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INTRODUCTION

I set out to do my senior thesis regarding inmate identity. My hypothesis was that some people who have been arrested and sentenced to jailtime will increase their social status/self identity, while other people will find incarceration detrimental to their social status/self identity. My initial thesis was whether or not incarceration affects a person's self identity, and status within a group.

However, as I started interviewing inmates at the Camden County Correctional Facility, I found a common theme in each inmate’s story. Every inmate I interviewed, as well as many of the guards, told me essentially, “everyone knows everyone here”. All the inmates know each other “from the street” and all the inmates know at least most of the guards. The inmates and guards went to high school together, played on sports teams together, are former employees/employers, in-laws and even blood relatives. This creates a unique social situation, in which identity and status are still crucially important.

PART I - PHILOSOPHY AND GENERAL BACKGROUND

Although a person may have control over committing a crime, the act of being arrested is not directly controlled by the person. In this way, being arrested and thus incarceration is an extremely unique life changing event. Rather than joining the army, or pursuing a certain profession where an individual can direct the course of the life changing event, the act of being incarcerated allows for little personal control. Therefore, I chose to study whether or not incarceration affects a person’s self identity, and status within a group. However, I believe that although some groups of people feel fewer social consequences of being arrested, I do not believe that (most) people commit crimes for the sole purpose of being arrested in order to change their status within their social/cultural group. Therefore, imprisonment is unique and should be studied.

The concept of "identity" in anthropology is certainly ambiguous. In one sense, the idea of self-identity portrays the idea that a person is distinct from all other individuals. On the other hand, "ethnic" or "group" identity confers a sense of sharing some quality or "sameness". This observation is made by Richard Robbins in Cultural
Anthropology: A Problem Based Approach. In fact many social and cultural anthropological encyclopedias and dictionaries do not even bother listing the concept of "identity". In one encyclopedia that did list the concept of identity, the editors stated "[w]hile the term 'identity' is frequently employed by anthropologists to refer to selfhood in a loosely Eriksonian way, the concept is usually treated more sociologically, emphasizing the individual's social and cultural surroundings, and the mechanisms of socialization and cultural acquisition." (Barnard and Spencer 292) However, two terms far more prevalent in anthropological literature are the ideas of "person" and "self".

Although commonly used throughout anthropological literature, "the notion of 'person', 'self' and consequently, 'self-identity' have been described as somewhat ambiguous, and there is little consensus within the discipline over how they should be used" (Levinson and Ember 922) However, a general consensus is that the "self" is "lowest abstract level of the cultural conception of society" (Levinson and Ember 922) The founders of these concepts in anthropological literature are Emile Durkheim regarding "person", and Marcel Mauss and Erik Erikson regarding the concept of "self". Durkheim believed that people have distinct social personalities, which is the "person".

This is similar to William James' theory regarding the "self". James believes that each person has three distinct selves-- the material self, the social self and the spiritual self. The most relevant "self" in the William James definition, is the "social self". James understands this "self" to be the individual one presents to the world. However, a person can have as many social selves as there are social situations. For example, I can have the social self of a daughter to my parents, a student to my professors, and a friend to my friends. I can even have a different "friend" "self" depending on the friend with whom I am interacting. William James published these ideas in 1925.

In 1989, Grace Gredys Harris' proposed the idea that "personhood" is a person with a status quality. This is extremely relevant to my thesis, as once someone is incarcerated their status quality changes. However, for my research, I would like to understand "self" and "person" as the faces one puts on when interacting with other members of the society. One can have many different "persons" or "selves" and these "persons" and/or "selves" can and indeed must change according to the people with whom a certain individual is interacting.
Therefore, does being incarcerated force an individual to change every single conception of self, or just certain "selves"? After an individual is arrested and incarcerated does the person change his or her "child-self" (the way this person interacts with a parent) or "neighbor-self" or any self? Does being incarcerated cause the individual to feel the need to alter any self, or all selves or only some of the selves? As Cohen asks, "is identity merely transient and ephemeral?" (Cohen, 3) Does that fact that the inmates are so closely connected to the officers in both culture and identity change the environment of the jail?

Another vital component to my research is the idea of class and status. The society in which we live in the United States is most certainly a stratified society containing a hierarchy of classes. However, there is no consensus on how many classes this hierarchy holds. Anthropologists tend to agree that there is an upper, middle and lower class. Boundaries are often drawn using income, education, profession, language and even clothes to distinguish these classes. Within these classes is the concept of status.

Status is one’s position in society. Status affects a person’s role in society and in some anthropological definitions, a person’s access and control over resources. Radcliffe-Brown provides a definition consisting of class and status as the arrangement of persons in controlled and defined relationships.

Jail is important because it has the ability to change a person’s status. Once a person is incarcerated they move from an "innocent" status, to the status of a convict. This type of role is permanent, the same way the role of a child is permanent. A person will always be someone’s child. Even though a person might be freed from jail for forty or fifty years, they still bear the title of convict. The role applies to anyone who has been incarcerated -- anyone who has been "convicted".

It is essential for my thesis research to understand that there are different social classes, and these classes change a person’s status when that person is in jail. It is possible that the effect of being incarcerated significantly reflects the individual’s status outside the jail. If a person is in a subculture which incarceration is looked upon as a rite of passage, or not a big deal, then I hypothesis that that individual will not suffer any negative status change, and thus not change any of his or her "selves". However, if an individual is in a subculture which looks negatively on incarceration, or which has social
controls that do not allow for incarceration, that specific individual may feel the need to alter one or more of his or her "selves". The changing of one or more of these "selves" may be a possible mechanism to cope with his or her status changing to a less desirable level.

Certainly, the concept of "self" and the notion of status play a crucial role in my senior thesis project. This research is to understand what is going on at the level of the individual, in the way that the individual interacts with other members of the group when that person is incarcerated. As was stated in Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology, "...'persons' are aspects of the ideologies of cultures; different cultures attribute different features to personhood, and it remains for the anthropologist to discover what these features are, how they are revealed in social practice and cultural acts, and how they are constructed and evaluated within the ideology of the culture" (Levinson and Ember 922).

Social control is another interesting concept within anthropology. In order to control individuals with social boundaries, Foley (quoted in Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology) believes "an individual learns the norms of the group" (Levinson and Ember, 1194). Therefore, social control begins with enculturation. Once a person knows what is acceptable and what is intolerable in a culture, certain behaviors and actions can be manipulated to control individuals. For example, in some social groups, being incarcerated may be intolerable. Therefore, members of the group can use the threat of being arrested as a means of social control – one can threaten another individual by saying that person will be arrested. Because being arrested is negative, it works as a method to control that person. However, if being arrested is not unacceptable in the social group, then the threat and act of being arrested do not serve as a social control.

Although some people use the word "jail" interchangeably with the word "prison", these two facilities have very different functions. Jails are locally operated correctional facilities that confine people both before trial and sometimes after trial. When a person is arrested for a crime he or she is sent to jail until arraignment. If a person does not make bail or post a bond, that person is required to stay in the jail until the trial. For crimes that require sentencing of less than one year, often individuals are sentenced to jail rather than prison. Such crimes include child support violations, parole/probation violations, and other misdemeanor crimes. Jails are also used as holding
facilities for inmates that are being transferred from one city or county to another. People are most often in jail for one year or less. At the Camden County Correctional Facility, inmates are required to be residing in the jail no more than 364 days. However, both officers and inmates told me that some people have been in the Camden jail for up to four years awaiting their trials. Prisons, according to the Federal Bureau of Prisons Webpage, are state or federally operated facilities that confine people who have been sentenced to one year or more of incarceration. Often, inmates in prisons are convicted of felony crimes. “Felonies are severe crimes subject to punishment of a year or more in prison” (Adler, 27).

To understand the life of someone in jail, a definition of the purpose of jail is required. Many people agree that jail is a combination of: punishment to the individual who committed the crime, rehabilitation of the individual so that he or she can function in the society upon release, protection of the public from a dangerous individual, a deterring factor for anyone else who might be considering committing a crime. Malcolm Davies, in Punishing Criminals: Developing Community-Based Intermediate Sanctions notes that, “the system is simultaneously about punishment and denunciation of the wrongful act, and the protection of the public through selective incapacitation and deterrence” (Davies, 1).

As Michel Foucault explains in Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, punishing criminals evolved from a very public display of humiliation, torture and even execution, to the private, hidden punishment behind prison walls. Foucault makes the comparison of, “The guillotine takes life almost without touching the body just as a prison deprives of liberty.” (Foucault, 13) In a prison, the penalty is not physical pain, but the punishment of the soul. All liberties are taken away. Within a prison, a person’s body is completely controlled. A prisoner is told what and when to eat, when and where to sleep, and confined to a small, sterile space.

Foucault also goes on to explain six rules of punishment. First, it must be worse for the prisoner in prison than the benefit gained from committing the crime. Next, the punishment should deter other potential criminals. Third, the punishment should hit to the heart of the observer. Fourth, there should be a link between the punishment and the crime. A person should not be over punished for a minor crime, but also should not be
given a light punishment for a heinous crime. Fifth, Foucault believes punishment must be subject to a common truth. Last, all offenses must be classified.

Within the prison system, Foucault also sites Jeremy Bentham and discusses the idea of the Panopticon. The Panopticon is an architectural structure that allows for the inmate to be completely isolated, yet allows the guards to watch the inmate at all times. The structure is to have a guard tower in the center of the facility, watching over every inmate. The inmate’s cells are organized in a way that although each prisoner ideally cannot see any other prisoner, he or she can always see the guard tower. This is to remind the prisoner that he or she is always being watched. The idea is that while the prisoner has no human contact and is utterly alone, he or she never can be truly alone and has no privacy.

Incarceration is punishment for a number of reasons including isolation, public knowledge and the indignity of the jail system. Isolation can be agonizing because movements and actions are regulated and controlled. When a person is incarcerated, it becomes public knowledge that that person committed some kind of crime. That public knowledge of the crime can be embarrassing, and punishment in itself. For that reason public shaming, although less overt, is still used today.

For example, the New York Times ran an article publicly renaming white collar crooks. On the surface, the article appeared to be about the sentencing of former Tyco chief executive Dennis Kozlowski and ex-chief financial officer, Mark H. Swartz. However in the first paragraph of the story, the New York Times printed, “the recent corporate crime spree first made headlines with the disasters at Enron and WorldCom. Some cried foul when Bernard Ebbers of WorldCom and John Rigas of Adelphia Communications got sentences that meant those white-haired white-collar criminals would probably die in prison. Tomorrow night, Martha Stewart's version of the reality show "The Apprentice" will have its premiere amid her burst of post prison popularity.” (New York Times 20 September, 2005) The article relists each criminal. This is most definitely a public shaming tactic.

I want to understand if being incarcerated in jail alters a person’s identity, or status. My hypothesis is that for some social groups jail will actually improve their status. As one ex gang member commented after his first arrest, “I’m released back to my ‘hood
to discover doing time solidified my reputation by proving I’m rugged and raw” (Simpson, 33). Other scholars have also noted that imprisonment may not be detrimental to identity and status. Pattillo et al. notes that the prevalence of incarceration makes being arrested an acceptable event in many people’s lives. However, it is possible that imprisonment will be the force that causes a change in identity. “...It has been suggested that the individual may shift positions in the social matrix and that this will lead to a changed pattern of influences which impinge upon the identity.” (Breakwell, 40) This is certainly worthy of research.

PART II – METHODOLOGY AND SPECIFIC BACKGROUND

In September, I decided I wanted to understand more about the social structure and self identity of incarcerated individuals. Dr. Paula Sabloff who works in the anthropology department at the University of Pennsylvania agreed to be my advisor. Although downtown Philadelphia houses a jail, it is a Special Detention facility reserved for holding inmates for the day of their trial. I thought since inmates move fairly quickly through these Special Detention centers, (one officer estimated inmates stay no more than three days) this would not be a good place to conduct research. The next closest jail I could find was the Camden County Correctional Facility, in Camden, New Jersey.

Last year, Camden, New Jersey passed Detroit to become the city with the highest crime rate in the United States. Camden is located directly across the Ben Franklin Bridge, which spans the Delaware River and connects New Jersey to Philadelphia. The land area of Camden is 8.82 square miles, with water area consisting of 1.56 square miles. This data is from the Home Town Locator Website for Camden, NJ. According to the 2000 Census, from the United States Census Website, Camden has a population of 79,904 people and 29,769 housing units. Of these 80,000 people, 53.3% consider themselves Black or African American. New Jersey as a state has 13.6% of the population considering themselves Black or African American. The census data also indicates that as of 2000, Camden reported having a population that is 16.8% white, 38.8% Hispanic or of Latin origin, 2.5% Asian, 3.9% reporting two or more races, 0.6%
Native American, Native Alaskan, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and 22.8% reporting another race.

Although Camden reported only 8.9% of the population being foreign born, 39.6% of the population of Camden speaks a language other than English in their homes. While 51.0% of the people in Camden graduated from high school, only 5.4% obtained an education level of a BA or higher. New Jersey as a whole had a population of 82.1% which graduated high school, and 29.8% received an education of a BA or higher. For the United States, these statistics are 80.4% graduated high school and 24.4% acquired a BA or higher. The median income for Camden families in 2000 was $23,421, whereas the median income for New Jersey in 2000 was $55,146. The median income for families in the United States in the year 2000 was $41,994. In 2000, 35.5% of the population living in Camden was below the poverty line, while the state of New Jersey only had 8.5% of its population living below the poverty line. The United States had 12.4% of the population living below the poverty line in 2000.

Therefore, compared to New Jersey as a state, and the nation as a whole, people in Camden are significantly less educated, make much less money, and have a greater chance of living in poverty.

My first impression of Camden was that it was a run down city. Although there were many old and architecturally beautiful buildings, many of the doors were boarded up with cardboard and tape. Often the windowpanes were missing glass, and some of the buildings looked like they had been burned. I was surprised by how many people seemed to be walking around – Camden did not feel completely dead. There were many motorists on the streets, as well as pedestrians. Three or four corners I passed had food carts, which had lines customers. I got the sense that although Camden was a poor area, it was still alive. I never felt that I was in a particularly dangerous area, nor did I ever feel intimidated by anyone I met on the streets of Camden.

When I reached the jail, I asked the officer at the door if there was anyone I could speak with regarding interviewing inmates. The officer gave me the phone number of Deputy Warden Simon. I called the “DW” multiple times before I was finally able to reach him. We set up a meeting, in which I told him I was writing a thesis for my anthropology major at the University of Pennsylvania and I was interested in
interviewing inmates. He said that it would be no problem at all and to come back whenever I wanted. I was thrilled that it was so easy. When I met with my advisor, she instructed me to print out a copy of an IRB exemption form. My advisor and I thought I would only need an exemption form since I was not publishing any of my work and that I was an undergraduate student doing a project for my senior thesis. However, inmates are considered a protected population and require full IRB – Institutional Review Board approval. A full IRB approval hearing is required for a select group of “test subjects”. These “special” groups which require more protection include pregnant women, children under the age of 18, mentally disabled people and prisoners.

It is understandable to include children as a special population. Our own government considers people under the age of eighteen incapable of making their own decisions. Eighteen marks legal adulthood, voting rights and the ability to buy tobacco products. Children under eighteen years old may not understand different aspects of a study they are agreeing to participate in, and therefore need special protection.

Pregnant women are also a protected group. Growing fetuses are especially vulnerable to medications and actions the mother undergoes. Researches still do not entirely know how fetuses will react to different treatment. Because of this, pregnant women are carefully monitored in research and to conduct a study regarding pregnant women requires more supervision from an organization such as the Institutional Review Board.

Mentally disabled persons are also an obvious choice for a protected population. By definition, mentally disabled people have less mental capacity, and thus a more limited decision making capability. “When people move into a mental hospital, they enter a ‘marginal state’. They no longer have a place in the social system” (Hubert, 197) People consider mentally challenged people unable to comprehend scientific content and deserve special protection.

When others include inmates as a “vulnerable population” this suggests that inmates are incapable of deciding the course of their own lives. It is possible that our society sees inmates as a vulnerable population because the inmates are people who make poor choices that put them in jail and thus are incapable of making their own choices regarding other matters. However, the IRB takes the position that inmates are a
vulnerable population because they are locked behind closed doors and unable to seek refuge if the study went too far or became uncomfortable.

As with patients in a mental institution, when people are locked away in a prison or a jail, they lose their position in society. Instead of being a teacher, lawyer, mother or father, in the eyes of society, that person becomes only a resident in a mental hospital or correctional facility. That person fails to function in society, or provide any type of services, which make them a teacher or a mother. That person can no longer be in the classroom, or provide for their children. Because there is no giving back to the society, an incarcerated person loses that part of their identity. “...People who enter this marginal state are then perceived as both vulnerable and dangerous” (Hubert, 197). This concept of being marginalized certainly applies to both mental patients as well as inmates.

To comply with the Review Board, I downloaded a number of forms including “subpart C”, which deals with “Research involving prisoners”. (Appendix G). Most of the forms are set up for researchers conducting medical or psychological tests on prisoners. Clearly there has been a history of research abuse toward prisoners, such as the victims of the Nazis in concentration camps. However, even though my research is purely ethnographic, and undergraduate work, I still had to complete the IRB approval. “Subpart C” is designed to eliminate studies that would give prisoners special treatment for agreeing to participate, studies that a non-incarcerated person would not want to participate in, or studies that would unfairly select prisoners. Since the conditions of my thesis were met with approval I was allowed to go on.

In the following weeks I met with Nancy Koppelman, a representative of the Review Board. Since full IRB approval hearings are only held once per month, Nancy was kind enough to try to get my study expedited by sending my information solely to the “Prison Representative”, Mr. Inez. Together, Nancy and I went through a nine page packet called “Social & Behavioral Sciences IRB Protocol Summary Guidelines and Template”. (Appendix H) This packet contained the instructions on how I was to write a Protocol Summary so that the Board could review my suggested research. I had to include my introductions and objectives for my study, as well as the background of research. The Summary instructed me to,
Discuss the background of research problem, prior published data, and the nature of the research question as well as the resulting rationale for the proposed study. Summarize the available data (published or unpublished, if available) that could have significance or which is necessary to place the research in current context of our understanding of the area. Discuss how any preliminary data justifies the research (Appendix H).

For the Protocol Summary, I also had to include my study design, which included the specific number of subjects to be enrolled, and the duration in terms of hours, months and years. The Summary required I create extensive methods for subject selection and withdrawal. I needed to know exactly what inclusion criteria I wanted, and what would exclude an inmate from participating. My requirements were that inmates needed to be in the Camden jail, and over the age of 18. I also had to describe scenarios where subjects may withdraw and how a subject should do that.

Also included were my method, and any instruments I would use. I had to guarantee that privacy of the inmates would be protected. With the exception of Dr. Paula Sabloff, Nancy Koppelman, Deputy Warden Simon and Mr. Inez, all names have been changed. With the exception of Philadelphia and Camden, all towns and cities have also been changed. I assured the Review Board that I had taken sufficient measures to protect any evidence that may connect the inmates to my study. I agreed to keep my notes in a locked file cabinet in Dr. Sabloff’s office. I made sure to conduct my interviews in a sound proof room.

Since I did not do a statistical analysis or have any publication plans, I did not have to explicitly describe these in my Protocol Summary. I did however, have to painstakingly go through every single possible risk and benefit an inmate might receive by participating in my research. I concluded that this is a very minimal risk study with risks including feeling sad or uncomfortable, and the chance someone knows the inmate was interviewed. There are no direct benefits, although the inmate may feel happy discussing these issues or benefit from introspection. Another benefit for the inmate is that he helped me as the researcher become more educated.
One major aspect of the Protocol Summary and wishes of the IRB was that I wrote a consent form that was perfect (Appendix B). It had to be in language the inmates could understand. It included everything mentioned in the fifteen page, “Voluntary Informed Consent” (Appendix I). I did not want to make the form too long, because that would greatly deter people from wanting to sign or even to read it. I also made sure that I read the consent form out loud to each of the inmates. We each signed two copies of the consent form and we each kept a copy.

