whitehead, 2014). In almost every case, those who are concerned with

the ethics of the SPE are the ones who are brought up. If critiques of the methodology are brought up at all, the debate that follows is often brief, and in some cases, a reference is not even acknowledged. Kulig et al. (2017) came to the same conclusions on the coverage of the SPE in the journals of criminology and criminal justice. Even when reservations were raised, the SPE was generally well received in the articles, and support was shown for its message. It seemed as though the SPE's results were indisputable. Kulig et al. posed the question of whether or if this message (unquestioned reverence to the SPE) was also likely being taught in schools, and they came to the conclusion that if this were the case, "we are probably teaching it badly" (p.79). In addition, Bartels et al. (2016) conducted a poll of beginning psychology instructors and discovered that such coverage appears to be the norm in introductory psychology classes.

FALSIFICATION: DISTINGUISHING GOOD SCIENCE FROM BAD

According to the findings of O'Donohue and Willis's (2018) survey of psychology textbooks, less than one-third of the thirty textbooks they looked at distinguished between excellent science and bad science (or what is probably better termed, non-science). What are the characteristics of excellent science as opposed to bad science? A robust scientific field questions its own assertions and searches for evidence that would disprove them. Bad science attempts to protect its ideas by isolating them and searching for evidence that would validate them. So, in terms of scientific quality, how reliable was the SPE? Le Texier's (2019) archival revelations indicate that it was bad science in the sense that Zimbardo protected his belief about the toxicity of prisons and, as a result, did not subject it to possible falsification. This is because Zimbardo protected his belief, he did not subject it to possible falsification. A review of the nature of the SPE data records will serve as the jumping off point for our conversation about how the archive findings point to this conclusion. Zimbardo has often said that he kept extremely systematic and objective data records (for example, Zimbardo, 1975), but the archival materials have shown that this is not the case; rather, the records were not systematic, were not objective, and were not comprehensive (Le Texier, 2019). Le Texier found that no data were even collected on the third day of the experiment, and only about 10 percent of the 150 hours of the experiment (including the guard orientation day) were recorded by either video (six hours) or audio (eight hours) tapes, which makes these recordings clearly unrepresentative of the entire experiment. Le Texier found that no data were even collected on the third day of the experiment. Le Texier found that only about 10 percent of the 150 hours of the experiment were recorded by either video

materials also revealed that Greg White, the student who was in charge of studying the video recordings, told Zimbardo a few months after the SPE came to an end that these recordings were not representative of the experiment and that they were incredibly biased toward dramatising the SPE to be a far more powerful experience than it actually was. White told Zimbardo that these recordings were not representative of the experiment and that they were extremely biased toward dramatising the SPE to be a far more powerful. In line with this evaluation, Craig Haney, a graduate student who presided over the running of the SPE, wrote in an archival report that any statements made about the experiment had to be equivocal because the goals of filming had been primarily cinematic. Haney was in charge of overseeing the operation of the SPE. Because of this, only significant or unique occurrences were captured on film. He went on to say that the mundane events, which provide a more accurate depiction of the SPE, were sparsely recorded, which rendered the video tapes unrepresentative of the entirety of participant behaviour in the study. He said that this was due to the fact that the video tapes were not designed to capture the SPE. Even Haney et al. (1973b) admitted that the sampling of events from the video recordings was "selective" and "tended to be concentrated upon the more exciting, dramatic occurrences which happened" (p.78). In conclusion, the information that was gathered via the use of the video recordings does not in any way present a true portrayal of the SPE and is skewed toward occurrences that support what Zimbardo intended to demonstrate (i.e. that prisons are bad). In addition, the archival disclosures made by Le Texier (2019) on the coaching of guards with regards to their behaviour reveals further that Zimbardo intended to support his belief that jails were toxic while avoiding falsification of this belief. Zimbardo has been adamant that neither the guards nor the detainees had "any special training in these positions" (e.g. Haney et al., 1973b, p.69). It is said that the guards devised a variety of cruel and unusual punishments for the inmates under their care. However, documentation from the archives show that the guards were basically instructed on how to conduct themselves. How was it possible to do this? It is well-documented that Zimbardo and colleagues communicated expectations for prisoner abuse during the guard orientation (for example, see Banyard, 2007; Bartels, 2019; Gray, 2013; Haslam & Reicher, 2017).

