ANNUAL REVIEWS

Inmate Society in the Era of Mass Incarceration

Derek A. Kreager[1] and Candace Kruttschnitt[2]

[1]Department of Sociology and Criminology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802, USA; e-mail: dak27@psu.edu

[2]Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J4, Canada

ANNUAL REVIEWS **Further**

Click here to view this article's online features:
• Download figures as PPT slides
• Navigate linked references
• Download citations
• Explore related articles
• Search keywords

Keywords

incarceration, social organization, networks, prison

Abstract

The origins and contours of inmate social organization were once central research areas that stalled just as incarceration rates dramatically climbed. In this review, we return to seminal works in this area and connect these with six interrelated changes to correctional contexts that accompanied mass incarceration. We argue that changes in prison racial, age, crowding, gender, offense type, and managerial characteristics potentially altered inmate informal organization and have yet to receive adequate criminological attention. We review the few recent studies that document contemporary inmate social life and call for increased researcher-practitioner partnerships that achieve mutual goals and embed criminologists within carceral settings. We suggest that network approaches are particularly useful for building on past qualitative and ethnographic insights to provide replicable results that are also easily conveyed to correctional authorities. As the era of mass incarceration peaks, we assert that the time is ripe for renewed interest in inmate society and its connections to prison stability, rehabilitation, and community reintegration.

INTRODUCTION

In the mid-twentieth century, inmate social organization emerged as a significant object of criminological inquiry (Crewe 2007a,b; Kreager et al. 2016c; Simon 2000; Wacquant 2002). Aside from its inherent exotic appeal, criminologists elevated prison research by connecting it with prominent concerns of the time, including totalitarianism and systems of total control (Goffman 1961, Sykes 1958) and tectonic shifts in race relations and urban deindustrialization (Jacobs 1977). Moreover, social scientists were then integral members of prison staff, providing researchers with direct and daily access to inmate experiences and placing sociological scholarship at the forefront of progressive prison reform (Simon 2000). In a relatively brief period, a multitude of prison case studies became seminal works in the field and continue to shape our understanding of prison society, its origins, and its consequences (Clemmer 1940, Giallombardo 1966, Irwin & Cressey 1962, Sykes 1958, Ward & Kassebaum 1965).

Although substantial, the ascendance of prison criminology was short-lived and ironically declined just as American incarceration rates steeply climbed (Simon 2000, Wacquant 2002). There were several interconnected causes for this fall. On a practical level, prison administrators reacted to the challenges of housing and controlling a rapidly expanding prison population by prioritizing managerial professionalization, bureaucratization, and the built prison environment over penologists' rehabilitative ideals (Feely & Simon 1992, Garland 1990). Simultaneously, a highly visible large-scale evaluation of prison programming demonstrated weak or null effects for recidivism, further eroding the perceived necessity of prison-embedded sociology (Martinson 1974). Increased scrutiny of prison research from university Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) widened the gap between researchers and prisons, necessitating the use of secondary data sources (e.g., ex-inmate accounts, institutional data, and aggregated statistics of prisons and prisoners) as principal means of understanding the contexts of contemporary confinement. Although rigorous studies of inmate society persist, they remain infrequent, limited in scope, and/or confined to international settings. As a result, inmate social organization within US prisons remains opaque, a state that is particularly problematic because the transformations that accompanied mass incarceration substantially altered both prisons and the inmate population.

A burgeoning literature now documents the negative individual and collateral consequences of incarceration (Travis et al. 2014, Wakefield & Uggen 2010), yet research of inmates' lived experiences has stalled and often "...existing data do not provide even the most basic information regarding the conditions of confinement faced by prisoners" (Travis et al. 2014, p. 431). The purpose of this review is to reinvigorate inmate society as a valuable object of knowledge and update classic studies with concepts relevant for the current correctional landscape. Specifically, we document what is known today about inmate life in light of increased prison overcrowding, the proliferation of prison gangs and other inmate subgroups, the aging of the inmate population, inmate-staff interactions, and prisoners' increasingly limited interactional opportunities with the wider society. Throughout this text, we acknowledge the tremendous heterogeneity in incarceration experiences across space, gender, custody level, and race. We also consider whether carceral developments are unique to our own political context by contrasting our findings with those of our Dutch and English criminological counterparts. Finally, based on our findings (or lack thereof), we outline a set of recommendations for future research to enliven this relatively dormant, but highly promising, area of research.

FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

Thorough reviews of foundational work on inmate society exist elsewhere; thus, we do not cover it in depth here (Crewe 2007b, Simon 2000, Wacquant 2002). Useful for our purposes,

however, is how the assumptions of earlier theorists correspond with the changing carceral landscape over the past five decades. Specifically, seminal theories fundamentally differ in their propositions for the origins of prison culture, and these varying hypotheses have distinct implications for whether and how shifting prison contexts correspond with changes in inmate social organization.