After two months of working on the Protocol Summary and consent form, which was constantly being edited and reworked, I finally submitted my IRB packet to Mr. Inez (Appendices A-F and my bibliography). Initially, he rejected my proposal. DW Simon had originally planned for me to interview minimum security inmates living in trailers attached to the jail. I would have interviewed them in their common area. Mr. Inez was concerned that officers would overhear the interviews and use the information inmates were telling me against the inmate. I also specifically had to tell each inmate absolutely not to tell me any information about why he was in jail, about any pending trials, or any other information that could possibly get the inmate in trouble. I agreed to this, and DW Simon arranged for me to interview inmates in the main area of the jail, in the sound proof rooms reserved for attorney/inmate conferences. It was then that Mr. Inez finally gave me approval (Appendix K).

During our first meeting, Deputy Warden Simon, who is a tan, muscular man with huge hands and a thick brown mustache, gave me a brief background of the jail. Simon told me, which I had already read, that the Camden County Correctional Facility is extremely over crowded. On the day that I was speaking with DW Simon, there were 484 sentenced inmates and 1691 inmates pending sentencing. Officially, the jail can hold 1257 inmates, as there are 1257 beds.

This number of beds includes the four “mod” trailers that were attached to the side of the jail to allow for extra space. These trailers house minimum security inmates. DW Simon continued to look through his computer for statistics and told me that the regular housing block A should have no more than 120 inmates. The day of our interview, it had 181 inmates.
DW Simon also explained to me the way inmates are classified. If a prisoner makes it past “admissions”, the inmate is assigned a certain color uniform for “population” – where all the other inmates are housed. When a person is brought to admissions. Regardless of the crime, all prisoners are kept to a single cell. There may be up to six people in these small cells. The recently arrested people must stay in these cells for 23 hours, 40 minutes per day, and are not allowed to shower. Often, if a person makes bail and is able to pay his or her way out of jail, he or she never makes it to population. A person may be in admissions for up to seven days.

During the time a person is in admissions, he or she is seen by a physician, a mental health therapist and an officer assigned to “class unit”. This officer takes the professionals’ opinions, as well as the past criminal history, past incarceration, if the inmate was ever previously in the Camden jail, and how he or she behaved as well as the severity of the charge, and the amount bail was set to. Then the class unit officer assigns an inmate a number on a 1-10 point scale. An inmate given a rank of 1-3 is considered minimum. Inmates with points 4-6 are given medium status. Inmates who are assigned a 7 or higher are considered maximum security inmates.

All women are given beige uniforms regardless of the points they receive during admission. On the date I was speaking with DW Simon, there were 116 women in the jail. All of these women were residing in the North block.

Inmates who are assigned to live in the trailers, or the “mods” are given yellow uniforms. They are not allowed to be in the main jail and other inmates are not allowed to be in the trailers. I was told by some of the inmates that the “mods” are extra minimum security, although the Deputy Warden did not indicate this. Minimum security inmates who are assigned to live in the regular jail are given orange uniforms. Blue uniforms are for medium security inmates and red uniforms are reserved for maximum security inmates. DW Simon assured me that the point scale is important. “You have to look at past charges. You can have a shoplifter trying to beat everyone up and a real pain in the ass, or you can have a murderer who is a lamb”. Later I found out that “dark blue” uniforms are for inmates in the mentally ill block, and tan smocks are given to inmates who work in the kitchen. To me the jail seemed made up of mostly orange and red inmates.
DW Simon continued to tell me about life in the jail. Lunch starts at 10:00AM. Inmates used to be able to ‘walk around’, and eat in a cafeteria. Having all the inmates come out of their cells to eat, especially with over crowding, caused too many problems so now inmate’s food is brought directly to the cells on trays by kitchen staff.

Apparently, the Camden County Correctional Facility fails its annual Federal Review every year. The jail receives an automatic failure because the Camden jail does not allow contact visits, which is a requirement of Federal law. However, with over crowding, DW Simon told me, ‘[contact visits] are more trouble than it’s worth’. DW Simon said, ‘we fail every year and we don’t care. We’re not state, just county’. Since the Camden jail is a county jail rather than a state jail, it is privately funded rather than paid for by the state. Therefore, even though the jail fails its reviews, it does not have to worry about losing funding. For visits, inmates talk through a phone and may look at their visitor through glass. Apparently there were a lot of problems ranging from people trying to have sex, sneaking contraband into the jail, to fights breaking out between visitors and inmates.

The next week, I went back to the Camden Jail. I couldn’t start my interviews yet because I didn’t have IRB approval, but I was anxious to get a sense of the jail. Deputy Warden Simon had a female officer, Officer Juarez, give me a full tour of the jail. Officer Juarez was a petit Hispanic woman, probably only 25 or 30 years old. She seemed friendly to all the inmates, and would wave and joke with them as we went by. She had a terrible time remembering my name and why I was at the jail, but she was more than happy to tell me all the gossip.

We started in the Mods. ‘These are mostly parole violations, child support cases, or they are waiting to go to prison. There are not many problems here’ she told me. Officer Juarez also had her own explanation of the way the inmates were color classified. ‘Red are the murders’, she told me. ‘Their bail is set at $50,000 or more. The mins are yellow and orange, and their bail is set at $20-30,000’.

Officer Juarez told me that most of the problems occur in admissions. This area was not part of the tour because ‘it smells!’ Officer Juarez reiterated what DW Simon had told me about inmates having to stay unseparated for up to 7 days while being processed into the jail. ‘When they come out, they are smiling’, Juarez said. ‘Jail doesn’t change
people; it’s not a deterrent. When they get out of there [admissions] they get to go live with their friends and family. Once they get out of admissions they’re not scared. Maybe jail would be a deterrent if they only stayed in admissions.’

Officer Juarez continued to tell me about the inner workings of the jail.

‘Shipments are a little crazy’, she said. “Shipments” occur on Fridays, and are when the jail receives buses full of new inmates. Some of the inmates in the shipment are simply traveling through Camden on their way to another city. They may spend the night, or more likely a few days in the jail. Other inmates are being transferred to Camden because they have committed crimes in Camden County, or because another New Jersey state operated jail does not have space. Even though the Camden jail is significantly overcrowded, it is still contracted to take about 250 state inmates, because the state jail is even more overcrowded.

Code orange is the code called when two inmates are fighting. It is given this color code because in the recent past, all the inmates wore orange. A code brown is called when an officer is hurt. According to Officer Juarez, at any given time, there are about 250 – 280 officers on duty in the jail.

The jail is set up so that the first floor is divided into offices and central video surveillance. There are two elevators, one for officers and one for inmates. The officers’ elevator opens like a normal elevator but has no buttons. When an officer enters, he holds up the number floor he wants with his fingers. It is someone’s job to watch the camera in the corner of the elevator to see what floor he should allow the elevator to go to. The jail has two wings called “North” and “South”. In each wing there are three pods, labeled A, B and C. These pods hold multiple cells, which is also called a “cell block”. All of the cells in a certain pod will hold the same color uniformed inmates, but different pods in one wing can hold different colored uniformed inmates. Within these pods, or blocks, inmates are allowed to wonder from cell to cell. However, if a certain inmate is misbehaving, his entire cell is put under lockdown. These means every person assigned to that cell is also kept under lock down.

The second floor houses the mentally ill unit, as well as the women. The hospital is also located on the second floor. The third and fourth floors are connected by a stairway right through the middle. Technically at the top of the stairs is the 4th floor. This
is one area for visitors. The center of the third floor houses a room for video court. One third floor inmate, George, told me that ‘guys on the fifth floor are suppose to be more tougher but to me it’s all the same’. Officer Juarez never said anything about the different levels housing different security of inmates. Under the stairs are individual soundproof rooms where inmates have meetings with their lawyers. This is where I conducted some of my interviews.

The rest of my interviews were conducted on the fifth floor. The fifth and sixth floors were arranged in the same way as the third and fourth floors. The sixth floor was also for visitors. Inmates are not supposed to change floors unless they have a valid reason to do so, such as they are delivering food trays. Inmates who live on the third floor must have their visits on the connecting fourth floor, and inmates who live on the fifth floor must have their visits on the sixth floor. The pods at each of the wings go up two stories to fill the space of the combination third and fourth stories, as well as the combination fifth and sixth stories. However, when inmates say where they are housed, I never heard any one talk about the “fourth floor” or “sixth floor”.

The seventh floor was simply the roof. It had an outdoor basketball court. There was also an indoor area that had a weight room. Inmates go up to this recreational area with their entire block, the way an entire elementary school grade might have recess at the same time, even though there are different classes. Inmates are given one hour per day to spend on the seventh floor.

PART III - INTERVIEWS

It was December before I finally started interviewing inmates. My first interview was with Eddie Torres. On the day I arrived to begin my interviews, there was some miscommunication regarding who I was going to interview and where these interviews were going to be conducted. I waited in the Sergeant’s office with Officer Caudley while another correctional officer went to straighten things out and “find” the inmate the officers had arranged for me to interview. I thought the word “find” was interesting because I assumed the officers would know the exact position of every inmate in the jail at every moment. Apparently, the officers do not.
Since I was not allowed to bring a tape recording device into the jail, I took rigorous notes. Many of my notes say something like, “First time spent night in jail – 17 years old”. This means I asked the question, “when was the first time you spent the night in jail?”, to which the response was something very close to, “when I was 17 years old”. Therefore, when I transcribed my notes, I added in the extra words such as “when I was” to make the text more readable. The interviews are not direct quotes, but I paid close attention to the way the inmates spoke, and the choice of words such as “we do this” or “they do this” to capture the meaning and feeling of the interviews.

During my interviews, I focused on the knowledge the inmate (or officer) possessed as well as his attitude and behavior. I paid special attention to the interaction of all three of these concepts.

I printed out a list of questions that I planned to ask each inmate. (Appendix C). I usually started off by asking the inmate where he was from. I asked about brothers, sisters and any children. To break the ice a little bit, I would ask follow up questions about the inmate’s children, if it were applicable. I asked how old the kids were, what grade they were in, what did they enjoy, if they played sports. Talking about their kids seemed to make the inmates relax and be more comfortable talking to me.

Officer Caudley was probably in his thirties, and had a thick, stalky build. He was more fat than muscle but he had wide shoulders and an imposing manner. He had sandy brown hair and a thick Philadelphia accent. He announced he could already tell me everything the inmates were going to say, and urged me to practice with him. A paraphrasing of our mock interview is as follows: (I asked the questions to Officer Caudley directly, as if he was the inmate himself, but his responses were often “‘they’ do this” and “‘they’ do that”).

Alison: Where are you from?
Officer Caudley: Camden. Most are from Camden.
Alison: Is this your first time in jail?
Officer Caudley: No this is not my first time. They might say it’s their first time but it’s not. They probably got arrested as juveniles and got away.
Alison: When was the first time you were in jail?
Officer Caudley: They will say they were arrested between 18-20 years for the first time. They have come back ever since.

Officer Caudley then began discussing his feelings about the inmates, so I let him keep talking without asking questions. He proceeded to tell me that:

In jail is where the inmates make friends, are educated — but educated “strictly on crime” — they learn about drugs and how to steal cars. The people here are raised within the facility. Very few people here are in here for the first time. If a person has a successful life, they will have never been here and come here for the first time at age 30. But most of the inmates here have been incarcerated here their whole life, this is home. People have their best friends here, their cousins. People don’t know how to act.

Officer Caudley then asked me, ‘are you familiar with the demographics here? I might get in trouble, but here’, and printed out the demographics of the Camden County Correctional Facility. It seemed to be the same information DW Simon was reading to me earlier. The printout showed the ethnic breakdown of the Camden jail, as well as the number of inmates in other county jails through out New Jersey (Appendix L).

Caudley continued to tell me that, ‘Camden is the 4th largest county jail population wise. (Jan 9, 2005) There are exactly 1959 inmates here today (Jan 9, 2005). There are two North Jersey jails with populations around 2000 but for South Jersey this is by far the largest jail.’ Officer Caudley began reading statistics off his computer. He informed me that:

140 of these inmates haven’t seen a judge. On Mondays we do bail reduction. Fridays are for sentencing. The inmates are in trial Monday through Friday. There are 2178 inmates accounted for right now, but that includes work programs. Three inmates are under 18. Out of the 2178, 600, well, 608 inmates have been incarcerated before. If they only do
admissions they never come back. If they make it to population there are
certain things they get used to. When these inmates go home they don’t
have washing machines so they wash their clothes in the shower [just like
they do here].

Caudley continued:

Around the holidays, there are always fights. There are more suicides.
We’ve found a few. In ten years we’ve had 5 or 6 successful suicides. Last
year someone killed a mental health inmate. That area has always been
crowded. The guy who was killed, they told me he was real annoying.
He’d like, sing and be real loud. His roommate killed him with his bare
hands. In another county they’d call it positional asphyxiation and it would
be out of the papers in two days. Here… (sighs).

I asked Caudley what he meant, and he said the death was all over the media.
Alison: Why was it in the media for so long?
Caudley: Because it doesn’t happen here. The staff is very professional. We keep things
calm. There’s not much to dwell on so they [the media] dwell on that. We’re the third
largest county facility, probably the largest single facility.

I looked the prisoner’s death up online. According to the Mental Health Association of
New Jersey’s website, Joel Seidel was a 65 year old man with a mental illness. He was
beaten to death in his cell by two of his cell mates on January 27th, 2004. Seidel had
chosen to stay in jail rather than paying the $150 bail. The article stated the jail was
severely overcrowded. The article also blamed the “guards” (a word I was instructed was
very insulting to the “officers”) for not checking on Seidel every fifteen minutes.

Officer Caudley started talking to me again about my interviews.
Remember, he told me, if anyone bothers you, or says or does anything you don’t like – even if it’s just looking at you funny, you tell us and we will get him out of there. Period. You’re a pretty blond girl and I don’t want anything to happen to you. Seriously, if they say anything that makes you uncomfortable let us know. Plus, if DW Simon likes you, which apparently he does, you can do anything. And if anything happens to you, it will be my ass. I mean, we’re not going to give you any guys that are – well, your first interviewee – Eddie, he’s a good guy. I mean, he’s not because he’s a criminal, but he’s a good guy. He’s been in here a few times, but he’s had a rough time. He’s in some shit, excuse my language, that just seems...I dunno. I believe him; I think it was an accident. What happened was there was a shooting, probably over drugs or something stupid and a 12 year old boy got shot and killed. Eddie’s a good guy though. I believe him.’

Just as Officer Caudley finished telling me about Eddie, Eddie arrived for the interview. Eddie was tall – probably 6’1”, had jet black hair and pale skin. He had huge forearms like he lifted weights but he had flab hanging off his biceps. His head was shaved, and it appeared his arms were shaved also. He came across as tough, but not intimidating. He was very polite and interested in what I was doing, in a completely asexual way. I never felt as if he was hitting on me, or looking at me in any sexual way. Before I started asking questions, I told Eddie, as I told all the inmates, I don’t want to know anything about your case. I don’t want to get you in trouble and I don’t want you to tell me anything that could possibly get you in trouble. I had Eddie sign the consent form. Then I started my interview by asking where he was from and his age. He was from Camden, NJ, and was 29 years old. My next question was, “what is the purpose of jail”? Eddie answered:

Eddie: Jail? Jail is a place to pay for your mistakes. It’s punishment. I guess it’s to get on the right track for what you’ve done.

Alison: When was the first time you got in trouble?
Eddie: Arrested or locked up?
Alison: Both

Eddie: This is the first time I’ve ever been arrested or locked up. I’ve known people here. Half the people I grew up with are in jail. This was never a place I wanted to go. The lucky ones never went to jail. Now I know exactly what they went through. The pain, the pain for their family. It’s especially hard during the holidays.
Alison: When was the first time you got in trouble with the law though—
Eddie: I was 15 years old. I was scared. I hoped my parents were going to look at me again once I got out. As far as up bringing, I had it good. I went to a private school – St. John’s.
Alison: Where is that?
Eddie: Camden County New Jersey.
Alison: Do you have any brothers or sisters? Are you married? Do you have any kids? What is your family like?
Eddie: I have three brothers. I am the youngest. My oldest brother, I was 18 when he first got in trouble.
Alison: What did your parents say?
Eddie: I wasn’t living with my parents at the time. I was 16 when I moved out—I was still in high school. My parents didn’t want me to leave. There was a person I was involved with. She was in college. My father had nothing to say but you know how mothers are. They don’t want their babies to leave. (laughs) My oldest brother, he was 23 or 24 when he first got in trouble – he’s eight years older than me. My mom was shocked. She never suspected what he was doing. She never suspected he would go to jail for what he did. It was real bad. It was real hard on her. It was broadcasted all over the news and stuff. She was hurt. She tried to keep us away from certain areas.
Alison: (Pause)
Eddie: Years ago in Camden you could leave your car unlocked. You could sleep with the windows open without anyone taking anything. Camden is not what it used to be. It’s a total change. It’s like a dream, from what is was to what it is now. It’s like a ghost town now. People barely walk the streets past 9 o’clock. There are no activities for children because parents are scared.
Alison: Why do you think Camden is like that?
Eddie: There isn’t enough money in the budget. People in the community don’t want to give money because they are scared. People want out but not everybody is fortunate enough to pick up and leave. Like Halloween? There were barely any children trick or treating past 6:30. I mean, I was in here but I phoned a couple people, I keep in touch. I know things faster in here than people on the outside do!

Alison: So tell me about the first time you got in trouble:
Eddie: It was an easy process. There was this kid at school, I was in front of him, I was accompanying him. It got back to the principle that we had marijuana so they notified our parents. My parents – they were shocked. Here I was 15 or 16 years old at a private school with marijuana on me. I was released from the police station; he [the other kid] got the one year rule. You can’t get in trouble in one year or you will receive probation.

Eddie: You know, this is the worst county. There are four people in one room that is only supposed to hold two individuals. There’s someone sleeping near the toilet, you have to wake him up to use the bathroom. To get him to move over, you know? You could make a movie about some of the stuff that happens here.

Alison: Wait, tell me more about the first time you were in trouble. What did the kids at your school think?
Eddie: A lot of kids went up to me to shake my hand. It made you look better, you know? A total image...like it was cool or whatever.

Alison: What about the first time you had to spend the night in jail?
Eddie: The first time here [in jail] I knew I was going to spend a lot of nights here. I just take it one day at a time. I’m strong minded. It’s a waiting process. The bails are outrageous. For example, somebody locked up for stealing out of a store – shoplifting – years ago bail was $1500-2000. Now it’s no less than $10,000.

Alison: How does the bail process work?
Eddie: Cash bail is 10% of the bail. You don’t get that 10% back. So lets say you have a $100,000 bail, the bail bondsman has security, he takes the $100,000 and you make payments on that $100,000. You’re reimbursed when you show up to court.
Alison: What happens if you don’t show up?
Eddie: Then they send a bounty hunter after you. There are two types of bounty hunters—one that works for the state, you know, when you are running from the state, and the other works for a bail bondsman because you violated their rules.

Alison: So what kind of work do you do when you are not in jail?
Eddie: I’m a heavy equipment operator. I still stay in touch with my boss. We’re good friends.
Alison: Does he care that you’re in here?
Eddie: Nah, not at all.

Eddie: I’ve been here 15 months, since November 2\textsuperscript{nd} of 2004. On my block there aren’t too many new faces. A lot of people who come in here you can like, feel the tension. It’s not the town – it’s the crime rate. There are just so many things. There is a negative vibe. In my block there are fights every day. People do what they want in the room. The officers aren’t going to say anything.

Eddie: We gossip more than women. You know everything outside before someone tells you on the phone. You know, you’ll call someone and they will say, my ex girl was messing with so and so, but you already knew about it. I constantly seen people I went to school with.

Eddie: There are cycles. One guy said you get locked up one time you’ll be back. I know guys my age who’ve been eight or nine times going to state prison and are back.