SYNOPSIS OF MOCK PRISON STUDY

By creating a replica of a jail that was more functional than literal, researchers were able to conduct experimental research on the interpersonal dynamics that occur in environments that are similar to prisons. In an effort to create a 'psychology of imprisonment,' environmental,

structural, institutional, and social variables were manipulated in a group of subjects who role-played being guards (for eight hours a day over three shifts) and a group who acted as prisoners. The subjects were split into two groups: one group played the role of guards, and the other group played the role of prisoners (for twentyfour hours a day).

Alternative explanations in terms of pre-existing dispositions were eliminated through subject selection and random assignment to treatments in order to determine the extent to which social and situational forces influence the behaviour of these volunteer subjects. The purpose of this endeavour was to determine how much influence social and situational forces have on the behaviour of individuals. After conducting in-depth interviews with and diagnostic tests on a wide pool of applicants who had responded to newspaper advertising, a representative sample of twenty male college students from the United States who were considered to be normal, average, and healthy was selected. The participants were students from universities located all across the United States and Canada. They agreed to take part in "a study of jail life" in exchange for a daily stipend of fifteen dollars for a period of time that was anticipated to last for two weeks.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Harry Perlstadt 2018. Concerns regarding the morality of social scientific research have persisted ever since the Stanford Prison Experiment was conducted. In a simulation, male student volunteers were either chosen at random to play the role of inmates or guards. During the course of the experiment, the guards exhibited sadistic tendencies, while the captives displayed tremendous tension. The possibility of the participants to withdraw from the experiment and the inability to offer enough monitoring and intervention to minimise the maltreatment of the convicts are two examples of problems that arise from an ethical standpoint. In 2018, similar concerns were brought up again, and several individuals judged the experiment to be both unscientific and unreliable. On the other hand, the experiment was conducted before many of the ethical standards for social science research were defined. The experiment, when described in further depth, sheds light on how the dynamics of groups and the social structure of institutions like prisons may influence normally functioning people to act in ways that are harmful to one another. The study serves as a cautionary story that should be published in textbooks in order to enhance research in the social sciences, illustrate the necessity of research ethics, and stop outrageous treatment of prisoners in the real world.

Therefore, L Onishi 2014. Clinicians have a tendency to see around 15 percent of their patients as being "difficult." The early theories of challenging patients focused on the features of both the patients and the doctors, but they frequently downplayed the impact that the patients' surroundings had on their behaviour. The Stanford Prison Experiment, which is considered a classic experiment in the field of human behaviour psychology, offers a more comprehensive systems approach to studying the ways in which patients are influenced by their surroundings. When caring for a problematic patient, a systems approach takes into account not just the patient's characteristics but also the environment of the health care setting as well as the settings farther removed from the health care setting (ie, familial, societal, and cultural). Clinicians who are aware of the multidimensional influence that these many surroundings have on the conduct of patients are more positioned to comprehend, respond to, and maybe even prevent challenging patient interactions.

Anjana Rahubaddha 2018. Both of the studies that were carried out by the well-known psychologists Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo had the same overarching goal, which was to get a better understanding of how people behave in social settings. The findings of these research are consistent with one another and point to the same conclusion, which is that an individual's conduct is more likely to be influenced by social factors and environmental circumstances than by their innate personality qualities (1). (4). These investigations are also notorious for sharing the reputation of being two of the most contentious experiments carried out on human subjects that have blatantly breached the ethics that govern current day research. Both of these studies were carried out by researchers at universities throughout the world.

RESEARCH OF METHOD

This research was conducted with the intention of making a contribution to the existing body of literature on the subject of the potential psychological impacts of imprisonment by examining the issue from the point of view of those who have themselves been incarcerated. In this study, I investigated the potential psychological impacts that persons who had previously been jailed may have developed as a direct result of their time spent behind bars. In this chapter, I will discuss the research procedure, which will include an explanation of Husserl's philosophy of phenomenology (Groenwald, 2004; Husserl, 1970), the qualitative research design of phenomenological research, as well as the justification for selecting this research technique. This chapter also includes explanations of the history of qualitative

phenomenological studies as well as the value of such studies, the population that was studied along with how the participants were chosen, methods of interviewing, data collection, and the materials that were used for data collection. In addition, this chapter includes descriptions of the coding and classifying of the data, the method of transcription, the authenticity of the information that was acquired, and the measures that were made to ensure that this study complied with both the law and ethical standards.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND RATIONALE

In order to carry out this research, I resorted to a qualitative approach (Cresswell, 2009, 2013; Patton, 2005). The study of a phenomena in its natural environment is made possible via the use of a qualitative design (Patton, 2005). The best way to get insight into the phenomena of incarceration and the psychological impacts of imprisonment was to speak with people who had personal experience with either topic (Cresswell, 2009; Patton, 2005).