Sykes' (1958) *Society of Captives* provides the most well-known and illustrative example of what is now termed the deprivation model of inmate culture. For him and other functionalist scholars (e.g., Goffman 1961, Sykes & Messinger 1960), deprivations indigenous to prison (e.g., loss of security, heterosexual sex, liberty, autonomy, goods, and services) promote inmate responses that alleviate those pains. For the most part, such adaptations are self-serving and alienative, exemplified by such argot roles as "rat" (an inmate who betrays another inmate to gain staff favor), "merchant" (an inmate who uses valued goods to exploit other inmates), "wolf" (an inmate who forces another inmate into homosexual sex), and "gorilla" (an inmate who physically takes goods from other inmates). Alongside these roles, however, may arise inmate leaders (i.e., "real men" or "right guys") who suffer prison's deprivations with dignity, resist exploiting peers, and provide community goods that encourage inmate solidarity and passive resistance to formal authority. Inmate hierarchy and cohesion are then intricately linked to the experience of incarceration and the actions of prison authorities that either exacerbate or ameliorate prison's deprivations. Following the basic logic of the deprivation perspective, changes wrought by mass incarceration would impact inmate society to the extent that they alter the prison setting, particularly regarding inmates' felt deprivations.

The primary competing explanation for inmate culture comes from the importation model, most associated with the work of Irwin (Irwin 1970, Irwin & Cressey 1962) and Jacobs (1977; see also Clemmer 1940). Arising at a time of immense social change and rising crime rates, importation arguments share the assumption that prison culture largely reflects the values and norms outside of prison, primarily from the communities and streets inmates call home. For example, the gangs present within prison are expected to reflect the geographically and racially based gangs found outside of prison, and the characteristics associated with "street" status should be similarly valued in the prison setting. To the extent that an inmate code exists, the importation argument holds that it is a warped version of norms existing beyond the prison gate (Crewe 2007a,b). At their base, importation arguments rest on the assumption that contexts external to prisons influence inmate society. Accordingly, trends in crime, criminals, and society are more relevant for changes in inmate informal organization than are changing conditions within prisons. Applied to gender, importation arguments insist that gender norms and acculturation promote differential men's and women's responses to similar prison conditions, resulting in distinct social structures in men's and women's prisons (Giallombardo 1966).

A third theoretical strand emphasizes contextual heterogeneity and situational factors as more important than broad generalities for understanding inmate society. Research adopting this situational perspective challenges the deprivation-importation dichotomy with case studies that defy easy categorization (e.g., Mathiesen 1965, Ward & Kassebaum 1965) or with large-scale multilevel analyses of inmate outcomes that demonstrate institutional or interactional effects between inmate characteristics and prison contexts (Camp et al. 2003, Steiner & Wooldredge 2009a). Work in this area reminds us that, even at similar points in historical time, heterogeneity exists in prisons and prisoners across space. Local correctional policies, social conditions, and inmate demographics vary widely and interact in complicated ways to potentially affect inmate society. Although it is beyond the scope of this review to examine all possible factors, wherever possible we identify contextual heterogeneity, including inmate gender, race, offense, and policy differences, and how it may impact inmate social organization.

THE IMPACTS OF MASS INCARCERATION ON CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS

Beginning in the mid-1970s, the number of incarcerated persons in the United States rose precipitously, reaching a high-water mark in 2008 with more than 2.3 million imprisoned or jailed inmates (Kaeble & Glaze 2016). During this historically unprecedented era of mass incarceration, the country's incarceration rate surpassed that of all other nations, at its height reaching 760 inmates per 100,000 residents (Travis et al. 2014). Moreover, the rising risk of imprisonment disproportionately affected minorities and the socioeconomically disadvantaged. The imprisonment rate among young black males, for example, reached more than six times that of similarly aged white males, and the young Hispanic male imprisonment rate approached two-and-a-half times that of whites (Carson & Golinelli 2014). The resulting concentration of incarceration within disadvantaged and minority communities necessarily increased racial stratification and magnified preexisting economic, geographic, and social inequalities (Clear & Frost 2013, Travis et al. 2014, Wakefield & Uggen 2010).

Although incarceration rates rose across the United States during the era of mass incarceration, significant state-level variability remained and likely differentially affected prison conditions and inmate experiences. At one end of the spectrum, several states in the Northeast and Midwest (e.g., Maine, New Hampshire, Minnesota, and Nebraska) saw their incarceration rates less than double between 1970 and 2000. Alternatively, some Southern states (e.g., Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas) had incarceration rates that increased more than sixfold in the same period (Travis et al. 2014). These dramatic differences remind us that carceral contexts are often more a local than a national phenomenon.

More generally, mass incarceration corresponded with six interrelated trends for prisons and prisoners, each with its own direct implications for inmate life and social organization. First, the rapid influx of prisoners quickly strained existing prison capacities and often led to overcrowded conditions in prisons across the United States. At their height in the early 1990s, state prisons nationwide operated, on average, at 118% of their capacity and federal prisons operated at over 150% of their capacity (Mumola & Beck 1997). Although originally designed to reduce prison litigation and federal involvement in state prison operations, the Prison Litigation Reform Act [42 U.S.C. § 1997(e) (1996)] contributed to prison crowding in the 1990s by curtailing prisoner release orders designed to reduce unconstitutional conditions of overcrowding (Belbot 2004). Facility expansion and decreasing incarceration rates have reduced prison overcrowding in some states over time, but 18 states and the federal prison system continue to meet or exceed their maximum prison capacities (Carson & Anderson 2016).