Eddie: Since this county [jail] has been built, there have never been any real riots. It’s always been inmate against inmate. Sometimes an officer gets punched. If that happens you are going to get locked up, and get a little treat too.
Alison: What do you mean treat?
Eddie: (laughs) you know… treat…they’re going to rough you up a little bit.
Eddie: Lock up is when you do something wrong. Sanctions means you are locked up 23 hours per day, with no visits. I have a friend locked up in Two South. He’s real crazy – he urinated in a cup and told someone it was tea.

Eddie: You know there is no contact here. [Contact visits for the inmates]. We had a vote to either have cable or contact visits, and those idiots chose cable.
Alison: When was this?
Eddie: When the jail first opened.

This is interesting because DW Simon specifically told me that the administration at the Camden Jail chose to stop the contact visits because contact visits caused too many problems. Since many of the officers are close to the inmates I would have expected if the officers knew the truth that the inmates would know the truth. A possible follow up question to an officer is “why are there no contact visits at the Camden jail?”

Eddie’s response is also interesting because even though he claims not to have been incarcerated during this time, he still says “we” to refer to the people who had a vote. Either he is lying about when he was incarcerated or he includes himself in this “inmate” group. However, since in his next sentence Eddie refers to inmates as “those idiots”, I believe Eddie may have been in the Camden County Jail at the time of the “vote”. Therefore, when Eddie says “we”, he literally means himself rather than saying “we” for any Camden inmate population.

When I asked Eddie if he was or ever had been in a gang, he replied no, he was not in a gang. But yes, he is a Latin King. Latin Kings are a large Latino gang, most well known on the West Coast. Their gang colors are gold and black. I asked him again, so you were a Latin King? To which he responded, “no I am a Latin King. But I don’t consider myself a gang member”.

Alison: Do people know you are a Latin King?
Eddie: People aren’t supposed to know. Certain officers know. They bring me a name, and I tell them no that’s not one of my guys. [If a certain inmate is causing problems].
Alison: What if it is one of your guys?
Eddie: They [the officers] let me meet him. They let me out of here. I overview the situation. If they [the inmate] did something wrong, I give out sanctions. If you send an order it has to be done. I have the same position on the street. I’m a First Crown. There are four crowns in our family. I’m in charge of inside the jail; there is another Crown in charge of the street. “Our nation – I don’t run it under the West Coast guidelines”.

Eddie and I continued talking, for almost two hours. When lunch was being served for the inmates, Officer Caudley came in again. He told us we needed to finish up, so Eddie could have a chance to eat lunch. All food is served in the inmates’ cells. Eddie turned to me and said, ‘I like Officer Caudley. He doesn’t look at us like we’re animals – like we are bad people’.

After Eddie left, Officer Caudley started talk to me again. ‘You know what causes problems?’ he asked me. ‘Lower officers. They want authority. They act like real asses to the inmates and it just causes problems. I just treat people, you know, if it was my brother, how would I want them to be treated.’ Officer Caudley continued to tell me his theories regarding the jail system.

Officer Caudley: You know, 90% of all major incidences are from food or food issues. Look it up – seriously, go online and look it up. It will say. Food is a major cause of problems in jails. It’s because in jail, all you have to look forward to is eating... I feel like a social worker here. You get a feel for the guys who don’t belong here. Then you get the guys who enjoy it here. They are just a product of their environment.

The next week I interviewed two orange level-of-security inmates – Ricardo and Troy. Ricardo was born in Puerto Rico, and moved to Western Flats, NJ when he was 10 or 11. He lived in Western Flats, a small South Jersey town for one year, and Pittsburg for one year before permanently moving to Camden in 7th or 8th grade. Today, Ricardo is 43 years old. He is a slight man with thinning hair and a faded tattoo on his forearm. He spoke very quietly with a Spanish accent. He seemed nervous to be talking to me. When
he did start talking more openly, he mostly wanted to talk about his troubled childhood and his mother who he felt didn’t care for him.

Alison: What was the first time you ever got in trouble?
Ricardo: It was in Camden. I was joyriding in a car.
Alison: What happened?
Ricardo: Well, I got caught inside a stolen vehicle. I didn’t steal it. Some other person stole it. I was just in it.
Alison: What did your parents do?
Ricardo: They came and got me from the juvenile detention facility.
Alison: When was the first time you ever went to jail?
Ricardo: I was about 14.
Alison: How did it make you feel?
Ricardo: It’s hard to say. I was afraid my mom was going to find out.
Alison: Did she?
Ricardo: Yes
Alison: How?
Ricardo: She had to pick me up. They released me to her.
Alison: [silence]
Ricardo: And that was it.
Alison: What was her reaction?
Ricardo: Nothing really happened. She just scolded me.
Alison: Did anybody else find out?
Ricardo: It didn’t happen in my neighborhood so my neighborhood didn’t know what happened. Like closed doors.
Alison: How many times have you been in jail?
Ricardo: Oooh, about fifteen times...
Alison: When was the first time you spent the night in jail?
Ricardo: I was 19. It was in 1981.
Alison: What did your mom say then?
Ricardo: She was more upset...Well not really. I'm just finding out, when I was growing up she was drinking a lot. I was not surprised. She worked. I had no communication with her at a very early age. I'd go to the YMCA after school to exercise. By 7:00, she'd already be sleeping. I've never thought about my life history.

Alison: How does it make you feel?
Ricardo: Good. I have a lot of issues I need to work through. I wish I could talk to people, but they [the inmates] look down on you here if you try to talk about your problems.

Troy is from Woodside, NJ, a slightly more affluent town no more than a 45 minute drive from Camden. He is 31 years old and had been arrested 31 times. He is a white man with sandy brown hair and stubbly facial hair. He had two visible tattoos, one on each bicep. The tattoos were partially covered by the sleeves of his orange jumpsuit. When Troy came in, I was crossing out the word “guard” and replacing it with “officer” on the consent form because Officer Caudley had told me that ‘guards are for malls not jails’. When Troy realized why I was changing the wording he said, ‘these are guards. All they do is babysit us.’ However, later in the interview I realized Troy was close friends with many of the officers.

Alison: Do you have a job outside of jail?
Troy: I work with concrete.
Alison: What exactly do you do?
Troy: Work with different types of chemicals – like calcium. I love doing it. It’s hard, it’s fun, it keeps you in shape. I’ve been doing it for nine years.

Troy: I’m better than everyone else, I shouldn’t be here.

Troy: All the cops think – there are eight cops [jail officers] here who I played [township] hockey with. In Cascade Hills. They called me out here, they said, go brush your teeth, she’s [Alison] pretty. They don’t give me an extra [food] tray though. That’s a big deal. So I don’t ask either. On the streets they’d do anything for me. In here they make it hard for me, so I won’t come back. There are five officers who all live on my same block [at
home]. The female officers here are terrible. One just got fired because she got caught with eight ounces of coke. In here, a $10 bag of drugs costs $100.

Troy started talking about how he’s had enough of jail. Troy said he’s sick of the other inmates and the food. He turned to me and said, “Enough of this bullshit Alison. I want to go home. I’m a soldier but I’m tired of marching”. I think it’s interesting that Troy uses the metaphor of a soldier. A soldier conjures up images of toughness and bravery. Foucault describes that becoming a soldier teaches men to stand with their heads erect and their eyes not on the ground. When someone teaches a man to be a soldier, “one has gotten rid of the peasant and given him the air of a soldier” (Foucault, 135).

An officer came by, grinning, and gave Troy the middle finger. Both men laughed. Troy: See this guy? This guy with the glasses? My cousin does demolition work. He just knocked down [the officer's] house.

Troy gave the officer the middle finger back.

Although I did not specifically ask my first three interviewees why they had been picked, I can make an educated guess. I imagine Eddie was picked because at least Officer Caudley and whoever the other officer was who “found” Eddie thought Eddie was a good guy who would talk to me and not give me any problems. Since Ricardo mentioned that no one will listen to him, and that he has no one to talk to about his problems, I imagine Ricardo has tried to talk about his “problems” to someone. Perhaps the officers picked up on this and thought he would be willing to talk to me. Last, I think it is highly likely that the officers in the jail picked Troy to talk to me because a number of the officers are close personal friends with Troy. Talking to me would give Troy a chance to get out of his cell and give him something to do.

The next week in my interviews I started asking the inmates why they thought the officers had picked them to talk to me. My first interviewee was Isaiah. He was clad in an orange uniform. He had a tall, thin but muscular frame, with hot chocolate colored skin and an attractive face. He told me he was 31 years old, but he looked younger. Isaiah had very kind eyes and I was immediately relaxed and comfortable around him.
Alison: Why do you think the officers picked you to come talk to me?
Isaiah: I don’t know… I’m in and out of here. I’m not a bad guy – I mean, I get along with the officers. Not no cop shit – excuse my language [meaning Isaiah gets along with the jail officers but does not consider himself a friend of police officers]. I don’t know… I’m not funky…
Alison: Where are you from?
Isaiah: From Camden. Around the corner.

Isaiah: Did you hear about Camden in Colorado? This city is like Iraq. It’s devastating. North Camden looks real bad. The government doesn’t care about it. The mayor doesn’t care. Everybody knows how bad it is though. Every corner is a drug corner. All the old houses and abandoned buildings…I played hide and seek in all them when I was little. This is a very violent city. You get killed for nothing. Life has no value here. Nobody has got any morals. I mean, there never have been morals here but it’s gotten worse. Young guys kill for making money. This city sucks. Growing up here made life bad. I’ve been to prison four times. I was always smart in school too, I dropped out in 10th grade but I got my GED.

By comparing Camden to Iraq, Isaiah is creating another soldier metaphor. If both Camden and Iraq are war zones, then the people living there must fight. They must fight like soldiers fight – for their lives.

Isaiah went on to tell me his first time he was arrested was for marijuana possession. His mom was shocked. Isaiah’s brother was “caught” with a homicide when Isaiah was 16 or 17. His brother was only 18.

Isaiah: I know a lot of people here. When I got locked up [recently] there were 15 or 20 people with us. Everybody was selling drugs. [Now they are all in the Camden Jail together].
Alison: Do you ever see people outside of jail who you know from inside jail?
Isaiah: Yah, I see the officers all the time. I see [the officers] ride by, or at a concert or I might see them at shows. I might see them all the mall – the Strawberry Hill mall, outside Camden.

Alison: What is that like—seeing them?

Isaiah: I know all the officers so we’re friendly. They are much more friendly [outside the jail]. I’m pretty much cool with them. There’s a big change. They are definitely nicer.

Alison: Are they nice to you in jail?

Isaiah: Yah I mean, we’re cool.

The next inmate I interviewed was George. He is a 42 year old African American man born in Camden. His whole family is still currently living in Camden. George was rather thick and stout, but more doughey than muscle. He was in an orange uniform. Before I had the chance to ask any questions, George began spouting out how horrible jail is and how badly he is treated.

George: Of course my mother was upset I was in jail. Jail is horrible. That was a stupid question. Ask something else.

The first time George had gotten in trouble was when he was 17. He had broken into “an old lady’s house”, which happened to be his neighbor. The neighbor recognized him and called the police.

Unlike the other inmates I interviewed, I didn’t think George was being particularly truthful with me. I thought George was telling me what he thought I should hear – that jail is terrible and he doesn’t deserve to be here, rather than the actual emotional reaction his friends and family have to him being in jail. However, he did seem to be a bit more honest about his employer.

Alison: Does your boss care if you are in jail?

George: Huh! Of course! ...But he wouldn’t fire me.

Alison: Why?
George: All the guys who work there [in the shipyards] have been incarcerated at one time or another.  
Alison: How do you know? 
George: Because I do. I've been there long enough to know.  

Alison: Why were you picked to come talk to me?  
George: Everybody likes me.  
Alison: Do you know any of the officers?  
George: Like be friends with the guards? How can you be friends with the guards? You can't be friends. If you're friends with the guards then you [are] [the] police. Having that type of label is no good when you're in jail because then they [other inmates] will kill you.  
Alison: What happens if you see an officer outside of jail?  
George: Nothing. We both might wave. Say hi maybe. But if who [I'm] with says, who's that, then I make sure they know it ain't nothing like that [that George and the jail officer are friends].

George was the only inmate out of nine who I interviewed who used the pronoun “we” to refer to himself and other inmates. He used “we” extensively. The other people I interviewed either used the words “you” (you act this way in jail) or “I”. Occasionally, the other inmates would say “they” to refer to other prisoners’ actions.

George: We're smarter than them [officers] because we are animals. We're smarter than they think we are. They think we're stupid. Jail is not good at all for us. This is terrible. This place is not for human beings. We keep people jobs. [The inmates allow the officers to have jobs in the jail].  
George: We know what's going on. We “ear hustle”. We hear the police talking, we hear it and they don't. We listening. That's how rumors spread.

Perhaps most striking is when George includes the mentally ill inmate population in his “us”.
George: Some of us are not all that okay. Two South A? [Mentally ill block]. Any of us up here can end up there. You end up like Fred Flintstone in a padded suit.

George also makes a reference to a soldier.
George: “We in jail now, we become warriors”
George made this statement after I asked him why all the inmates I interviewed or even the inmates I pass in the hallways constantly ask me for my pens. George said the jail issued pens don’t work because they are cheap.

At one point in our interview, George started laughing and pointed to another man, sitting down in the adjacent conference room. The man laughed and waved back. They made some type of sign to one another that I could not understand. It turned out that the man George was talking to was his little brother. I specifically asked if it was a blood relative rather than a friend George was calling his “brother”, which made George upset. George assured me it was his real brother.

When I returned to Camden one week later, my first interview was with Ruben. Ruben is 35 years old black man born in North Philly. He came to Camden in 1992. Ruben told me people call him “KC” because he lived on Kansas City Ave, a major avenue in North Philadelphia. I heard both officers and other inmates calling Ruben “KC”. Of his five children, only one currently lives in Philadelphia. The rest live in Camden. Ruben had massive hands that reminded me of a heavy weight boxer. His body shape also reminded me of a heavy weight boxer. He wore a red jail uniform. Ruben is someone who could easily be very intimidating, but I did not feel threaten by him at all. He had huge dimples in his cheeks and a charming laugh. He was extremely friendly, courteous and respectful.

Ruben explained to me that his father was a truck driver and his mother was an alcoholic. Therefore, Ruben “did what it took to survive”. He first got in trouble at 11 or 12 for stealing items out of stores – “little kid things”.
Alison: What did your mom say when she came to get you? [When Ruben was first arrested and in jail]  
Ruben: Nah, she just beat me.  
Alison: Did your dad say anything?  
Ruben: Nah, he just beat me too.

Ruben told me he was scared when he first went to prison, but jail is "a mess—like kitty cat. It's just a whole bunch of babies".

Ruben: On my block I maintain control.

Alison: How?  
Ruben: People respect me. If I make a call they gonna respect it. I'm not super bad, super tough guy but... I'm not gonna allow you to get me on lock down and stop my visits. You act crazy, my stuff gets shut down. Plus I can fight. And people know it. I get it in and they respect me.

Ruben: Automatically someone comes on [on the block], they [the other inmates] tell them [the new inmate] they [everyone] call me KC. They [other inmates] say, he [Ruben] ain't that dude to be messing with.

Alison: Have you ever seen guards on the street? [Outside the jail walls]  
Ruben: Yaa (smiles)... see on the street... [In jail] I was in a situation, and the guards just have a job to do. So the guards are like, what up man, buy you a drink or something. People got family members here. It's cool though. A couple officers, I did work for them in their houses. It's not a hate relationship. They [the officers] just not gonna jeopardize they job for you. Like give you cigarettes or something.

Alison: Do you have a job when you are not in jail?  
Ruben: I do construction, like home remodeling. I work with sheet rock. I like tearing the whole house apart and rebuilding it. Guards here now, that own property, they say, 'Yo man, I'll be glad when you get out, I have work for you'... Oh, I left my coffee [in the sergeant's office], can I go get it?
This is interesting, because none of the inmates are allowed in the sergeant’s office. Someone who is considered “red”, and therefore under maximum security is not suppose to be wandering around, and especially not suppose to be in the sergeant’s office. When Ruben came back, I asked him why he thought the officers asked him to talk to me.

Ruben: I honestly believe it’s because they know my character. I’m an overall good person. I’m not going to sit here and ask you stupid questions.

Ruben and I continued to talk about his childhood and his children. When Ruben saw the next inmate I was set to interview, he said:

Let me tell you about this guy. He’s an intellectual dummy. He’s got these glasses, and he’s only smart when he puts on the glasses. He’s extremely...vocally gifted (laughs). He’s gonna come in here and try to impress you. Watch, watch. He’s going to come in here and say, ‘well, do to…’ (clears his throat) the things I’ve been through’ (laughs). You’re gonna laugh. I’m gonna come back and ask you what you think about him!

The inmate Ruben was referring to was Daniel. Ruben was actually extremely accurate about Daniel’s personality. Although I wouldn’t call Daniel a “dummy”, he did seem to fake an intellectualism. Daniel did indeed come in and get out a pair of glasses. Daniel spoke with an almost pompousness, although occasionally, Daniel would become really interested in the story he was telling, and forget his “elevated” speech and tone.

Daniel is 29 years old African American man. He is tall and wide, rather than overweight. He told me he belonged to the faith of Islam. He had a long beard the way many religious Muslims do. The first time Daniel was in trouble was for not paying for peanuts at a corner store. The rest of his incarcerations were mostly drug related. Daniel wore an orange jail uniform. The first thing Daniel said to me was:
Daniel: The previous guy, was he a good interview? Because I am an intellectual. I have what it takes.

Alison: (laughs) Alright. Ok, where are you from?

Daniel: From this city.

Alison: Camden?

Daniel: Camden, yes.

Daniel has one seven year old son. In response to me asking if his son liked school, Daniel said:

Daniel: What?! Yes, he does.

Alison: What is his favorite subject?

Daniel: Reading. I can truly say he’s like his father.

Alison: Oh ya? What was your favorite subject in school?

Daniel: Language. I’m big on that. I speak Arabic and English. I try to speak accurately and fluently.

Daniel was rather difficult to interview. He did not listen to my questions, or at least, he did not attempt to answer them. Often, he would go on tangents in which he talked about his theories on happiness, love and life. However, one aspect that made his interviews easier was that Daniel would take long pauses, in which I could write down his exact words, for a quote. For example:

Alison: Have you ever been to prison?

Daniel: Yes.

Alison: Is prison different from jail?

Daniel: Yes.

Alison: How is it different?

Daniel: “Prison – the only difference prisons have (pause) other than county facilities (pause) I can say (pause) the movement, as far as the movement is concerned, rehabilitating into more structured things”.
Daniel: Life is something we experience with all the elements which can make you happy and make you sad. It’s how you travel with it. You must deduce these elements. I may say, it was such a good day today, my boy came through. The next day, man, I can’t believe this guy, he didn’t put a blinker on. Life is always introducing itself to us.

Unfortunately, I was not able to get Daniel to focus on my questions long enough to answer whether or not he had ever seen guards outside the jail, or if he knew anyone inside the jail before he came. Our interview time was over and Daniel had to return to his cell before I got past my introductory questions, even though we talked between 30 – 45 minutes.

The next week I conducted my last two interviews. First, I interviewed Thomas. I talked to Thomas for a while. He then had to go downstairs for a probation or parole hearing – he was in jail for violating his parole. I then spoke to Alfonso. After Alfonso left, Thomas came back to talk to me some more. I have the feeling Thomas did not want to return to his cell. That day, I also saw both George and Ruben in the halls talking to the guards. I imagine both must have special privileges to be allowed out of their cells and allowed to wander the halls.

Thomas was the only inmate I felt a little uncomfortable around. He was perfectly nice to me, and respectful, but I had a funny feeling about him. He told me he was 61 years old. He’d been in prison for the last 34 years and was let out in 2003. As soon as he told me this, the reason he made me uncomfortable made perfect sense. I have seen dogs locked up in small cages when they are puppies. These dogs get no socialization. When people try to adopt the dog when it is 1 or 2 years old, the dog is completely crazy because they don’t know how to act. I felt the same way about Thomas. He had spent most of his life, and certainly the majority of his adulthood, in prison. To me, Thomas seemed like an unsocialized puppy. He didn’t quite know how to act. Thomas is a white man, with short white hair. He spoke with a “black” accent. Later he told me his wife was a black woman.