In an effort to gain a better understanding of what formerly incarcerated individuals experienced while incarcerated and during their postincarceration adjustment, I developed open-ended questions with the intention of yielding as much detail as possible in the exact words of the individuals who experienced being incarcerated. This was done in an effort to gain a better understanding of what formerly incarcerated individuals experienced while incarcerated and during their postincarceration adjustment (Creswell, 2013). The following were the research questions:

1. How do people who have previously been jailed characterise the state of their mental health prior to their first encounter with the criminal justice system?
2. How do a self-selected group of former inmates characterise their time spent in jail for the first time?
3. What, if any, potential psychological impacts may the experience of being incarcerated have, according to the accounts of former inmates?
4. How do those who have been released from jail or prison talk about the transition back into society?

Any definite and quantifiable aspect of something that is experienced might be referred to as a phenomena. The experience may be that of a single person or of several people working together (Laureate, 2013). The most important finding of this research was the manner in which the participants experienced incarceration. Incarceration is defined as a punitive form

of consequences for breaking the law (Lynch, 2012), and it consists of the legal confining of individuals who have been convicted of a crime. This study focused on how the participants experienced incarceration (Mears, Cochran, & Cullen, 2015). The focus of this study was on how the experience of incarceration may have contributed to the development of psychological problems in some of the incarcerated individuals who were studied. Incarceration is an experience that can be defined, and the focus of this study was on how that experience may have contributed to the development of psychological problems (Hagan et.al; Haney, 2012; Lynch, 2012; Schnittker, 2014). The most effective technique to comprehend all of the incarceration experience and any development of psychological issues that may result from incarceration is to explore the experience from the perspective of individuals who experienced it. This is the best way to learn about both the incarceration experience and any psychological issues that may result from incarceration (see Creswell, 2013).

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This hermeneutic phenomenological research was conducted with the intention of investigating the practise of incarceration as well as the potential psychological impacts of being locked up. The following questions were asked of the participants in the study: (a) How do former prisoners describe their psychological health prior to their first incarceration experience? (b) How do former prisoners describe their first prison experience? (c) What psychological effects, if any, do former prisoners describe experiencing? (d) How do former prisoners describe their adjustment after they have been released from prison? In this chapter, I will discuss the environment, the demographics, the data gathering methods, the data analysis techniques, the outcomes, and then I will end with a summary.

SETTING

There were no personal or organisational conditions that influenced the participants or their experience at the time of this study, nor were there any conditions that may have influenced the interpretation of the results of this study. This means that the results of this study can be interpreted without any bias. According to my most reliable information, all of the participants had successfully finished their parole and did not have any pending legal matters. No participant in this study was subjected to any circumstances that may have impacted either their decision to participate or how the outcomes of this investigation should be interpreted.

DEMOGRAPHICS

All of the participants agreed that the demographic information they provided on the participant eligibility form (which may be found in Appendix B) was to the best of their knowledge correct. When they were questioned, all of the participants were residents of New York State and had prior experience serving time in a state or federal facility located in the United States.

Participant Demographic Variables

Participant	Age	Sex	Race/ Ethnicity	Education	Employment status	Age at first incarceration	Years incarcerated
A	42	M	Hispanic	GED	Unemployed	14	16
B	51	M	African American	GED	Disabled	13	15
C	53	M	African American	High School	Yes	34	17
D	45	F	African American	GED	Yes	12	5
E	52	F	African American	High School	Yes	42	2.5
F	53	F	Caucasian	BS	Yes	22	26
G	51	F	African American	High School	Yes	24	10
H	41	M	Caucasian	BA	Yes	17	17
I	37	M	African American	GED	Yes	18	6
J	57	M	African American	High School	Unemployed	19	34.5

Participants ranged in age from 31 all the way up to 57 for this study. There were one man

and one female who identified as European Americans, one male and one female who identified as African Americans, four men who identified as African Americans, three females who identified as African Americans, and one guy who identified as Hispanic. Two of the participants were incarcerated for at least 17 years in a row, and one of the participants was incarcerated for a total of 33 years in a row. One of the participants was a juvenile when they went to prison but was released as an adult, and another participant went to prison as a juvenile but was also released as a juvenile. Several of the participants have racked up a cumulative total of years spent behind bars, which indicates that they have served at least a minimum of two consecutive years behind bars and more than one term of two consecutive years behind bars, including time spent behind bars for violating parole. Participants typically refer to straight time as a "bid," which is short for "biddable," and straight time is the amount of years in a row that someone has been jailed without a break. In order to protect the participants' privacy, each participant's name has been substituted with a random letter of the alphabet. When I refer to participants in the next stages of this study, I will always use the letter that was allocated to them.