Thomas told me about the crimes he committed. He told me he hit a kid with a brick when he was nine, but the first time he ever got in real trouble was when went to
prison for murder. Thomas told me about his unhappiness with the jail system. Prison, according to Thomas, is hard. Inmates don’t get away with disrespecting officers. In jail, the officers don’t punish the inmates.

Thomas: These cops have no control. They don’t know how to interact with the inmates. If they [the inmates] cuss out of these women [the female officers] nothing happens. In prison they’d [the inmate] get beat down. Here they just put in eight hours [locked up for eight hours]. A lot of these young cops are fresh out of high school.

Without any prompting, Thomas told me:
Thomas: Camden County is like a big family. Cops [jail officers] are the people you grew up with. They have a job to do. [Inmates]-will say, ‘oh, we went to high school, played football together, so bring me some cigarettes’. They will ask for special favors. But cops are just trying to do their job. They try to treat you as a normal human being. When you act stupid, so do they.

Thomas then pointed out a short, round, African American woman standing in the hallway.
Thomas: See this woman? She’s my sister in law. I’m married to her sister. I don’t ask her for nothing. You have to keep it separate. She works in the mail room.
Alison: Wait, that woman right there?
Thomas: No, not the video court woman. She is one ugly woman. Her brother used to be in my wing, he was gay as a $3 dollar bill. His name was Day-Day. What kind of name is Day-Day?
Alison: Isn’t there a special area for homosexuals?
Thomas: This was a closet fag.
Alison: Ah.
Thomas: He never spoke. He tried to ask her for things. She think she owns everything.

Thomas probably could have talked to me for hour longer, but lunch was being served and he had to return to his cell. I think it is very interesting that both female officers in
the hallway during our interview had family in the Camden jail. I don’t know if it is a coincidence or the norm for officers to have family in the jail. It would be interesting to follow up with a survey of all the officers asking them if they have family members in the Camden jail.

The last inmate I interviewed was Alfonso. Alfonso was in an orange jumpsuit. He is a pudgy Hispanic man with yellowy skin and dark circles under his eyes. He answered my questioned politely, but did not give any extra information. He did not seem to want to stay and chat with me. Alfonso is 33 years old with nine children total. Five children he raised are his own and four he raised as his own, but have a different father. Alfonso is recently divorced. He seemed most eager to talk about his failed marriage and separation from his wife. As soon as he gets out of jail he plans to find a nice woman to settle down with.

Alison: Do you ever see officers from the jail out on the street?
Alfonso: Yaa. Camden is small. Everyone mostly knows everybody. You see officers out there. It feels good to see them out there instead of in here. I respect them. They just do their job.

When I asked Alfonso if it he ever had any problems finding work because of his incarceration he responded:
Alfonso: Officers here, they have connections. They see who you are, they already know you were incarcerated. They can line up jobs.

Alison: Why did the officers pick you to come talk to me?
Alfonso: The truth? Because I’m honest, I’m a good inmate, the officers know me, the officers trust me, I’m honest, I’m a hard worker, I’m a trustee, I can go inside the sergeant’s office.

After I completely my interviews, I went back to Philadelphia and began analyzing my data. I went through all my notes and highlighted every time an inmate
mentioned a relationship he had in connection to the jail. This could be a relationship the inmate had with another inmate, or a relationship between the inmate and an officer.

PART IV – CONCLUSION AND DATA ANALYSIS

Although I set out to find out about the changes in identity inmates undergo as a result of being incarcerated, I discovered a very interesting community in the Camden Jail. What is most remarkable about this jail is the relationships between both inmate/inmate and inmate/officer. Each of the inmates emphasized the relationships they had in jail.

Both Officers Juarez and Caudley commented that “all” of the inmates have friends and family in the jail. Officer Juarez mentioned “When [an inmate] come[s] out, [into the general population] they are smiling...When they get out of [admissions] they get to go live with their friends and family. Once they get out of admissions they’re not scared”. Officer Caudley echoed the opinion of Officer Juarez. “…Most of the inmates here have been incarcerated here their whole life, this is home. People have their best friends here, their cousins”.

Eddie told me specifically, he is the head of all the Latin Kings in the Camden County jail. He knows each of these men, and has control over them. He can order them to carry out tasks. He also has a strong enough relationship with the officers that officers come to him and ask him if other certain inmates are Latin Kings. If that other inmate is indeed a Latin King, and is causing trouble for the officers, Eddie can order that inmate to behave. Eddie was certainly on friendly terms with Officer Caudley as well, stating, ‘I like Officer Caudley. He doesn’t look at us like we’re animals – like we are bad people.’ Officer Caudley felt the same way about Eddie. Before I even met Eddie, Officer Caudley told me, ‘Eddie, he’s a good guy. I mean, he’s not – because he’s a criminal, but he’s a good guy’.

Out of all the inmates, Troy was the most specific about knowing officers. When Troy is not in jail he plays for a township hockey team, which includes eight men who work as officers at the Camden County jail. Considering ice hockey only has six players on the ice at once, I would imagine eight people is a significant proportion of the team.
Troy said that another five officers are his neighbors in the town of Woodside, New Jersey. These men certainly have many social connections, because Troy said that his cousin ‘does demolition work. He just knocked down [an officer’s] house.’

Isaiah and Alfonso both noted that although they aren’t close friends with any of the officers, they are usually friendly with them. Isaiah commented that ‘I see the officers all the time. I see [the officers] ride by, or at a concert or I might see them at shows. I might see them all the mall – the Strawberry Hill mall, outside Camden.’ Isaiah also told me that, ‘I know a lot of people here’. Although Alfonso didn’t mention being friends with specific officers, he said, ‘officers here, they have connections. They see who you are, they already know you were incarcerated. They can line up jobs.’

Ruben also spoke of his relationship with the guards. He told me, ‘guards here now, that own property, they say, ‘Yo man, I’ll be glad when you get out, I have work for you’. Ruben more thoroughly explained that relationship by saying, ‘see on the street… [In jail] I was in a situation, and the guards just have a job to do. So the guards are like, what up man, buy you a drink or something. People got family members here. It’s cool though. A couple officers, I did work for them in their houses. It’s not a hate relationship. They [the officers] just not gonna jeopardize they job for you. Like give you cigarettes or something.’ However, it seemed as though Ruben was also allowed some special treatment. He had been talking to some of the officers in the sergeant’s office, and left his coffee there. According to jail policy, inmates are not allowed in the offices.

Thomas echoed Ruben and Troy when he asserted that just because an inmate knows an officer, it does not mean the officer will give the inmate special treatment. The officers are just trying to do their jobs, and will get fired if they provide special treatment. Thomas remarked, ‘Camden County is like a big family. Cops [jail officers] are the people you grew up with. They have a job to do. [Inmates] will say, ‘oh, we went to high school, played football together, so bring me some cigarettes’. They will ask for special favors. But cops are just trying to do their job. They try to treat you as a normal human being. When you act stupid, so do they.’ Thomas also told me about the close relationships he and other inmates had with some of the officers. He told me about his sister-in-law, who works in the mailroom. He made sure to mention that, ‘I don’t ask her for nothing. You have to keep it separate.’ When Thomas pointed out his sister-in-law, I
thought he was pointing to another officer. He corrected me, and informed me that, 'her brother used to be in my wing... He never spoke. He tried to ask her for things. She think she owns everything.'

Ricardo and Daniel were the only inmates who did not mention knowing other inmates or officers. This may partly be because both Ricardo and Daniel had their own agendas of what they wanted to talk about. Ricardo was more nervous, and wanted to focus on his childhood. He told me he had no one to talk to and it felt good for someone to listen to his problems. Daniel had a hard time listening to my questions and responding to them. I think he liked to listen to himself talk, and wanted an audience for his views on life.

I found my entire interviewing experience very rewarding. I think all the inmates who I spoke with enjoyed talking about their pasts. It would be arrogant to say that I helped them get their lives on track, but I do think I helped them think about their situation in a way they might not have before. When the inmates had children, I asked them how they would feel if their kids would be arrested. Every single inmate told me that they do not want their children to go to jail. Then I asked them how they would prevent their kids from going to jail. Some inmates said they would move away from Camden, others didn’t know. I suggested the inmates talked to their children about choices people make, and what choices the inmates made to get them arrested. I also told the inmates to help their children with schoolwork and encourage them to stay in school. I don’t know if any of the inmates will do this, but at least they were thinking about it.

It is very interesting that officers are so close to their inmates. Although the inmates noted that officers don’t hook them up with extra food or cigarettes, it does seem like the officers go out of their way help inmates, especially finding jobs. I did not hear about any job programs paid for by the city or by the jail, but three of my interviewees commented about working on personal jobs for the officers. This is not the type of social interaction I would have expected between inmates and officers.

According to Foucault, the Panopticon is set up so that the guards can watch over all of the inmates without being seen by the guards. This anonymity is supposed to further the punishment of the prisoner. However, these officers do not seem to be trying to impose punishment. The examples of officers helping prisoners upon their release.
from jail include both Alfonso and Ruben stating that officers help them get work outside of jail. This suggests officers are trying to help (perhaps unconsciously) rehabilitate the offenders.

During high school I volunteered at the Denver County Jail. This jail was very different from Camden. What was most striking to me was the amount of freedom prisoners at the Camden County Correctional Facility had. At the Denver jail, inmates were not allowed to move around the jail. Nor were they talking in a friendly manner with the guards. The inmates in Denver would bang on the bars of their cell, throw objects from their cells, and make sexual comments to me. I was shocked that when I had my tour with Officer Juarez this did not happen. One or two inmates told me I was beautiful, but nothing compared to the 'will you bend over for me' comments I had in the Denver jail. Mostly the inmates greeted Officer Juarez with smiles and handshakes. Overall, I felt like there was significantly more respect in the Camden jail than in Denver.

The freedom that the Camden inmates possessed, I believe, is due to the prisoners and the jail officers knowing each other outside of the jail walls. Even though not all of the prisoners have personal relationships, Camden still has a small town feeling.

Another interesting aspect of my interviews was that most of my interviewees were older in age. The men ranged 29 to 61, but most were in their 30s. I believe the reason my interviewees were in this older age range was because most of the officers were in this age range as well. Since the people I interviewed were closer with the officers it is no surprise that the inmates and officers were school peers who grew up together and obviously are still the same age. Perhaps by being in the same age range, regardless of incarceration, allows people to share similar values and become friends.

Troy was the only person who did not consider Camden home. Even though both Ricardo and Ruben were not born in Camden, when I first asked, “where are you from” they both said Camden. Only after I asked where they were born did they tell me other cities. Each of these men, even Troy, is an integral part of the Camden community.

The Camden County Correctional Facility becomes an extension of this Camden community rather than isolation from the town. The relationships between inmates and officers has little to do with whether or not a person has been incarcerated, but rather what relationship the inmate and officer have outside of jail. These relationships may be a
brother and a sister, or teammates. It is these outside relationships that stay intact when a person enters the jail. In fact incarceration does not seem to change a person’s status as far as relationships are concerned. Being arrested makes one person in the friendship or classmate relationship a convict. I hypothesized that once a person became an “inmate” instead of a “classmate” the change in identity would affect the relationship between the classmates. However, this does not seem to be the case. Inmates understand that in a jail situation, an officer can’t give them special treatment, but the inmate and officer still have a friendship-based relationship. This most certainly complicates our ideas of self-identity and status.

The structure of the Camden County Correctional Facility does not seem to follow the six rules of punishment set out by Foucault. Observers of the punishment are not taken aback by its severity. Even though the jail is set up with the officers watching the prisoners from all angles, the idea of the Panopticon does not apply. Prisoners are not forced to stay in their cell, without interaction among other human beings. The idea of public shaming does not apply to Camden either. Officers — friends and family of the inmates — know about inmates’ crimes. It does not seem to be a successful deterrent for friends and family to know about a person’s incarceration.

The William James sense of self does seem to apply. Inmates do have a certain “jail self” in which the inmates in interviewed know they cannot ask the officers for extra food or cigarettes. In a brother/sister relationship it would not be unacceptable to ask for second helpings of dinner, or bum a cigarette. However, the officers seem to have less of a different “jail self”. Even though officers know they can’t give inmates special items like food, they do help the inmates by providing jobs. This is a type of behavior one would expect from a friend or sibling.

In Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration, Pattillo et al. reiterate what I found in Camden. “...Imprisonment is no longer a symptom of deviance; its sheer extent challenges us to think about incarceration as an increasingly normal event in the lives of young disadvantaged men” (Pattillo et al, 3). Because so many people are being arrested it becomes part of the norm. The threat of incarceration can no longer be used as a mechanism for social control. Officers can still have friend and family relationships with the inmates because being arrested is no longer looked down upon.
This system is a positive feedback cycle. The more people who are arrested, the more officers continue to maintain friendships with the inmates in jail. The more friendships that are maintained, the more people will be arrested because they do not see incarceration as a punishment.

The idea that the Camden jail is an extension of culture is similar to Doug Foley’s ethnographic study of a high school in Texas. Even though the populations are different, in both groups of people, the town culture is on full display in these locations. Foley discusses racism in America, by stating, “this study shows how schools are sites for popular culture practices that stage or reproduce social inequality” (Foley, xv). The Camden County jail also becomes a site for cultural practices. These practices include helping inmates find jobs, hanging out in the hallways of the jail and discussing the town gossip.

The research I conducted and the data I obtained from interviewing inmates at the Camden County Correctional Facility is most certainly an interesting addition to the anthropological database. Similar to Foley’s findings in Texas, my findings confirm that a jail is an expansion of the community and provides an excellent setting for cultural reproduction. It would be fascinating to continue researching inmates at the Camden facility to determine how explicitly important the jail is to the Camden community, not only in an economic sense, but in a cultural sense as well.
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List study personnel who have been designated and trained by the PI to be involved in the informed consent process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding/Grants</th>
<th>Grant (Office of Research Services Institution # Status (Pending, Awarded))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Is this protocol part of a larger (Prime) grant? If yes, provide the following:
   - Title of Prime Grant:
   - ORS # for the Prime Grant:  
   - IRB #  

2. Is this part of a multi-site study? If yes, list the institution name and the Federalwide Assurance Numbers for each site?

3. Are individuals not affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania or another research institution acting as co-investigators in the study?
   - If yes, contact the Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA) for an independent investigator agreement.

4. Are other individuals not affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania and not acting as co-investigators assisting the PI in the research? If yes, explain their role in the protocol summary.

5. Certain vulnerable populations are afforded additional protections under the federal regulations. Human subjects involved in the proposed activity include any of the following special populations/categories? If yes, consult ORA for guidance.
   - Minors
   - Pregnant Women
   - Prisoners
   - Fetuses
   - NONE of the above listed special populations/categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. Some populations may be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence. Does your research involve any of the following groups? If yes, describe in the protocol summary any additional safeguards for these subjects.

- Diminished capacity/Impaired decision-making ability
- Economically disadvantaged
- Elderly
- Terminally or seriously ill
- Homeless
- Drug addiction, alcoholism, substance abuse
- UPenn employees or students
- HIV-positive subjects

- [ ] [ ]

7. Has the Principal Investigator taken the on-line Patient Oriented Research training (questions call OHR: 215-746-7400)
   - IF YES, attach copy of certification. (required by School of Medicine for all SOM Faculty)

- [ ] [ ]

List all study team members (Sub-investigators, Coordinators) and anyone involved with the conduct of the study. If more than 5 names, attach a separate sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>POR training?</th>
<th>PennCard ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REQUIRED SIGNATURES:** The department chair's signature for the individual department's with faculty participating in this study in addition to the principal investigator and principal investigator's department chair's signature, are required below. If additional signatures are required in excess of the number of spots below, please obtain and identify the appropriate signatures on another sheet and attach it to this form.

**Principal Investigator (PI) Signature**

- Printed Name of PI

**PI's Dept. Chair's Signature or Dean's Signature if PI is Dept. Chair**

- Printed Name of PI's Dept. Chair/Dean

**Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean's Signature**

- Printed Name of Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean

**Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean's Signature**

- Printed Name of Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean

**Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean's Signature**

- Printed Name of Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean

**Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean's Signature**

- Printed Name of Co-Investigator's Dept. Chair/Dean
Title of the Research Study: Incarceration as a Possible Mechanism for Change in Identity
Principle Investigator: Dr. Paula
Co-investigator: Alison
Emergency Contacts: Deputy Warden Simon or any Camden County Correctional Facility Officer.

I would like to interview you for a research project about how being in jail affects the ways you think about yourself. I am doing this project for my senior thesis, and I would appreciate your help. If you choose to participate, please sign this form. If you do not want to, you do not have to sign this form. You were asked to participate because you are over the age of 18, and you have had the experience of being in jail. If you have any questions about this research, please ask me. I will read the form with you as we review it together. Please ask me if you don’t understand anything about this consent form. If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to sign this form and a copy will be given for you to keep.

What is the purpose of the study? The purpose is to learn more about whether or not people’s feelings about themselves change as a result of being in jail. None of the information I receive will ever be published. All names will be changed before I write my final paper and any information that could identify you will be changed. You will not receive any payment for being in this study.

Where will the study take place? The study will take place at the Camden County Correctional facility for the next four months. The interviews will held in the visitation area.

What will you be asked to do? I am asking permission to interview you between 1 and 3 times over the next four months. Each interview will last between 30-90 minutes. You will be one of 3-10 people in this study. You will be asked to answer some questions about how you feel about being in jail. I will not ask you anything about your case, and I will stop you if you start to talk about your case because that information is not relevant to this research study. In order to remember what you tell me, I will take notes.

What are the risks? This is a very minimal risk study. Talking about your experiences might make you feel sad or uncomfortable. Although your confidentiality will be protected in every way possible, there is always a chance someone might know you were interviewed. This shouldn’t be considered a major risk, since this research will never be published and very few people will actually read the final report. Also, I do not plan on asking you any information that could get you in trouble. I just want to know how you feel.

How will you benefit from the study? There are no direct benefits to you by being in this study. However, there is the benefit of introspection, which means actively talking might help you reflect back on an experience and make you feel better. There is also the
benefit of by educating me; I will be able to be more sensitive to the possible identity changes inmates undergo, if I ever want to work with inmates.

**What other choices do you have?** You may choose not to be in this study.

**What happens if you do not choose to join the research study?** There will be no negative consequences. Whether or not you choose to take part in this study will have no affect upon any services you receive at the jail or on any decisions made concerning your probation or parole.

**When is the study over? Can I leave the study before it ends?** Your part in the study will be over when our interview sessions are finished. All the interviews will be completed by February, 2006. You have the right to drop out of in the research study anytime during the study. You can drop out by telling Deputy Warden Simon.

**How will confidentiality be maintained and your privacy be protected?** I will keep all the information you tell me during the study strictly confidential, except as required by law. The only exception is if you tell me you have a current plan to harm yourself or another or that you have committed child abuse. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Pennsylvania is responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of research volunteers like you. The IRB has access to this consent form. Any documents you sign, where you can be identified by name will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my advisor’s office at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. These documents will be kept confidential. All the documents will be destroyed when the study is over. Your name will never be used in the final paper; you will be given a fake name when I reference our interview.

**Who do you contact if you have a question about your rights and welfare?:** If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a volunteer in the research study please contact the Office of Regulatory Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania at 215-898-2614. You may also contact Deputy Warden Simon or any other Camden County Correctional Facility Officer.

**Who do you contact if you have questions about the study?** Deputy Warden Simon or any other Camden County Correctional Facility Guards. He has my contact information and will be able to assist you contacting me.

**When you sign this document, you are agreeing to take part in this research study. If you have any questions or there is something you do not understand, please ask. You will receive a copy of this consent document.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name of Subject</th>
<th>Signature of Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name of Interviewer</th>
<th>Signature of Interviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for inmates:

Basically, I want to know about people's perception of jail.
--Did it change once the person was arrested and/or incarcerated?
--Did being in jail change the person's perception of himself?
--How does the entire situation of being in jail make you feel?

The following are some questions I would like to start by asking:

Background Questions:
--Age
--Where did you grow up
--What kind of neighborhood
--Who with? Siblings, relatives
--What family do you have now? Children, wife, girlfriend
--Who do you live with now
--What jobs have you had, past/present

How is Personal Identity and Breaking the Law Incorporated:
--How old were you when you first got in trouble with police
--Were you arrested
--How did your family react
--How do you feel about jail
  --Before you were arrested? Now? (If not the 1st time being arrested)
--Has your feeling toward jail changed over time?

The most important two questions are: How did you feel about jail before you were ever arrested and how do you feel about jail now? Any subsequent questions will somehow revolve around these two key questions.
I. INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES

Introduction and Purpose:

State the name and purpose of the study.

Name: Senior Thesis: Incarceration as a possible mechanism for change in identity
Purpose: To understand how incarceration affects a person's identity. This research is solely for my senior thesis in anthropology and I have no intentions of publication.

Principle Investigator: Dr. Paula Sabloff
Co-investigator: Alison Peters

- Provide the basic information concerning the rationale for the study and the previous data to support the research.

Background:

Discuss the background of the research problem, prior published data, and the nature of the research question as well as the resulting rationale for the proposed study.

Basic Information: I want to understand whether or not being arrested and incarcerated changes a person's identity.

Previous Data: There are a number of well documented accounts of incarceration. Much of the literature I discovered concerned prisons more than jail. I found literature that supported the claim that jail/prison/being incarcerated was detrimental to one's personhood, as well as claims that being arrested/in jail/in prison was simply part of one's life and life path. For example, gang member and author Colton Simpson comments on his first experience being arrested as causing more respect in his neighborhood: "I'm released back to my 'hood to discover doing time solidified my reputation by proving I'm rugged and raw" (Simpson, 33) However, authors such as Jane Hubert view incarceration (not just prisons but also mental institutions) as "When people move into [being incarcerated], they enter a 'marginal state'. They no longer have a place in the social system... people who enter this marginal state are then perceived as both vulnerable and dangerous" (Hubert, 197)

Background:

Most of data I found did not correspond to my topic. I mean, it's possible I am just not looking in the right place. However, what I seem to be finding is either gang literature that suggests that going to jail/prison is a part of life. For example, one ex-gang member writes about his first time the effects of his first time being arrested: "I'm released back to my 'hood to discover doing time solidified my reputation by proving I'm rugged and raw" (Simpson, 33) However, the gang literature does not actually focus on the affects of being incarcerated. The other literature I discovered regarding incarceration focuses on the family/community. One
article in *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*, edited by Mary Pattillo et al., focused on how having a father in prison breaks down the family unit and is detrimental not only to the father who is actually incarcerated but also to the mother raising her children alone, and to the children themselves. I haven't actually found any literature regarding the change in identity of a specific individual due to being incarcerated. I have, however, read literature about how drastic life changes (like being fired from a job) can "threaten" someone's sense of self identity. I just haven't found the two (identity change and prison literature) put together. Glynis Breakwell's article regarding "Threats to Identity" develops the idea that "...it has been suggested that the individual may shift positions in the social matrix and that this will lead to a changed pattern of influences which impinge upon the identity." (Breakwell, 40) In this publication, Breakwell discusses how changes in social status etc can be threatening to a person's sense of self. That is, when a person encounters a situation or life change (such as being arrested/incarcerated) that a person previously did not incorporate into his or her identity, it becomes a threat. The person must somehow cope with this change to identity. My study is intended to understand if being arrested/incarcerated DOES INDEED pose a threat, and if it does, how does it pose a threat. I hypothesize that whether or not incarceration is a threat to identity will vary depending on the individual. For my methods, I plan to use the anthropological technique of interviewing and analyzing as described by Bernard, in *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, as well as the guidelines established by my advisor and other anthropologists. Since this is my first time doing my own research I am taking a lot of advice from other people!

- Summarize the available data (published or unpublished, if available) that could have significance or which is necessary to place the research in current context of our understanding of the area.

Summarize: Please see above

- Discuss how any preliminary data justifies the research.

Discuss Data: Please see above

**Study Aims:**

- State the questions and goals of the research study; including the hypothesis being tested or questions to be explored. Protocols often refer to primary, and secondary objectives based on the amount of data to be collected and the breadth of area, or number of subjects to be enrolled.

Study Aims:

Questions and Goals: This study is designed to understand whether or not individual identity changes when one undergoes incarceration.
II. STUDY DESIGN

- Describe and justify the research design. The study should be designed to answer a specific research question through achieving the stated objectives and aims of the study.

Describe and Justify: Please see study aims

Describe in steps how the study will be implemented.

Describe in Steps: I have already contacted the Deputy Warden of the Camden County Correctional Facility, to make sure that I can interview individuals. Before I can interview anyone in his jail, he will have them sign an press release form (please see attached) as well as my own consent form. He said I can conduct interviews on any day that works for me, preferably in the morning. Therefore, I will be conducting interviews on Thursday mornings starting at 9:00AM. Depending on how long each interview lasts, I will be able to interview between 1-3 different people each Thursday that I come in. I suggested to the Deputy Warden that I could create a flyer describing my study that could be displayed in an area that is accessible to all inmates. (Or in multiple areas so each person has a fair chance of seeing the flyer). If anyone is interested, they will contact the Officers of Corrections in their area, who will then notify the Deputy Warden as to who is interested. He thinks that a snowball sampling will work better. Therefore, I plan to use snowball sampling, with the first recruits recommended to me by either the Deputy Warden or one of the other guards. I plan on interviewing between 3-10 individuals in a one on one basis free form in depth interview. I plan on conducting between 1-3 interviews with each individual. The interviews will last between 30-90 minutes. I will ask interviewees on an individual basis if they will allow me to tape record the interview. This is analyze my data and write my thesis.

- Identify the research methods, qualitative, quantitative or mixed method that will be used to achieve the aims and objectives of the study. Be specific about the types of qualitative methods such as ethnography, survey, interview, focus group and combination thereof to be utilized in the research. Explain the significance of each research method in achieving the overall objectives of the study. If snowball sampling is used, describe how the first individuals will be recruited.

Identify Research Methods: This research is solely qualitative. I will use some ethnographic methods, such as touring the jail and speaking to the Deputy Warden and Correctional Officers to gain context and gain a sense of the environment. The significance of using ethnography in this study is to have the ability to see first hand what the inmates are referring to, when they speak about the specific incarceration at the Camden County Jail. Most of my research method will be through interviewing inmates. The significance of interview style research is that it gives each person their own voice. The specific word choices individuals make when discussing their feelings regarding jail/incarceration will be vital to my study. I will have no surveys nor focus groups. After the flyers are displayed in the jail, or if for some reason they are ineffective, it is possible I will use snowball sampling (as allowed in anthropological research). I will recruit my
first participants from recommendations from the Deputy Warden and Correctional Officers.

Describe how the data will be collected and maintained.

Data Collected and Maintained: The data will be collected between 1-3 interviews lasting 30-90 min using 3-10 subjects. The interviews will be conducted within the Camden County Jail in a room at the Deputy Warden’s discretion. (A room he feels will be safest for both the inmate and me.) The data will be collected by taking notes. I will ask the inmates on an individual basis if it is all right for me to audio-tape record our sessions. This is only to help me because I am a slow note taker, and often people talk faster than I can write. All of my data, notes and possible audio tapes will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my advisor’s office.

- Explain the number of subjects to be enrolled. Once the IRB approves the number of subjects to be enrolled, no additional subjects can be enrolled without re-approval from the IRB.

Number of Subjects: I plan to interview between 3-10 subjects. The amount of subjects I use will depend on how much information I can gather from each individual. Since I have not interviewed anyone yet, I am not sure how much I will be able to learn from each person. There is only one site for this research.

- State the duration of the study. Be specific in terms of hours, days, months and years.

Duration of the Study: This study will be completed, and all my data will be analyzed and written up by April 2006, as this is my senior thesis and I graduate in May. The actual interview itself will last between 30-90 min. There will be no more than 1-3 interviews per individual. All the data will be collected between the months of November 2005 to February 2006.

- Describe how the aims of the study can be met within the specified duration of the study.

Aims: The aims can be met within the specified duration because this is not a long term study. I simply want to ask participants how they felt about jail before they were incarcerated, and how do they feel about jail now. (Now that they are actually incarcerated.)

- Explain where the research will be conducted and where the data will be analyzed. If the study is conducted at more than one site, such as a lab and an office include the location of both sites.

Where: The data will be collected at the Camden County Correctional Facility, in Camden, NJ. The actual room that I hold the interviews in will be at the discretion of the
Deputy Warden. The data will be analyzed once I am back at the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, PA.

- Include the expected duration of subject participation (the amount of time terms of years, months, weeks, days and hours) and a description of the sequence and duration of all trial periods involving data collection from subjects including follow-up, if any.

Expected Duration: The subjects only need to participate for a total of 1-3 interviews. This is a total of 0 years, over the course of no longer than 3 months (from October to February). No participant shall be interviewed more than 30-90 minutes in one day. The first interview will consist of the bulk of data collection. Please see attached sheet for the questions I will be asking. Subsequent interviews will only be conducted if I deem them necessary.

- For telephone pre-screening, inform potential subjects up front about the location and duration of the study.

Telephone Prescreening: There is no telephone prescreening.

III. SUBJECT SELECTION & WITHDRAWAL

This section addresses the involvement of human research subjects. Describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria, including that of special populations, protection from risk, recruitment procedures, potential benefits, the process of informed consent, and the knowledge to be gained from the study.

Describe the process for identifying, recruiting and enrolling subjects. If applicable, describe methods for sampling larger populations and randomization procedures if conducting experimental manipulations.

Process for identifying, recruiting and enrolling: Subjects are identified by being held at Camden County Jail. They must be over the age of 18 and classified as “yellow” or “orange.” Yellow and orange refer to the colored jumpsuits inmates are issued at the time of their arrival at the Camden jail. Inmates are assigned a number ranging from 1-10, based on the charge(s), past history of crime, mental and physical health and past behavior if the inmate was previously incarcerated at the Camden jail. Yellow and orange are regarded as “minimum” (1-3, sometimes 4), blue is considered “medium” (4-6) and red is reserved for “maximum” – inmates receiving a 7 or higher on the classification scale. Both men and women use this color system. (They will be recruited by the process I explained above. If they choose to participate, I will be informed and enroll them in my study as long as they fit the selection criteria.

- Describe the circumstances and procedures for subject withdrawal from the study.
Process of withdrawal: If a person chooses to withdraw they will not speak to me, or ask to leave the interview session. They can stop the interview at any time and ask to leave. If they choose to withdrawal I will destroy all data I collected on them (and obviously not use it in my final paper.)

**Inclusion Criteria:**

Create a numbered list of eligibility criteria subjects must meet to be in the study.

Inclusion Criteria:

**Numbered List:**

1. Subjects must be 18 years of age or older.
2. Subjects are classified by the Camden County Correctional Facility as "yellow" or "orange." Or, simply inmates who have been given a jumpsuit of any color to wear, thus insuring that they have been exposed to the general population of the jail and not just a holding cell.

Restrictions: The only restriction I have is age, because I want to focus my research on adults.

Discuss and provide a compelling rationale for the specific inclusion of vulnerable groups such as prisoners, minors and pregnant women. Other groups may be considered vulnerable and undergo additional protections on a case basis, for instance persons who are; cognitively impaired, economically and socially disadvantaged, captive populations, terminally ill, mentally ill, HIV+, drug addiction, alcoholism, homelessness and the elderly persons.

Compelling reason for including prisoners: My research question is specifically designed to target the population of society that is incarcerated. The group of people I want to work with is specifically defined as people who have been arrested and incarcerated.

**Exclusion Criteria:**

- Create a numbered list of criteria that would exclude an individual from the research study. Generally this would include age, gender, physical or mental conditions. Please provide a justification for doing so.

Exclusion Criteria:

**Numbered List:**

1. Anyone under the age of 18 years. The justification is that I want to focus on adults.
2. Anyone who has never been arrested, and is not currently incarcerated at the Camden County Correctional Facility. The justification is that this is a study
attempting to understand whether or not incarceration has an affect on an individual. If an individual has never been arrested, it is impossible to tell if incarceration has had an affect. (Since it’s never occurred.) They would not have undergone the necessary life experiences to be able to contribute to this study.

3. Individuals classified as “blue” or “red.” The justification is to more specifically study a smaller subunit of the population. If I choose to exclude anyone not assigned a jumpsuit, this would eliminate inmates who have not been placed in the general population of the jail and have only been exposed to a holding cell. I believe that if someone has only been in a holding cell and has not seen the interior of the jail, they do not have the life experience of “jail” to alter their identity, and would not be suitable research subjects.

4. Individuals who do not speak English, or have such severe mental illness that they cannot communicate with me in an English, oral interview.

- There may be other populations that would not be appropriate for the study, list them and explain why they should not be enrolled.

Other populations: People who are not appropriate for this study are people who have never been arrested.

**Subject Recruitment and Screening:**

- Describe how subjects will be identified and recruited for the study. If snowball method will be used discuss the process and how the first individuals will be recruited.

Subject Recruitment and Screening:

Identified and Recruited: Subjects are identified by the process as stated above. I chose to use a snowball sampling to recruit interviewees. The first individual will be from a referral from a Correctional Officer/Deputy Warden.

Discuss all the methods used to identify and recruit subjects including referrals from physician offices, clinics, programs, or through advertisements and brochures.

Recruitment Material: I will use snowball sampling with my first recruits as recommendations by the Deputy Warden or other guards.

**Early Withdrawal of Subjects:**

Describe the scenarios under which a subject may be withdrawn from the study prior the expected completion of the project. Such reasons might include safety of the subject,
failure of subject to return for visits, failure to locate the subject and if subjects withdraw their consent. Explain any safety reasons in sufficient detail.

Early Withdrawal of Subjects:

Scenarios: Hopefully I will be able to collect all the data I need during one interview session. However, since the nature of my interview is open and free form, it is possible I will want to ask some follow up questions. A second or third interview is therefore not mandatory and will not impede my study, so it is not a great threat to my study if an inmate is not available to have a second or third interview. (In the event the inmate is in court, released, chooses to withdraw or some other unforeseen event occurs.) I am, however, asking to conduct a range of interviews (between 1-3) to give me flexibility just in case I think of something that would greatly advance my research after the first interview has terminated.

- Describe how subjects can withdraw from the study. The requirements for the process of withdraw should be consistent with the capabilities of the subjects under study. For instance, requiring a homeless, mentally ill or illiterate subject to provide to the PI written notice of intent to withdraw may be difficult. Other options should be considered and consistent with the group under study.

Process of withdrawal: If a person chooses to withdrawal they will refuse the interview or will ask to leave the interview session. They can stop the interview at any time and ask to leave. If they choose to withdrawal I will destroy all data I collected on them (and obviously not use it in my final paper.)

IV. METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

Please Note: Included in this section is information on maintaining confidentiality.

Study Instruments:

Discuss the particulars of the research instruments, questionnaires and other evaluation instruments in detail. Provide validation documentation and or procedures to be used to validate instruments. For well know and generally accepted test instruments the detail here can be brief. More detail may be required for a novel or new instrument.

Instruments: Please see attached questionnaire.

- For ethnographic studies identify any study instruments to be used (i.e. for deception studies) and describe in detail where, when and how the study will be conducted and who or what are the subjects of study.

Please see above.
• For oral histories or interviews provide the general framework for questioning and means of data collection.

Please see attached.

If interviews or groups settings are to be audio taped or video taped describe in detail the conditions under which it will take place.

Audio-Taping: I will be in a private interview with one single inmate. I will only audio tape if that specific inmate grants me permission. The audio tapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my thesis advisor’s office. They will be destroyed at the University Museum in April of 2006.

Method for Assigning Subjects to Groups:

Describe how subjects will be randomized to groups.

Methods for Assigning Subjects to Groups: There will be no research conducted in groups.

Administration of Surveys and/or Process:

Administration of Surveys: I will not be using surveys in this study.

Maintenance of data security:

Describe the steps to be taken to protect and preserve the confidentiality of subject information.

• Describe the use of pseudonyms, code numbers and how listing of such identifiers will be kept separate from the research data.

Steps Taken: All names of all individuals will be changed before I write my final paper. All my data will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a secure location – the office of my thesis advisor. All my notes and anything with identifiers (like names) on it will be destroyed after I have written my final paper, no later than April 2006.

Subject Follow-up:

Please Note: For SBS research that includes transient groups; describe how follow-up will be managed.

• If multiple visits are required discuss methods to contact subjects and what will happen if the subject is lost to the study before all data is collected.
Multiple Visits: Hopefully I will be able to collect all the data I need during one interview session. However, since the nature of my interview is open and free form, it is possible I will want to ask some follow up questions. A second or third interview is therefore not mandatory and will not impede my study, so it is not a great threat to my study if an inmate is not available to have a second or third interview. (In the event the inmate is in court, released, chooses to withdraw or some other unforeseen event occurs.) I am, however, asking to conduct a range of interviews (between 1-3) to give me flexibility just in case I think of something that would greatly advance my research after the first interview has terminated.

Describe if and how the researcher will assess and track subject compliance with the requirements of the research.

Tracking Subjects: Since they are incarcerated by the Camden County Correctional Facility, by definition, the subjects must be in the Camden jail.

Describe the follow-up process in the event that while participating in the study a subject is imprisoned, committed to a mental hospital, hospitalized for long term care, admitted to a drug/alcohol residential program, a residential living facility or alike.

Follow-up Process if Subject leaves: In the event the subject leaves the Camden County Jail, I will not do a follow up interview on that specific subject.

V. STUDY PROCEDURES

Explain sequentially the study procedure, including all the visits, contacts, and interactions. Also, for research of a sensitive psychological or emotional nature that recruits subjects vulnerable to the study questions or procedures, describe how professional attention will be provided for subjects if necessary.

Study Procedure: I plan on interviewing between 3-10 individuals in a one on one basis free form in depth interview. I plan on conducting between 1-3 interviews with each individual. If at any point after the first interview I feel my research could greatly benefit from a second interview, I will contact the Deputy Warden, and ask to re-interview said individual. All interviews will last between 30-90 minutes. This is the only contact and interaction I will have with the participants. I will interview them using the questions (attached) I have submitted to this board as a guide.

Describe the procedures to be performed to monitor the safety or inconvenience of the procedure.

Monitor Safety: There will be a Correctional Officer present at all times to monitor both my safety and the safety of the inmate.
• Describe assessments that can be performed to detect and report unanticipated events that could affect the subject's willingness to continue in the study.

Detect Unwillingness: If the subject is not speaking to me, I will understand this as an unwillingness to participate and I will see if the study wishes to withdrawal.

VI. STATISTICAL PLAN

I am not conducting a statistical analysis.

VII. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Benefits:

Please Note: Financial compensation for participating in study is not considered a benefit and may not be described as such.

Include any potential for benefit to the participant, to society and/or to the research community.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to participating in this study. Benefits include contributing one’s thoughts so that a larger community of inmates may be better understood. There is however, the benefit of introspection. Talking to a person about their own life provides a pathway for introspection. It is possible that there are great long term benefits for the greater good of the community such as understanding whether or not there are threats to ones identity after being incarcerated. Understanding the feelings people go through when people are arrested could help us better design jails, and policies regarding incarceration that are less psychologically damaging to inmates as well as better for our society as a whole.

Subject Confidentiality:

Describe how the confidentiality of subject will be maintained.

Maintained: Subject confidentiality will be maintained by using pseudonyms.

Describe if and how the data will be de-identified.