4.2.1 Participant A

Participant A is a single Hispanic man who is 42 years old and has spent time in jail or prison on many occasions. At the age of 14, he was taken into juvenile detention for the first time, and he remained there for a period of four months. He was taken into custody when he was 16 years old, tried as an adult, and incarcerated at a nearby facility. He was taken into custody once again when he was 17 years old, and at the age of 18, he was sent to a state jail facility for adults. He served various terms of less than one year until 2009. Participant A has served a total of 16 years in prison, of which 3 and a half years were served consecutively. While he was behind bars, he managed to get his GED. He does not have a job at the moment, but he is working on a graphic documentary of his life that will be composed of the artwork he created while he was incarcerated.

4.2.2 Participant B

Participant B is an African American man who is 51 years old and has been widowed. Since he was 13 years old, he has had at least one run-in with the law, and he has spent a combined total of 16 years behind bars.

Participant B was incarcerated for a continuous period of 5 years. Participant B is currently

receiving disability benefits despite having completed his GED while he was jailed. He donates a significant portion of his spare time to an organisation that serves the youngsters of the town.

4.2.3 Participant C

Participant C is an African American man who is 53 years old and is currently unmarried. At the age of 34, he served his first sentence in a federal correctional facility. After serving time without interruption for 17 years, he was finally freed. A high school graduation was obtained by Participant C prior to his incarceration, and he is today employed in the baking industry. Volunteering his time with a local youth group is one of the things he enjoys doing in his leisure time.

4.2.4 Participant D

Participant D is a 45-year-old African American woman who is now single and has three kids of her own. She was arrested as a juvenile when she was 12 years old and was sent to numerous different juvenile facilities until she completed the maximum term of her sentence when she was 17 years old. The participants used the word "maxed out" to represent the maximum expiry or completion of a sentence. This term takes into account any and all parole time. Her children were all born when she was younger than 19 years old. After serving her time in prison, Participant D went on to complete her high school education and is now employed full-time by the United States Postal Service.

4.2.5 Participant E

Participant E is an African American woman who is 52 years old and lives alone. When the participant was first arrested at the age of 40, she had one son who was already an adult when she was arrested. She was arrested again at the age of 44 after violating the terms of her probation. She served a total of 5.5 years behind bars, of which 2.5 were held in solitary confinement. Participant E completed her high school education and now operates two homes for recovering addicts and alcoholics. After completing their stay at an inpatient drug treatment clinic, the participant rents out rooms in both of their homes in order to pay the mortgages on both properties.

The participant ensures that all residents of her sober houses have access to nutritious meals and professional case management services. In addition to that, she is employed by the Council of Thought in Action as an intake case manager. Participant F

Participant F is a white woman who is 53 years old and lives alone. She has one daughter who is an adult. When she was arrested for the first time at the age of 22, her kid had just turned one year old. She has spent time in jail on many occasions and was sentenced to six years of hard labour. Participant F was responsible for her high school graduation, and she is currently in her last semester of her bachelor's degree programme in social work. She has a job as a waiter in a restaurant at the moment.

4.2.6 Participant G

Participant G is an African American woman with five of her own children. She is 51 years old and lives alone. She went to jail for the first time when she was 22 years old, and she has since spent time there due to many additional offences and violations of her parole. The participant broke the terms of her parole and was wanted during her whole pregnancy while she was out on furlough for only seven days. Cerebral palsy was present at birth in the child of Participant G. She started serving her sentence, which ranged from 6 to 12 years, fewer than 90 days after the birth of her crippled child. During her time behind bars, participant G acquired her General Equivalency Diploma (GED), an associate's degree, and her certification as a Credentialed Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Counselor. She was incarcerated for a total of eight years.