Data De-Identified: The only people who will have access to my data are my advisor and me. I will destroy all data that has identifiers (such as names) on it after I have completed my paper. I will never use real names to refer to the inmates or in my paper.

Explain how the data will be kept confidential throughout the course of the research identifying those persons in possession of and/or who will have access to the data.

Explain where and how the data will be stored and protected during the active research process.
Stored: The data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my thesis advisor, Dr. Paula Sabloff's office at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology. The only two people who will have access to this data are Dr. Sabloff and me.

Explain what will happen to the data at the conclusion of the study: if the data will be destroyed, retained and/or shared with other investigators for future research. If video and/or audiotapes were used in the data collection process describe the disposition of the tapes and/or discs at the conclusion of the study.

Conclusion of Study: I will destroy all my notes with identifiers at the end of the study. All audio recordings will be erased and then destroyed.

Compensation:

Compensation: There will be no compensation for participating in this study.

Risks:

- Typically, SBS does not pose severe or life threatening risks to subjects. However, the risk of harm can occur and should not be underappreciated. Some risks of harm are foreseeable and others unforeseeable. For example, a foreseeable risk may include; psychological distress during and after a study of post-traumatic stress syndrome (PTSD) that involves subjects diagnosed with PTSD. Another example, a psychological test that in and of itself is routine and poses no more than minimal risk, may be considered more than minimal risk if taken by a person who suffers from a mental illness, severe anxiety or depression.

- Other foreseeable risks may include risks associated with a possible loss of confidentiality. Investigators should be sensitive to the vulnerabilities of the population under study and how a breach of confidentiality may impact a subject's standing with the community, employer, spouse, school and alike.

Risks: This is a minimal risk study. I will not discuss any sensitive subjects such as drug abuse or criminal history with the participants. I only want to know if and how their perception of jail changed from the time before incarceration to the time after/during arrest and incarceration. It is possible that talking about jail might make an inmate feel sad or uncomfortable. Although the inmate's confidentiality will be protected in every way possible, there is always a chance ones true identity might be known. This shouldn't be considered a major risk, since this research will never be published, very few people will actually read the final report. Also, I do not plan on asking you any information that could get you in trouble. I just want to know how you feel. In the event of a possible loss of confidentiality there will be no threat to exposing sensitive material (because I will have avoided collecting sensitive material.)
Risk/Benefit Ratio:

- Describe the relative benefits obtained from the research in relation to the potential risks of the study. The risk of participating in the study should be balanced against the benefits to be realized by the potential subject and/or society.

Risk/Benefit Ratio: Since there is no real risk—the risk is minimal, and the benefit is to the greater good of society, the benefit in participating in this study outweighs the risk.

VII. INFORMED CONSENT

- Unless waived by the IRB all potential subjects will be provided a written consent document that describes the study and provides sufficient information for them to make an informed decision about whether or not to participate in the study.

Please see attached consent form

VIII. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Funding Source:

Describe how the study will be financed.

The study is 100% funded by me. The only cost is the transportation cost— that of gasoline, and the tolls for the bridge.

IX. PUBLICATION PLAN

State whether there is intent to publish or present the results of the proposed research. Identify who holds primary responsibility for publication of the results of the study.

None of this data, nor the final paper will ever be published. I am only researching and writing about this topic for my senior thesis.
To: To Whom it May Concern

From: D/W James J. Simon #03

Date: 17, November 2005

Re: Inmate Interviews

Ms. Peters has permission to interview inmates within the Camden County Correctional Facility. The Interviews will be conducted in the visiting area of the institution, it will be conducted via phone with a piece of 1” glass in between Ms. Peters and the Inmate. No Audio Equipment is permitted in the Institution. The Officer monitoring the interview will be in an enclosed booth unable to hear the interview conducted by Ms. Peters. Any questions you may have, you may contact me at 856-756-2201.
November 1, 2005

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Deputy Warden Simon allow Alison Peters to interview and audiotape Camden County Correctional Facility inmates for her senior thesis between the months of November 2005 and February 2006.

[Signature]
Deputy Warden James Simon
Appendix F

Department of Corrections
Joseph Ripa
Freeholder Liaison
Eric Taylor
Warden

Office of the Warden
Correctional Facility
330 Federal Street
Camden, New Jersey 08103
phone 856.225.7632
fax 856.964.3207
etaylor@camdencounty.com

www.camdencounty.com

Date

Resident's Name __________________________ CCCF# __________

Name of news media representative __________________________

Name of news media represented __________________________

Name of media organization __________________________

I, the above-named resident, have been advised that the above
mentioned reporter wishes to interview me.

I, __________________________, do freely give permission to the
above-named news media representative to interview me and I do
hereby authorize the news media represented by this person to use
any information gathered about me during this interview for any
legitimate purpose.

I, __________________________, DO NOT give permission to the
above-named news media representative to interview me.

I, __________________________, do freely give permission to the
above-named news media to take photos of me (still, movie, or
video) as well as voice recordings and I do hereby authorize the
use of such pictures or recordings for any legitimate purpose.

I, __________________________, DO NOT give permission to the
above-named photo session.

Resident's signature __________________________

Witness __________________________ Title __________________________
§46.301 Applicability.

(a) The regulations in this subpart are applicable to all biomedical and behavioral research conducted or supported by the Department of Health and Human Services involving prisoners as subjects.

(b) Nothing in this subpart shall be construed as indicating that compliance with the procedures set forth herein will authorize research involving prisoners as subjects, to the extent such research is limited or barred by applicable State or local law.

(c) The requirements of this subpart are in addition to those imposed under the other subparts of this part.

§46.302 Purpose.

Inasmuch as prisoners may be under constraints because of their incarceration which could affect their ability to make a truly voluntary and uncoerced decision whether or not to participate as subjects in research, it is the purpose of this subpart to provide additional safeguards for the protection of prisoners involved in activities to which this subpart is applicable.

§46.303 Definitions.

As used in this subpart:

(a) Secretary means the Secretary of Health and Human Services and any other officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services to whom authority has been delegated.

(b) DHHS means the Department of Health and Human Services.

(c) Prisoner means any individual involuntarily confined or detained in a penal institution. The term is intended to encompass individuals sentenced to such an institution under a criminal or civil statute, individuals detained in other facilities by virtue of statutes or commitment procedures which provide alternatives to criminal prosecution or incarceration in a penal institution, and individuals detained pending arraignment, trial, or sentencing.

(d) Minimal risk is the probability and magnitude of physical or psychological harm that is normally encountered in the daily lives, or in the routine medical, dental, or psychological examination of healthy persons.
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§46.304 Composition of Institutional Review Boards where prisoners are involved.

In addition to satisfying the requirements in §46.107 of this part, an Institutional Review Board, carrying out responsibilities under this part with respect to research covered by this subpart, shall also meet the following specific requirements:

(a) A majority of the Board (exclusive of prisoner members) shall have no association with the prison(s) involved, apart from their membership on the Board.

(b) At least one member of the Board shall be a prisoner, or a prisoner representative with appropriate background and experience to serve in that capacity, except that where a particular research project is reviewed by more than one Board only one Board need satisfy this requirement.


§46.305 Additional duties of the Institutional Review Boards where prisoners are involved.

(a) In addition to all other responsibilities prescribed for Institutional Review Boards under this part, the Board shall review research covered by this subpart and approve such research only if it finds that:

1. The research under review represents one of the categories of research permissible under §46.306(a)(2); ✓

2. Any possible advantages accruing to the prisoner through his or her participation in the research, when compared to the general living conditions, medical care, quality of food, amenities and opportunity for earnings in the prison, are not of such a magnitude that his or her ability to weigh the risks of the research against the value of such advantages in the limited choice environment of the prison is impaired;

3. The risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by nonprisoner volunteers;

✓4. Procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison are fair to all prisoners and immune from arbitrary intervention by prison authorities or prisoners. Unless the principal investigator provides to the Board justification in writing for following some other procedures, control subjects must be selected randomly from the group of
available prisoners who meet the characteristics needed for that particular research project;

(5) The information is presented in language which is understandable to the subject population;

(6) Adequate assurance exists that parole boards will not take into account a prisoner's participation in the research in making decisions regarding parole, and each prisoner is clearly informed in advance that participation in the research will have no effect on his or her parole; and

(7) Where the Board finds there may be a need for follow-up examination or care of participants after the end of their participation, adequate provision has been made for such examination or care, taking into account the varying lengths of individual prisoners' sentences, and for informing participants of this fact.

(b) The Board shall carry out such other duties as may be assigned by the Secretary.

(c) The institution shall certify to the Secretary, in such form and manner as the Secretary may require, that the duties of the Board under this section have been fulfilled.

§46.306 Permitted research involving prisoners.

(a) Biomedical or behavioral research conducted or supported by DHHS may involve prisoners as subjects only if:

(1) The institution responsible for the conduct of the research has certified to the Secretary that the Institutional Review Board has approved the research under §46.305 of this subpart; and

(2) In the judgment of the Secretary the proposed research involves solely the following:

(i) Study of the possible causes, effects, and processes of incarceration, and of criminal behavior, provided that the study presents no more than minimal risk and no more than inconvenience to the subjects;
(ii) Study of prisons as institutional structures or of prisoners as incarcerated persons, provided that the study presents no more than minimal risk and no more than inconvenience to the subjects;

(iii) Research on conditions particularly affecting prisoners as a class (for example, vaccine trials and other research on hepatitis which is much more prevalent in prisons than elsewhere; and research on social and psychological problems such as alcoholism, drug addiction, and sexual assaults) provided that the study may proceed only after the Secretary has consulted with appropriate experts including experts in penology, medicine, and ethics, and published notice, in the FEDERAL REGISTER, of his intent to approve such research; or

(iv) Research on practices, both innovative and accepted, which have the intent and reasonable probability of improving the health or well-being of the subject. In cases in which those studies require the assignment of prisoners in a manner consistent with protocols approved by the IRB to control groups which may not benefit from the research, the study may proceed only after the Secretary has consulted with appropriate experts, including experts in penology, medicine, and ethics, and published notice, in the FEDERAL REGISTER, of the intent to approve such research.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, biomedical or behavioral research conducted or supported by DHHS shall not involve prisoners as subjects.
Guidelines and a template for writing a protocol summary are provided below. The protocol summary must be written to contain elements of information so the IRB can make the determinations required by the CFR. The guidelines are designed to assist researchers and facilitate the process of writing a protocol summary that is appropriate for IRB review.

PROJECT TITLE: [ ]
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/FACULTY SPONSOR: [ ]
PROTOCOL SUMMARY VERSION DATE: [ ]
VERSION #: [ ]

I. INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES

Introduction and Purpose:

- State the name and purpose of the study.
- Provide the basic information concerning the rationale for the study and the previous data to support the research.

Background:

- Discuss the background of the research problem, prior published data, and the nature of the research question as well as the resulting rationale for the proposed study.
- Summarize the available data (published or unpublished, if available) that could have significance or which is necessary to place the research in current context of our understanding of the area.
- Discuss how any preliminary data justifies the research.

Study Aims:

- State the questions and goals of the research study; including the hypothesis being tested or questions to be explored. Protocols often refer to primary, and secondary objectives based on the amount of data to be collected and the breadth of area, or number of subjects to be enrolled.

II. STUDY DESIGN

- Describe and justify the research design. The study should be designed to answer a specific research question through achieving the stated objectives and aims of the study.
- Describe in steps how the study will be implemented.
- Identify the research methods, qualitative, quantitative or mixed method that will be used to achieve the aims and objectives of the study. Be specific about the types of qualitative methods such as ethnography, survey, interview, focus group and combination thereof to be utilized in the research. Explain the significance of each research method in achieving the overall objectives of the study. If snowball sampling is used, describe how the first individuals will be recruited.
• Describe how the data will be collected and maintained.

• Explain the number of subjects to be enrolled. Once the IRB approves the number of subjects to be enrolled, no additional subjects can be enrolled without re-approval from the IRB.
  
  o Please Note: Enrollment refers to the number of subjects who agreed to participate by signing a consent document.

• For multi-site studies, be specific about the number of subjects to be enrolled at each site.

• State the duration of the study. Be specific in terms of hours, days, months and years.

• Describe how the aims of the study can be met within the specified duration of the study.

• Explain where the research will be conducted and where the data will be analyzed. If the study is conducted at more than one site, such as a lab and an office include the location of both sites.

• Include the expected duration of subject participation (the amount of time terms of years, months, weeks, days and hours) and a description of the sequence and duration of all trial periods involving data collection from subjects including follow-up, if any.

• For telephone pre-screening, inform potential subjects up front about the location and duration of the study.
  
  o Please Note: Extensive and expensive travel time may sway the decision of potential subjects to participate, eliminating the need for the entire pre-screening.

• For complex research designs a schematic diagram is appropriate and recommended.

III. SUBJECT SELECTION & WITHDRAWAL

This section addresses the involvement of human research subjects. Describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria, including that of special populations, protection from risk, recruitment procedures, potential benefits, the process of informed consent, and the knowledge to be gained from the study.

• Of importance: For studies where subjects are recruited from community or residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs, in house and outpatient hospital detoxification centers, the juvenile justice system or related educational placement settings or intermediate transitions sites, return to work programs, rehabilitation centers, psychiatric institutions, half way houses, community mental health programs or placement agencies or any site where prisoners may be in attendance but not necessarily confined to jail, the PI bears full responsibility for determining the legal status of potential subjects prior to recruitment.

• Describe the process for identifying, recruiting and enrolling subjects. If applicable, describe methods for sampling larger populations and randomization procedures if conducting experimental manipulations.

• Describe the circumstances and procedures for subject withdrawal from the study.
Inclusion Criteria:

- Create a numbered list of eligibility criteria subjects must meet to be in the study.
- Include a rationale for subject selection based on review of gender or ethnicity categories particular to the research area being studied and a rationale/justification for any exclusions based on race or ethnicity.
- Justify the following restrictions if applicable: age, gender, ethnicity and race, socioeconomic status, enrollment restrictions based on childbearing status and pregnancy and other disparities that may impact on enrollment.
  
  - The distribution of men and women should be equitable so they equally share the benefits and the burden of the research. Therefore, provide justification in terms of scientific contraindications for unequal distribution of one gender.
  - Pregnant women or women of childbearing age should not be excluded without sufficient justification.
  - Provide a rationale for the specified age range and explicitly state the age range for both adults and minors. Unless specifically contraindicated by the nature of the study, there should be no age restrictions for adult subjects.
  - If children and adolescents are included in the study, specify the age range and provide a rationale and justification for the selected age range.
  - Explain and justify any preferences or restrictions based upon race and ethnicity.
  - The inclusion of individuals of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds should be equitably distributed thus the benefits and burdens of the research are equitably distributed.

- Please Note: It is common in SBS to study one ethnic or racial group at the exclusion of others. Please justify why. The exclusion and inclusion criteria should be consistent with the purpose of the study.

  - Discuss and provide a compelling rationale for the specific inclusion of vulnerable groups such as prisoners, minors and pregnant women. Other groups may be considered vulnerable and undergo additional protections on a case basis, for instance persons who are; cognitively impaired, economically and socially disadvantaged, captive populations, terminally ill, mentally ill, HIV+, drug addiction, alcoholism, homelessness and the elderly persons.

- SBS can include the study of homeless persons or persons with an active drug/alcohol dependence or substance abuse history. If such populations are included, the study procedures should reflect how follow up will be achieved given the transient nature or the difficulty in locating the subjects. See exclusionary criteria.

- The inclusion criteria for SBS with attributes from other disciplines such as medicine and nursing must be specific for all disciplines.

Exclusion Criteria:
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GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATE

- Create a numbered list of criteria that would exclude an individual from the research study. Generally this would include age, gender, physical or mental conditions. Please provide a justification for doing so.

- The exclusion of transient groups or groups that may be difficult to locate for follow up may be appropriate for some SBS research. Please explain.

- There may be other populations that would not be appropriate for the study, list them and explain why they should not be enrolled.

Subject Recruitment and Screening:

- Describe how subjects will be identified and recruited for the study. If snowball method will be used discuss the process and how the first individuals will be recruited.

- Discuss all the methods used to identify and recruit subjects including referrals from physician offices, clinics, programs, or through advertisements and brochures.

- Discuss how information is to be disseminated to subjects such as handouts, brochures, flyers and advertisements. All recruitment materials must be approved by the IRB prior to being used. Include recruiting materials with the protocol submission to the IRB.

- Describe the eligibility criteria and list any special test or evaluations potential subjects may have to undergo before they are actually determined to be eligible for the study.

Early Withdrawal of Subjects:

- Describe the scenarios under which a subject may be withdrawn from the study prior the expected completion of the project. Such reasons might include safety of the subject, failure of subject to return for visits, failure to locate the subject and if subjects withdraw their consent. Explain any safety reasons in sufficient detail.

- Describe how subjects can withdraw from the study. The requirements for the process of withdraw should be consistent with the capabilities of the subjects under study. For instance, requiring a homeless, mentally ill or illiterate subject to provide to the PI written notice of intent to withdraw may be difficult. Other options should be considered and consistent with the group under study.

- Even though subjects may be withdrawn prematurely from the study, in some circumstances it is important to provide them services or information such as counseling for conditions noted during the study.

IV. METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

Please Note: Included in this section is information on maintaining confidentiality.

Study Instruments:

- Discuss the particulars of the research instruments, questionnaires and other evaluation instruments in detail. Provide validation documentation and or procedures to be used to
validate instruments. For well known and generally accepted test instruments the detail here can be brief. More detail may be required for a novel or new instrument.

- For ethnographic studies identify any study instruments to be used (i.e., for deception studies) and describe in detail where, when and how the study will be conducted and who or what are the subjects of study.

  o Please Note: For more information on how to conduct ethical and valid ethnographic research, follow the link

- For oral histories or interviews provide the general framework for questioning and means of data collection.

- If interviews or groups settings are to be audio taped or video taped describe in detail the conditions under which it will take place.

- Include a copy of any novel or new test instruments with the IRB submission.

**Group Modifications:**
- Describe necessary changes that will or have been made to the study instruments for different groups.

**Method for Assigning Subjects to Groups:**
- Describe how subjects will be randomized to groups.

**Administration of Surveys and/or Process:**
- Describe in detail all the steps necessary to conduct the interview or for the subject to complete the survey/instruments. Describe all procedures and evaluations to be applied. For instance, discuss if the interviews be conducted on volunteers following long term ethnography of a group; describe how the volunteers will be recruited.

- Describe the approximate time and frequency for administering surveys and/or evaluations.

- For surveys, questionnaires and evaluations presented to groups and in settings such as high schools, focus group sessions or community treatment centers explain how the process will be administered and who will oversee the process. For instance, discuss the potential issues of having teachers and other school personnel administer instruments to minors who are students especially if the content is sensitive in nature.

- Describe the procedure for audio and videotaping individual interviews and/or focus groups and the storage of the tapes. For instance, if audio tape recording is to be used in a classroom setting, describe how this will be managed if individuals in the class are not participating in the study.

- Explain if the research involves the review of records (including public databases or registries) with identifiable private information. If so, describe the type of information gathered from the records and if identifiers will be collected and retained with the data after it is retrieved.
- Describe the kinds of identifiers to be obtained, (i.e. names, social security numbers) and how long the identifiers will be retained and justification for use.

Maintenance of data security:

- Describe the steps to be taken to protect and preserve the confidentiality of subject information.
- Describe the use of pseudonyms, code numbers and how listing of such identifiers will be kept separate from the research data.

Subject Follow-up:

Please Note: For SBS research that includes transient groups; describe how follow-up will be managed.

- If multiple visits are required discuss methods to contact subjects and what will happen if the subject is lost to the study before all data is collected.
- Describe if and how the researcher will assess and track subject compliance with the requirements of the research.
- For studies involving prisoners not confined to jail, and in consideration of the high rate of recidivism, describe the process for follow-up should the subject commit a crime that results in confinement in a penal institution.
- Describe the follow-up process in the event that while participating in the study a subject is imprisoned, committed to a mental hospital, hospitalized for long term care, admitted to a drug/alcohol residential program, a residential living facility or alike.
- Describe the follow-up process in the event that the subject falls under the guardianship of another, the guardianship of the state or in the case of minors becomes a ward or the state.

V. STUDY PROCEDURES

- Explain sequentially the study procedure, including all the visits, contacts, and interactions. Also, for research of a sensitive psychological or emotional nature that recruits subjects vulnerable to the study questions or procedures, describe how professional attention will be provided for subjects if necessary.
- If necessary, use bullet points or create a study procedures flowchart/table that describes the activities and procedures to be followed at each contact with the subject.
- Describe the procedures to be performed to monitor the safety or inconvenience of the procedure.
- Describe assessments that can be performed to detect and report unanticipated events that could affect the subject’s willingness to continue in the study.

VI. STATISTICAL PLAN
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*Also included in this section is information on maintaining confidentiality.

Sample Size Determination:

- Describe the statistical methods for determining the sample size for the study.
- Justify additional subjects that might need to be recruited due to dropouts.
- Give any experience on dropout or withdrawal rates from other studies if available.

Please Note: If a long term study recruits subjects from short term drug/alcohol detoxification center or similar type treatment facility the investigator should anticipate a poor retention rate with difficult follow-up and design the study accordingly.

Statistical Methods:

- Summarize the overall statistical approach to the analysis of the study.
- The section should contain the key elements of the analysis plan, but should not be a restatement of a detailed study analysis plan.
- Be clear on primary as well as any applicable secondary analyses.

Subject Population(s) for Analysis:

- This section should be very specific in defining the subject sub-populations whose data will be subjected to the study analyses — both for the primary analysis and any applicable secondary analyses.

Data Management:

- Describe how and who manages confidential data, including how and where it will be stored and analyzed. For instance, describe if paper or electronic report forms will be used, how corrections to the report form will be made, how data will be entered into any database, and the person(s) responsible for creating and maintaining the research database.

VII. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Benefits:

Please Note: Financial compensation for participating in study is not considered a benefit and may not be described as such.

- Include any potential for benefit to the participant, to society and/or to the research community.

Subject Confidentiality:

- Describe how the confidentiality of subject will be maintained.
- If the research involves the collection of PHI, HIPAA guidelines for security must be followed.
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- Describe if and how the data will be de-identified.
- Explain how the data will be kept confidential throughout the course of the research identifying those persons in possession of and/or who will have access to the data.
- Explain where and how the data will be stored and protected during the active research process.
- Explain what will happen to the data at the conclusion of the study: if the data will be destroyed, retained and/or shared with other investigators for future research. If video and/or audiotapes were used in the data collection process describe the disposition of the tapes and/or discs at the conclusion of the study.
- For data that is retained or shared with other researchers explain under what conditions personal identifiers will be used, if at all.
- Explain under what conditions the data may become part of the subject’s permanent record, such as an employment or academic record. Explain how this can be mitigated if possible.

Compensation:

- Explain the types of payments to subjects including justification for the amounts. This includes re-imbursements for travel, meals and alike. Be specific about the nature of each type of payment making a distinction between compensation for participating in the research versus re-imbursements for expenses.
- For study related compensation, state the form the compensation will take such as cash, gift certificate, tickets, coupons and alike.
- Explain when and how subjects will be compensated. Be specific for studies taking place over a long time where compensation is disbursed periodically.
- Compensation is not a benefit to participating in the research and should not be stated as such.
  - Please Note: Compensation should not be coercive in any matter.

Risks:

- Typically, SBS does not pose severe or life threatening risks to subjects. However, the risk of harm can occur and should not be underappreciated. Some risks of harm are foreseeable and others unforeseeable. For example, a foreseeable risk may include; psychological distress during and after a study of post-traumatic stress syndrome (PTSD) that involves subjects diagnosed with PTSD. Another example, a psychological test that in and of itself is routine and poses no more than minimal risk, may be considered more than minimal risk if taken by a person who suffers from a mental illness, severe anxiety or depression.
Other foreseeable risks may include risks associated with a possible loss of confidentiality. Investigators should be sensitive to the vulnerabilities of the population under study and how a breach of confidentiality may impact a subject's standing with the community, employer, spouse, school and alike.

For SBS with attributes of other disciplines such as medicine and nursing where the subject needs to undergo a blood draw, MRI, DEXA scan, CAT scan or other medical tests, the risks associated with those tests should be fully described.

Risk/Benefit Ratio:

- Describe the relative benefits obtained from the research in relation to the potential risks of the study. The risk of participating in the study should be balanced against the benefits to be realized by the potential subject and/or society.

VII. INFORMED CONSENT

- Unless waived by the IRB all potential subjects will be provided a written consent document that describes the study and provides sufficient information for them to make an informed decision about whether or not to participate in the study.

- A copy of all consent documents should be included with the submission to the IRB. The consent document will be reviewed and approved by the IRB.

- The formal consent of a subject, using the IRB-approved consent form, must be obtained before that subject participates in a study activity.

- The subject or a legally authorized representative must sign the consent document for it to be legally valid.

- The IRB can waive the requirement for informed consent either verbal or written. Please refer to the section on Voluntary Informed Consent for more information.

VIII. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Funding Source:

- Describe how the study will be financed.

- If support is through a federal grant, a copy of the complete grant application must be included as an attachment.

- The IRB is required to independently determine that the investigator has sufficient funds and or facilities available for them to complete the study. While this is usually part of the assurance from the department, the IRB may require separate confirmation.

IX. PUBLICATION PLAN

- State whether there is intent to publish or present the results of the proposed research. Identify who holds primary responsibility for publication of the results of the study.
Introduction

Informed consent is a person’s voluntary agreement, based upon adequate knowledge and understanding of relevant information, to participate in research or to undergo a diagnostic, therapeutic or experimental procedure. Informed consent is essential for studies involving humans. Participants need to understand why the research is being pursued, why they are being asked to participate, what procedures, methods and time commitments are involved, and the potential risks and benefits.

Voluntary informed consent is a critical process in protecting human subjects. However, obtaining a voluntary informed consent may not be sufficient if the process and/or the content of the consent fails to meet the federal requirements. Of particular importance, failure to fully inform a subject or their legally authorized representative of foreseeable harms that may occur from participating in a study is considered negligent. The IRB serves as a gatekeeper to assist in the development and implementation of a valid process of voluntary informed consent. Therefore, before subjects are recruited the IRB must approve the methods for securing voluntary informed consent and all written consent documents. When applicable, the IRB can waive the requirement of informed consent or written documentation of informed consent.

The Ethical Foundation of Voluntary Informed Consent

Voluntary informed consent is one of the fundamental principles underlying the ethical conduct of research with human subjects. It is embodied in common law and was adopted by U.S. and international policies and regulations that guide human subject’s protections. The principle of voluntary consent was adopted in the Nuremberg Code of 1947 as a fundamental right of individuals who participate in research. Informed voluntary consent was always codified in U.S. and international policies and regulations as a principle element in the ethical conduct of research. For more information see the following documents:

- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research (1979), otherwise known as the Belmont Report;
- World Medical Association; Declaration of Helsinki (current 2000).

Anyone conducting research on human subjects should be familiar with the three major ethical principles embodied in the Belmont Report.

The three ethical principles include:

- Respect for persons
- Beneficence
- Justice
Researchers should consider the ethical principles as the foundation for the practice of ethical research. It is imperative that these principles be applied to the conduct of research and reflected in protocols and consent documents submitted for review.

The three ethical principles; respect for persons, beneficence and justice underscore the regulatory requirements that are to be met when conducting research on human subjects.

The three regulatory requirements include:

- Informed consent
- Assessment and appropriate balance of risks and benefits
- Fair procedures for selection of research subjects.

Please Note:
- The protection of confidentiality is supported in the three regulatory requirements even though it is not clearly specified.

Responsibilities of the PI include:

- Assure that informed consent be obtained by qualified personnel who know enough about the study to respond to questions asked by the potential subject.
- Obtain a legally effective informed consent from each participant or from the participant's legally authorized representative prior to his or her participation in the research, unless this requirement has been waived by the IRB.
- Unless waived by the IRB, obtain a written consent document that is signed and dated when the subject or their legally authorized representative gives informed consent.
- Obtained an informed consent before completion of screening activities that is solely performed to determine a prospective participant's eligibility to be in the research.
- Seek consent only under circumstances that provide the potential subject or their legally authorized representative, sufficient opportunity to consider whether to participate and to minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence.

The IRB must approve all consent documents, assent forms, and scripts. If these forms are changed, altering the content of the consent document, the IRB must approve the changes prior to use of the revised consent document.

The Process of Voluntary Informed Consent

1. Definition:

Informed consent can be defined as providing an individual or their legally authorized representative with accurate and complete information of the procedures, risks and benefits, alternatives and other relevant information about the study they are being asked to join.

2. Process: Voluntary informed consent is a process, an interaction; it is NOT a document.

Federal guidelines and international agreements place great importance on the process of obtaining informed consent. The process refers to an informative exchange between the PI and the potential subject where all relevant information about the study is clearly conveyed. Ideally
the process of an informative exchange is to respect the individual as an autonomous agent and to aid them in understanding the risks and obligations of participating in the study. Depending on the research design the process for informed consent and documentation of informed consent can vary.

3. Purpose: A consent document is considered well written if it is effective in purpose.

The purpose of an informed consent is to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research. Investigators should keep this in mind when consenting their subjects regardless of whether the informed consent process includes a formalized written document, relies on a verbal exchange and/or necessitates the participation of a legally authorized representative. For written documentation of informed consent, investigators should not assume that long, detailed, technical documents are the most effective in conveying information.

4. Efficacy: A consent document must embody three elements

An effective informed consent process must embody three elements; a full disclosure of all the relevant information about the proposed research in a language and manner understandable to the potential subject; and, individuals are free to make a decision to participate or not without pressure, undue influence or coercion from the PI or a third party.


A consent document should not be written as an instrument to legally protect institutions, investigators or sponsors of research. Terminology in the consent document that attempts to waive the subject’s legal rights or protect institutions, investigators or sponsors from liability for negligence will be deemed invalid.

Please Note: Examples of exculpatory language that would be prohibited: "I waive my right to be compensated for injuries that I may sustain from participating in this research" or, "I agree to hold (the PI) and/or the University of Pennsylvania harmless in the event that I sustain an injury while participating in this research", or "If I sustain an injury while participating in the study I agree not to hold (the PI) and/or the University of Pennsylvania responsible for damages."

Specific Elements of Information for Voluntary Informed Consent

The federal regulations (CFR) require a legally effective informed consent to include eight (8) specific elements of information, unless the IRB grants a waiver of any of the elements. The CFR also provides six (6) additional elements of information that when applicable must be included in the informed consent. The six elements should be evaluated on a case basis to determine if any or all of them are applicable to the study and relevant to the decision of the participant.

Eight (8) Required Elements of Information for an Informed Consent

(1) A statement the study involves research
(b) An explanation of the **purpose** of the research
(c) The expected **duration** of the subject's participation in the research
(d) A description of the **procedures** to be followed
(e) Identification of any **experimental procedures**

- This section includes a statement that the individual is being invited to participate in a research study.
- The statement that the study is research should be emphasized. If necessary, this section should also draw a clear distinction between research and clinical treatment, therapy, counseling, etc.
- Be specific about the purpose of the study and why they are being invited to participate. Describe the eligibility criteria and any methods used to determine eligibility if applicable.
- Explain the purpose of the study, why it is important and what kind of knowledge might be gained.
- This section of the consent document should provide the individual with sufficient information about the purpose of the study, the necessary procedures, where the study will take place and the required time commitment.
- For studies that are complex in procedural design, involve travel and a substantial time commitment consider using charts, tables and diagrams to organize and convey expectations and complicated information.
- Clearly describe the sequence of events and identify procedures and activities that are routine, standard of care and/or investigational in nature. Include a description of the screening procedures used to determine eligibility for enrollment into the study.
- Describe the type of questionnaires, assessment scales, surveys, interviews, or other instruments used to screen subjects for eligibility and/or acquire data. If questions are of a sensitive nature and/or designed to probe into personal issues provide the individual with a sample of the questions. If minors are the subjects under study, provide the parents with a sample of the questions as well.
- Notify individuals that some sensitive questions can elicit emotional responses and that they can refuse to answer questions. Inform the subjects that if the process of answering sensitive questions they become upset a professional will be available.
- If the study is being conducted for a thesis or dissertation explain this and identify the faculty mentor in the consent document. This can be addressed at the top of the consent document where the PI is named.

(2) A description of any reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the subject;

- Typically, social science and behavioral research does not pose severe or life threatening risks to subjects. Foreseeable risks may include: psychological distress during and after the study, physical discomfort, risks associated with a loss of confidentiality, embarrassment, stigmatization, and/or adverse effects on the subject's status at his/her place of employment, school, social program from which the subject is obtaining services, etc.
- The document should clearly state all possible risks regardless of severity. It should also state what measures have been implemented within the study design to minimize the possibility of occurrence of such risks.
• While writing the protocol, PI should be creative when determining all possible risks. For example, mentioning the risk of a breach in confidentiality may not be enough, unless the document states what such a breach could entail (e.g. public embarrassment, stigmatization, loss of employment, etc).

• You must be sensitive to the vulnerabilities of the population under study. For example, a psychological test that in and of itself is routine and poses no more than minimal risk, may be considered more than minimal risk if taken by a person who suffers from severe anxiety or depression.

(3) An adequate description of any benefits to the subject or others that may reasonably be expected from the research:

Your study may be beneficial at different levels—to the individual (directly or indirectly), to society, to the research community, etc.

• The consent document is most concern with benefits to the individual, and the presence or absence of such should precede benefits to the community, society, etc.

• When determining what direct benefits are there to the subjects, PIs should ask themselves how the subjects will be, with a high degree of possibility, better after participating in the study.

• If there is no direct benefit to the subject, the consent document should clearly state the case. Common consent language to express the lack of direct benefit includes “there is not direct benefit to you;” or “you may not benefit in any way from participating in this study.”

• Once this has been said, it is acceptable to mention other levels of benefit. Any potential benefit to society and/or to the research community should be acknowledged only after stating the benefits to the individual, or the lack of such.

• Financial compensation for participating in the study is not considered a benefit and may not be described as such.

• Having a chance to share feelings, frustrations, etc, generally does not count as a direct benefit.

(Example: A participant in an interview about job satisfaction in an industry will not directly benefit from being interviewed. However, this study could influence policy makers to improve the working condition of the industry. Therefore, the subject may benefit indirectly, by being a member of a group. Also, the study may expand the literature on high risk industrial organization, which is acceptable to mention in the consent document, but it does not translate into any direct benefit to the subject).

(4) A disclosure of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any that might be advantageous to the subject;

• Disclose appropriate alternative procedures and courses of treatment if available.
If the only alternative to participation is not to participate, the consent document should clearly state this while reassuring the subjects that there will be no adverse consequence for deciding not to participate.

(5) A statement describing the extent, if any, to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained:

- Describe how the data will be de-identified.
- Explain how the data will be managed throughout the course of the research identifying those persons in possession of and/or who will have access to the data.
- Explain where and how the data will be stored and protected during the active research process.
- Explain what will happen to the data at the conclusion of the study: if the data will be destroyed, retained and/or shared with other investigators for future research. If video and/or audiotapes were used in the data collection process describe the disposition of the tapes and/or discs at the conclusion of the study.
- For data that is retained or shared with other researchers explain under what conditions personal identifiers will be used, if at all.
- Explain under what conditions the data may become part of the subject’s permanent record, such as an employment, medical, or academic record.
- Notify subjects that should the PI become aware of certain foreseeable circumstances such as child abuse or sexual assault they are obligated by law to contact the appropriate third parties and in doing so the participant may be named. (Include a paragraph)
- If the study involves audio/or videotaping, these are considered data, and all of the above apply to them. The consent document should explain how confidentiality and privacy of the material in the tapes will be maintained. Explain how the data will be transcribed, stored and what will happen to the tapes/disks when the study is completed or if a subject withdraws before the study is complete.

(6) For research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to whether any compensation and/or whether any medical treatments are available if injury occurs and, if so, what they consist of, or where further information may be obtained;

(7) An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research-related injury to the subject;

- In the consent document, (typically at the top of the title page) include the name, title, address, telephone and email address of the PI, co-investigators and other responsible persons. Explain in the body of the consent that these individuals should be contacted for questions related to research and related injuries.
- Explain that the ORA should be contacted for questions related to the rights and welfare of research participants. Include the address of the ORA, telephone number (include a toll free number if possible) and email address.
A statement that participation is voluntary, that refusal to participate at anytime will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

- The purpose of the regulation is to extinguish feelings of coercion that may arise when an individual is in a position of perceived subordination, i.e., a research subject to the PI. SBS research is frequently conducted in neighborhoods or facilities that serve the poor, minorities, persons in recovery from alcohol or drug abuse, mentally ill, or groups who exhibit risky behaviors. In these cases the subject may feel the PI, who may or may not be involved in their care, will be disappointed or angry if they withdraw from the study. Such concerns are common and can influence the individual decision-making process. To satisfy the requirements of this regulation consider the following recommendations if appropriate:

- Explain individuals are free to decide to participate in the study, not to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice.

- Also, explain that regardless of their choices, they will not lose any benefits, jeopardize job standing, grades, status on athletic teams, therapies and/or services that they are receiving including health care.

Six (6) Additional Elements of Information for an Informed Consent

(Required When Appropriate)

As appropriate, the PI should provide pertinent information that might aid the individual in making an informed decision as to whether to participate in research. The following additional elements of information are stipulated in the federal regulations and should be incorporated in informed consent if applicable.

(1) A statement that a particular procedure may involve risks to the subject (or to the embryo or fetus, if the subject is or may become pregnant) which are currently unforeseeable;

- Please Note: This requirement may be more applicable in the medical sciences or in SBS research with attributes of medicine and/or nursing, or in those studies involving magnetic resonance imaging procedures.
- In studies that are greater than minimal risk, there is always the potential for unforeseen risks. It may be difficult or impossible for a PI to predict all the potential risks associated with procedures of an uncertain nature. Therefore, if subjects are enrolled in a study that is greater than minimal risk and there is a possibility that the procedure may involve unforeseen risks, the CFR require this information be disclosed to the subject.

(2) Anticipated circumstances under which the PI may terminate participation without regard to the subject's consent;

- Particular circumstances may arise that warrant the removal of a subject from the study. It is the responsibility of the PI to remove the subject. Circumstances that warrant such action include:
Subjects who do not follow the study procedures,
- Subjects whose safety was in jeopardy.
- Subject is disrespectful of the opinions of other subjects (in focus groups or group discussions).

In the consent document describe any other circumstances that will necessitate withdrawal of a subject from a study. In doing so, individuals will have more information about what is expected of them if the choose to join the study.

- Refer to dissenting behaviors for studies involving children.

(3) Any additional costs to the subject that may result from participation in the research;

- If applicable, explain that the subject may incur expenses directly associated with participating in the study and that the subject is responsible for those expenses. For example, study related expenses might include the cost of transportation, hotel and food that are specifically not covered under the study.

- The participant should be informed of any study related procedures that will be billed to their health insurance and that co-pay, deductible or partial payments are their responsibility.

COMPENSATION:

- If the participants will be compensated, this should also be stated in the consent form.
- The consent document should also discuss whether full, partial, or no compensation will be provided to those who opt to withdraw before the culmination of the study.
- For studies in which participants will be compensated at different rates, or for completing a certain number of activities, a clear schedule of payment should be included stating when, how much, and for doing what will the participants be paid.
- Financial compensation should not be so high as to unduly influence the possible subjects to accept participation. A too generous compensation can also influence parents to involve their children in the study against the child’s assent.
- If the compensation is in the form of a raffle, the expected number of subjects should be disclosed as well as a numerical statement of the probability to win in lay terms (e.g. 1 person out of every 20 will win the $20 gift certificate).
- If the compensation is in the form of extra course credits, the credits should not be denied to those who prefer to withdraw prior the completion of the study without providing them with another opportunity to obtain the same amount of extra course credit.