4.2.7 Participant H

Participant H is a man of the Caucasian race who is 42 years old and is married. His first stint in jail began when he was 17 years old, and he was finally eligible for release on parole after spending 17.5 years of consecutive time in state prisons. Participant H received his General Equivalency Diploma (GED) while he was locked up, and he went on to get his bachelor's degree in Human Services when he was out on parole. Participant H is presently working for a county government organisation in the capacity of director of a health outreach service.

4.2.8 Participant I

Participant I am a guy of African American descent who is currently 37 years old and was arrested for the first time when I was 18 years old. Participant I was sentenced to a total of less than one year in county jails before beginning my consecutive term of six years in New York State prisons. As a participant, I was responsible for a sum total of ten years spent behind bars, during which time he was able to acquire his GED. He is presently working for a firm that provides transportation services.

4.2.9 Participant J

Participant J is an African American man who is 57 years old, has been married for 34.5 years, and has spent his entire adult life in state prisons. After completing his high school education, he was arrested for the first time at the age of 22. Participant J established and conducted victim impact programmes while he was incarcerated, and he is presently working on building a victim impact programme for those who have been released from prison. Counseling guys who have recently been released from prison and are having trouble adjusting to life after their stint behind bars is what Participant J does with his time.

CONCLUSIONS,

In this hermeneutic phenomenological research, I investigated the experience of incarceration and how it affects a person psychologically from the point of view of those who have gone through the process themselves. This research was conducted with the goals of examining the nature of incarceration and the potential psychological effects that may develop as a result of the incarceration experience. Additionally, the researchers wanted to determine whether or not these potential psychological problems influenced successful post-incarceration adjustment or whether or not they led to recidivism. I sought out people who had been jailed in the past but were no longer on parole so that I could investigate how they, in their own words, characterised their time spent in prison and how they had adjusted to life after release from prison after serving their sentences. Constant studies of the interview data uncovered numerous important conclusions, including the following: (a) some participants reported enduring psychological problems that they feel are the result of their time spent in jail or prison; (b) the psychological problems that participants described are consistent with the symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and complex PTSD; (c) the participants in the study did not report that the psychological problems they believe they developed while they were incarcerated influenced poor postprison adjustment, (d) some participants reported that the personalities they developed for survival while incarcerated were difficult to release after they were released from prison. (e) participants who were incarcerated as juveniles appeared to be more traumatised than those who entered prison as adults, (f) some participants reported that difficulty with prison guards and solitary confinement were the most difficult issues to deal with while incarcerated, and (g) participants did not report that the traumatic events they experienced prior to incarceration prevented them from functioning normally while they were incarcerated.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, E. (2015). This experiment, so fatal: Some initial thoughts on strategic choices in the campaign against solitary confinement. *UC Irvine Law Review*, 5(1), 1-48.
2. Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
3. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5™*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
4. Bennion, E. (2015). Banning the bing: Why extreme solitary confinement is cruel and far too usual punishment. *Indiana Law Journal*, 90(2),
5. Berg, M., & Huebner, B. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of socialities, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(2),
6. Berger, R. L. (2003). *From the inside: A prison memoir*. Bloomington, IN: iUniverse. Binswanger, I. A., Nowels, C., Corsi, K. F., Long, J., Booth, R. E., Kutner, J., & Steiner,
7. J. F. (2011). “From the prison door right to the sidewalk, everything went downhill,” A qualitative study of the health experiences of recently released inmates. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 34(4),
8. Bloom, S. G. (2005). Lesson of a lifetime. *Smithsonian*, 36(6), 82.
9. Boxer, P., Middlemass, K., & Delorenzo, T. (2009). Exposure to violent crime during incarceration: Effects on psychological adjustment following release. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*
10. Brown, M. (2005). “Setting the conditions” for Abu Ghraib: The prison nation abroad. *American Quarterly*, 57(3),
11. Bulman, P. (2012). The psychological effects of solitary confinement. *Crime and Delinquency*, 53,
12. Butterfield, F. (2004). Mistreatment of prisoners is called routine in US. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from Carson, E. (2014). *Prisoners in 2013*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from

13. Chan, Z. C., Fung, Y. L., & Chien, W. T. (2013). Bracketing in phenomenology: Only undertaken in the data collection and analysis process. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(30),
 14. Chong, C. (2013). Inmate-to-inmate: socialization, relationships, and community among incarcerated men. *Berkeley Undergraduate Journal*, 26(2). Retrieved from
 15. Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Cloitre, M., Garvert, D. W., Brewin, C. R., Bryant, R. A., & Maercker, A. (2013).