(4) Any consequences of a subject's decision to withdraw from the research and procedures for orderly termination of participation by the subject;

- Explain the consequences of withdrawing from the study. When a subject decides to withdraw from a study, they should be provided with information and/or
recommendations for alternatives to services they were receiving while participating, such as counseling, therapy and treatments. For example, if an obese person is enrolled in a weight reduction study and chooses to withdraw they should be provided with information about other programs and their alternatives, both within the research context and not, if appropriate.

- Explain what procedures a participant should follow if they want to withdraw from a study. Typically, subjects can withdraw in writing or verbally. You may request written documentation of a participant’s intent to withdraw and in most circumstances this request is appropriate. However, in particular situations it may not be appropriate to require a subject to provide a written statement documenting their intent to withdraw. The procedure to withdraw from the study should be consistent with the capabilities and resources of the subjects enrolled in the study. For instance, a study of lower income minority women enrolled in a substance abuse day treatment program. In this case there may be social and psychological impediments that interfere with the subjects ability and/or desire to write a statement and forward it to the PI in a timely manner. Those factors may include: illiteracy, lack of motivation, lack of resources, stress, depression and cognitive impairment.

(5) A statement that significant new findings developed during the course of the research which may relate to the subject’s willingness to continue participation will be provided to the subject; and

- During the course of the research it may be necessary to inform subjects of significant new findings. New facts may impact a subject’s willingness to continue in the study.

- Relevant findings discovered in the course of research may require that you reconsent the subjects. At that time, the process of informed consent should include the new information.

(6) The approximate number of subjects involved in the study.

- Informing potential participants of the number of subjects enrolled in a study may influence their decision to participate. For instance, potential subjects may feel there is less risk in a study where they are 1 person in 5000 as opposed to 1 person in 50.

- For multi-site studies, include information about how many subjects will be enrolled at each institution.

Instructions for Writing a Consent Document

If your study does not meet regulatory requirements for waiver of consent and/or documentation of consent you will need to obtain written informed consent from the persons you are asking to volunteer as research subjects in your study. The process for doing so, and a template for writing
a consent document are outlined below. Instructions and guidance are provided in italics. Please remove the italicized instructions from your consent document.

Be aware that some of the text in this template is very general and it may not apply to your study. Coping-and-pasting from this template without revising for contradictory or irrelevant information may result in unnecessary delays at the time of review.

In the consent document the subject will learn important information about the study that they are being asked to join. Please keep in mind the process of consent includes a dialogue between the PI and the individual about the procedures, risks, alternatives and other relevant issues pertaining to the study. A written consent document is a supplement to the entire consent process.

Consent documents are reviewed by the IRB just as all other documents. Human subjects cannot be recruited nor participate in research unless the consent document has IRB approval. Please utilize the instructions and accompanying template for writing an appropriate and ethically sound document. Additional assistance is available from the ORA and/or by reviewing the CFR.

The consent document should be written so a middle school aged child can understand its content and purpose. It should include information so an informed decision can be made about whether or not to participate in the research study. To the greatest extent possible, it should be written in non-technical, non-scientific, simple language regardless of how long and complex the study. Below are tools and recommendations to assist researchers in writing an appropriate consent document.

Please Note:

- The consent document should be in a 12-point font. For subjects with difficulty in reading, larger font is appropriate.

- Include page numbers in the following format: “Page____of____”

- For subjects who cannot read, the document must be read to them.

- Include an appropriate heading; see template.
Draft Template for Writing an Informed Consent Document

Title of the Research Study:
Protocol Number:
Principal Investigator: (name, address, phone and email)
Co-investigator: (name, address, phone and email)
Emergency Contact: (name, address, phone and email)

You are being asked to take part in a research study. This is not a form of treatment or therapy. It is not supposed to detect a disease or fix something wrong. Your participation is voluntary, which means you can choose whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate or not to participate there will be no loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Before you make a decision you will need to know the purpose of the study, the possible, risks and benefits of being in the study and what you will have to do if decide to participate. The research team is going to talk with you about the study and give you this consent document to read. You do not have to make a decision now; you can take the consent document home and share it with friends, family, doctor and family.

If you do not understand what you are reading do not sign it. Please ask the researcher to explain anything you do not understand, including any language contained in this form. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and a copy will be given to you. Keep this form, in it you will find contact information and answers to questions about the study. You may ask to have this form read to you. (REQUIRED)

What is the purpose of the study? (REQUIRED)

The purpose of the study is to learn more about

- Fill in the space with a simple, accurate explanation of the purpose and what specific condition or conditions are under study.
- If the study is being conducted for a thesis or dissertation, it should be mentioned in here.

Why were you asked to participate in the study? (REQUIRED)

You are being asked to join this study because

- Explain and justify why the subject is appropriate for recruitment. Merely saying that the possible subject is being invited to participate because he or she meets the requirements for participation is not enough. You should state what are those requirements to clearly illustrate why him/her, and not somebody else, is being asked to participate.

How long will you be in the study? (REQUIRED) How many other people will be in the study? (REQUIRED ONLY IF APPROPRIATE)
The study will take place over a period of 0 years. This means for the next 4 months we will ask you to spend 12 days a month participating in this study. Each session will last approximately 30 min - 11/2 hr.

You will be one of 3-10 people in the study.

- Explain how much time the subject will need to commit in terms of hours, days, weeks, months and years.

Where will the study take place? (REQUIRED)

You will be asked to come to located at on at pm or am.

- Explain where the subject will have to go to participate. Be specific about requirements to go to different sites for different aspects of the study such as testing, meetings and alike.

What will you be asked to do? (REQUIRED)

- Provide a chronology of what the subject will need to do in a simple, non-technical language. If multiple visits are required, explain where the subject will need to go for each visit and what will happen at each visit. Bullets points are acceptable and encouraged. Remember to clearly identify any experimental procedures.

What are the risks? (REQUIRED)

(The document should clearly state all possible risks regardless of severity. It should also state what measures have been implemented within the study design to minimize the possibility of occurrence of such risks. While writing the protocol, PI should be creative when determining all possible risks. For example, mentioning the risk of a breach in confidentiality may not be enough, unless the document states what such a breach could entail (e.g. public embarrassment, stigmatization, loss of employment, etc.).

How will you benefit from the study? (REQUIRED)

There is no benefit to you. However, your participation could help us understand , which can benefit you indirectly. In the future, this may help other people to

(The consent document is most concern with benefits to the individual, and the presence or absence of such should precede benefits to the community, society, etc).

What other choices do you have? (REQUIRED)

Your alternative to being in the study is to not be in the study.
If you choose not to be in the study the following are other treatment choices that you may want to consider:

- If this applies, provide the pertinent information such as a contact name, phone number and address.

What happens if you do not choose to join the research study? (REQUIRED)

You may choose to join the study or you may choose not to join the study. Your participation is voluntary.

There is no penalty if you choose not to join the research study. You will lose no benefits or advantages that are now coming to you, or would come to you in the future. Your therapist, social worker, nurse, doctor or will not be upset with your decision.

If you are currently receiving services and you choose not to volunteer in the research study, your services will continue.

- Simply and directly tell the subject there are no negative consequences should they choose not to participate. The purpose is to mitigate any feelings of obligation or coercion on the part of the subject.

When is the study over? Can I leave the study before it ends? (REQUIRED)

The study is expected to end after all participants have completed all visits and all the information has been collected. The study may be stopped without your consent for the following reasons:

- The PI feels it is best for your safety and/or health-you will be informed of the reasons why.
- You have not followed the study instructions
- The PI, the sponsor or the Office of Regulatory Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania can stop the study anytime (REQUIRED ONLY WHEN APPROPRIATE)

You have the right to drop out of the research study anytime during the study. There is no penalty or loss of benefits if you do so. (REQUIRED)

If you no longer wish to be in the research study, please contact , at and take the following steps:

- Describe how subjects can withdraw from the study and explain the consequences, if any, for doing so (for example, medical or emotional related consequences, if any).

How will confidentiality be maintained and your privacy be protected? (REQUIRED)
The research team will make every effort to keep all the information you tell us during the study strictly confidential, as required by law. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Pennsylvania is responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of research volunteers like you. The IRB has access to study information. Any documents you sign, where you can be identified by name will be kept in a locked drawer in the office. These documents will be kept confidential. All the documents will be destroyed when the study is over.

- Explain how confidentiality will be maintained. Be specific about how records will be secured to protect the identity of the subject. State the IRB at the University of Pennsylvania will have access to the records. Explain how subjects will be de-identified; will code numbers be used? Please note; the content of this section will vary according to the research design. There may be cause for more or less protections depending on the nature of the research. The language suggested above should be altered when necessary.

- Note: For studies utilizing private health information, follow HIPAA guidelines. If the research is sensitive in nature, a Certificate of Confidentiality may be warranted. An example may include interviews with prison inmates or juvenile offenders attending a community re-entry program where information obtained from the subject may necessitate extra protection. The need for the Certificate should be determined on a case basis.

What happens if you are injured from being in the study? *(REQUIRED ONLY IF STUDY INVOLVES MORE THAN MINIMAL RISK, BUT SOMETIMES APPLICABLE TO LOW RISK STUDIES TOO)*

If you are injured and/or feel upset and emotional discomfort while participating in the study you may contact the PI or the emergency contact name on the first page of this form. Also, you may contact your own doctor, counselor or seek treatment outside of the University of Pennsylvania. Bring this document, and tell your doctor/counselor or his/her staff that you are in a research study being conducted at the University of Pennsylvania. Ask them to call the numbers on the first page of this form for information.

If you are injured and/or feel emotional discomfort from being in the study, the appropriate care will be provided without cost to you, but financial compensation is not otherwise available from the University of Pennsylvania. If you are injured and/or feel emotional discomfort while in the study but it is not related to the study, you and your insurance company will be responsible for the costs of that care.

- If injury occurs explain what, if any, compensation and medical treatments are available. Describe the treatments and compensation and where information can be obtained.

Will you have to pay for anything? *(REQUIRED ONLY WHEN APPROPRIATE)*

- Explain the how much it will cost to participate in the study (how much, to whom and why) or state that there are no costs associated with participating in the study.
Will I be compensated for participating in the study? (REQUIRED ONLY WHEN APPROPRIATE)

To show our appreciation for your time, we will give you . If you decide to withdraw from the study before the study is over, your compensation

(The consent document should discuss whether full, partial, or no compensation will be provided to those who opt to withdraw before the culmination of the study).

Who do you contact if you have questions about your rights and welfare? (REQUIRED)

If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a volunteer in the research study please contact the Office of Regulatory Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania at 215-898-2614 and/or the PI named on the first page of this document.

Who do you contact if you have questions about the study? (REQUIRED)

If you have questions about the research study please contact the PI named on the first page of this document or any of the other persons identified.

When you sign this document, you are agreeing to take part in this research study. If you have any questions or there is something you do not understand, please ask. You will receive a copy of this consent document.

Signature of Subject

Print Name of Subject

Date
APPENDIX C: SUBPART C DOCUMENTATION: RESEARCH INVOLVING PRISONERS*

Completed by Primary Reviewer or Chair:

- Check the appropriate box for each part as it relates to the proposed research. When shaded box is checked, provide justification as to how the proposed research meets the criteria for that part and go to next part.
- Prisoners* may be involved in research if all of the following conditions in shaded boxes are met:
  - §46.303(c): "Prisoner" means any individual involuntarily confined or detained in a penal institution. The term is intended to encompass individuals sentenced to such an institution under a criminal or civil statute, individuals detained in other facilities by virtue of statutes or commitment procedures which provide alternatives to criminal prosecution or incarceration in a penal institution, and individuals detained pending arraignment, trial, or sentencing.

(1) Category: The research under review represents one of the categories of research permissible under §46.306(a)(2): §46.305(a)(1)

- [ ] None of the permissible categories, A-D, applies to the proposed research
  - STOP! §46.305 NOT met.

(2) Risk/Benefit ratio: Any possible advantages accruing to the prisoner through his or her participation in the research, when compared to the general living conditions, medical care, quality of food, amenities and opportunity for earnings in the prison, are not of such a magnitude that his or her ability to weigh the risks of the research against the value of such advantages in the limited choice environment of the prison is impaired.

- [ ] No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.
- [ ] Yes

(3) Commensurate risk: The risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by non-prisoner volunteers.

- [ ] No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.
- [ ] Yes

(4) Subject & control selection: Procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison are fair to all prisoners and immune from arbitrary intervention by prison authorities or prisoners. Unless the principal investigator provides to the Board justification in writing for following some other procedures, control subjects must be selected randomly from the group of available prisoners who meet the characteristics needed for that particular research project. The risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by non-prisoner volunteers.

- [ ] No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.
- [ ] Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Language use:</th>
<th>The information is presented in language which is understandable to the subject population.</th>
<th>[§46.305(a)(5)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Parole status:</td>
<td>Adequate assurance exists that parole boards will not take into account a prisoner's participation in the research in making decisions regarding parole, and each prisoner is clearly informed in advance that participation in the research will have no effect on his or her parole.</td>
<td>[§46.305(a)(6)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Follow-up care:</td>
<td>Where the Board finds there may be a need for follow-up examination or care of participants after the end of their participation, adequate provision has been made for such examination or care, taking into account the varying lengths of individual prisoners' sentences, and for informing participants of this fact.</td>
<td>[§46.305(a)(7)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No ▶ STOP! §46.305 NOT met.</td>
<td>Yes [i.e. follow-up care needed &amp; adequate provisions have been made] ▶ Subpart C: §46.305 met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes [i.e. follow-up care not needed] ▶ Subpart C: §46.305 met.</td>
<td>N/A [i.e. follow-up care not needed] ▶ Subpart C: §46.305 met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:

Reviewed By: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Dear DR PAULA SABLOFF:

The above referenced protocol and any applicable consent form(s), HIPAA authorization, recruitment materials and/or supporting documents were reviewed and approved by the Executive Chair (or her authorized designee) using the expedited procedure set forth in 45 CFR 46.110, category 7, on 11/3/2005. This study will be due for continuing review on or before 11/20/2006.

Approval by the IRB does not necessarily constitute authorization to initiate the conduct of a human subject research study. Principal investigators are responsible for assuring final approval from other applicable school, department, center or institute review committee(s) or boards has been obtained. This includes, but is not limited to, the University of Pennsylvania Cancer Center Clinical Trials Scientific Review and Monitoring Committee (CTSRMC), General Clinical Research Center (GCRC) review committee, CAMRIS committee, Institutional Bio-safety Committee (IBC), Environmental Health and Radiation Safety Committee (EHRs), and Standing Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee. Principal investigators are also responsible for assuring final approval has been obtained from the FDA as applicable, and/or a valid contract has been signed between the sponsor and the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. If any of these committees require changes to the IRB-approved protocol and/or informed consent/assent document(s), the changes must be submitted to and approved by the IRB prior to beginning the research study.

The IRB operates in compliance with GCP and applicable laws and regulations.

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Adverse Events: You are required to notify the Office of Regulatory Affairs, if during this study, any adverse events or unanticipated problems arise that pose a risk to subjects, or others involved in the study. Serious and expected adverse events that are probably or definitely related must be reported within five days, serious and unexpected adverse events that are probably or definitely related must be reported within 24-hours, by using PennAEs online reporting at http://www.upenn.edu/regulatoryaffairs/human/AdverseEvents.html. For serious problems, approval may be suspended pending further IRB committee review.

Changes and Amendments: The principal investigator must keep the IRB informed of any changes in the protocol, its participating investigators, procedures, recruitment, consent forms, FDA status of investigational agents or devices or conflicts of interest. Any changes to this protocol must be presented in writing to the Office of Regulatory Affairs. Changes cannot be initiated until the appropriate IRB approval has been given.
Continuing Review: It is the investigator’s responsibility to apply for continuing review of ongoing research at least
annually, or more often if required by the funding agency or the IRB. Forms for continuing review are mailed to
investigators and are available at the ORA website.

Completion of Study: Please notify the Office of Regulatory Affairs as soon as the research has been completed.

If you have any questions about the information in this letter, please contact the Regulatory Affairs administrative staff.
Contact information is available at our website: http://www.upenn.edu/regulatoryaffairs/Contact.html.

Thank you for your cooperation with the Office of Regulatory Affairs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

IRB Administrator

Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) through
an Expedited Review Procedure

Applicability

(A) Research activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or
more of the following categories, may be reviewed by the IRB through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45 CFR 46.110
and 21 CFR 56.110. The activities listed should not be deemed to be of minimal risk simply because they are included on this list.
Inclusion on this list merely means that the activity is eligible for review through the expedited review procedure when the specific
circumstances of the proposed research involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects.

(B) The categories in this list apply regardless of the age of subjects, except as noted.

(C) The expedited review procedure may not be used where identification of the subjects and/or their responses would reasonably
place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects’ financial standing, employability, insurability,
reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risks related to invasion of
privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.

(D) The expedited review procedure may not be used for classified research involving human subjects.

(E) IRBs are reminded that the standard requirements for informed consent (or its waiver, alteration, or exception) apply regardless of
the type of review—expedited or convened—utilized by the IRB.

(F) Categories one (1) through seven (7) pertain to both initial and continuing IRB review.

Research Categories

(I) Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met:
   (a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on
       marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the
       product is not eligible for expedited review.)
   (b) Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required;
       or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its
cleared/approved labeling.

(2) Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:
   (a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml
in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or
(b) from other adults and children, considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of
blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the
lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

(3) Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means.
Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner, (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care
indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external
secretions (including sweat); (e) uncanulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase
or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time
of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus; provided the collection
procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with
accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings;
(j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

(4) Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in
clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be
cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not
generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)
Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of
significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject’s privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c)
magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring
radioactivity, electroretinography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound,
diagnostic infrared imaging, Doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age,
weight, and health of the individual.

(5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely
for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt
from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not
exempt.)

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception,
cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research
employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance
methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human
subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

(8) Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB as follows:
(a) where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-
related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or
(b) where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or
(c) where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

(9) Continuing review of research, not conducted under an investigational new drug application or investigational device
exemption where categories two (2) through eight (8) do not apply but the IRB has determined and documented at a
convened meeting that the research involves no greater than minimal risk and no additional risks have been identified.

1> An expedited review procedure consists of a review of research involving human subjects by the IRB chairperson or by one or
more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among members of the IRB in accordance with the requirements set
forth in 45 CFR 46.110.

2> Children are defined in the HHS regulations as "persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or
procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted." 45 CFR
46.402(a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated Capacity</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>ASIAN/PACIFIC ISL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsentenced</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>I AM.IND/ALASKA NT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentenced</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Sent.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>OVER 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekenders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Prisoners</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24 - 30</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Entered</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OVER 60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRIKE ENTER - TO OBTAIN ACTIVE POPULATION BREAKDOWN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RATED CAPACITY</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>A ASIAN/PACIF ISL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>B BLACK</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>H HISPANIC</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSENTENCED</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>I AM.IND/ALASKA NT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETRIAL</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>U UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTENCED</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W WHITE</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCED</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Z OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY SENT.</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>NOT ENTERED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKENDERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNDER 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST.PRISONERS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18 - 23</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 - 30</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT ENTERED</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OVER 60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRIKE ENTER - TO OBTAIN ACTIVE POPULATION BREAKDOWN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>SSP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>SSP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTIC</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>MIDDLESEX</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERGEN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MONMOUTH</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>MORRIS</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMDEN</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>OCEAN</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE MAY</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>PASSAIC</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMBERLAND</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>SALEM</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>SOMERSET</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTER</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>SUSSEX</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDSON</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTERDON</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>WARREN</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCER</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTIVE INMATES**: 18717

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SPECIAL SENTENCE**: 542

**GRAND TOTAL INMATE POPULATION**: 19259

Date: 12/9/2005 Time: 9:34:50 AM
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