Second, increasing racial disparities in prison admissions resulted in growing racial heterogeneity in American prisons throughout the era of mass incarceration. For example, in California, the ratio of minority to white inmates grew from 0.5-to-1 in 1951 to almost 3.5-to-1 in 2011 (Skarbek 2014). Nationally, the absolute disparity in prison admissions between blacks and whites grew by threefold between 1970 and 1986 (Langan 1991). A high black-white disparity in drug-related arrests during the 1980s put even greater numbers of black men into prison. Today, although non-Hispanic blacks make up approximately 12% of the country's population (Rastogi et al. 2011), this racial category accounts for 39% of America's current inmate population (Carson & Anderson 2016). Similarly, Hispanic incarceration rates today are more than twice that of non-Hispanic whites (Carson & Anderson 2016). Hispanics now make up approximately 24% of the prison population.

Third, rising use of mandatory minimum and life sentences, three strikes laws, and severe penalties for drug violations has meant that inmates generally spend more of their lives in prison

than in the past. This, along with broader age trends, has resulted in an increasingly older inmate population. According to a recent Bureau of Justice Statistics report, the number of prisoners aged 55 or older in state prisons increased 400% between 1993 and 2013. This older age group is now 10% of the state prison population (Carson & Sabol 2016).

Fourth, although far from universal, scholars point to ways that mass incarceration has coincided with changing correctional policies and prison infrastructure. At a global level, prison management and correctional philosophy during the era of mass incarceration became increasingly professional, bureaucratic, actuarial, and rational, resulting in a focus on dispassionate classification and inmate control over rehabilitation and treatment (Feely & Simon 1992, Garland 1990, Jacobs 1977). Notable examples of these trends have been expansions in solitary confinement (i.e., administrative segregation, disciplinary segregation, and protective custody) and supermax prisons for managing inmates perceived as highly disruptive, flight risks, or at heightened risk of victimization (Beck 2015, Frost & Monteiro 2016). Recent estimates suggest that nearly 20% of prison inmates spent some time in solitary confinement within the past 12 months of their incarceration, with approximately half of these spending 30 days or more in that status (Beck 2015). The influx of inmates also resulted in the hasty construction of new prisons, often with podular designs that house inmates in small groups that are constantly shuttled between daily work assignments, meals, programming, and exercise throughout the prison (Irwin 2005). This segmented and routinized existence is commonly termed warehouse imprisonment as it seeks to reduce violence through incessant movement and mundane tasks. Adding to this segmentation is the increased emphasis on risk assessment tools for inmate assignment and programming. Under the principles of matching inmate risks with needs through actuarial assessment, the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model has diffused widely through American prisons and has important, albeit understudied, implications for individual inmates' lives and system-level properties related to cell, unit, and treatment program assignments (Andrews et al. 1990, Andrews et al. 2006). In particular, the RNR model asserts that "one of the major purposes of offender risk assessment is the classification of offenders into similar subgroups in order to assign them to certain interventions" (Andrews & Bonta 2010, p. 300). Accordingly, groups classified as high risk should be segregated from low-risk groups and receive more intensive treatment in order to maximize inmate rehabilitation and violence prevention.

Fifth, changes in arrest and sentencing policies have substantially affected the distribution of incarceration offenses over time. Nationally, the majority of incarcerated persons have been, and continue to be, classified as violent offenders. Indeed, the proportion of inmates whose most serious crime was violent rose substantially in the 1990s, and in 2015 accounted for more than half of inmates in state correctional facilities (Carson & Anderson 2016, Clear & Frost 2013). At the same time, however, the War on Drugs greatly increased the proportion of prisoners convicted of drug-related offenses. In the 1970s, approximately 5% of prisoners in the United States were sentenced for drug-related crimes. By 2010, almost 20% of prisoners were convicted of such offenses and this percentage reached 50% at the federal level (Clear & Frost 2013). In recent years, state prison admissions and sentence lengths for drug-related offenses have dropped, as has the percentage of current state inmates serving drug-related sentences, but these statistics remain far above estimates prior to the era of mass incarceration (Carson & Anderson 2016, Carson & Golinelli 2014).

Finally, America's punitive turn has also resulted in greater numbers of women placed behind bars. Since the early 1970s, women's incarceration rate has increased more rapidly than men's (Travis et al. 2014). Women's rate of imprisonment in state and federal institutions increased most dramatically between 1980 and 2000, moving from 11 per 100,000 to 59 per 100,000 (Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2003). It reached its high mark in 2008 (at 69 per 100,000) and has since fluctuated, but it remains eight times higher than it was in 1980 (Carson & Anderson 2016).

Like male offenders, these incarceration trends did not impact all racial groups equally. Incarceration rates for black women far outstripped those for white and Hispanic women, and by 2000, black women were being incarcerated at a rate that was approximately five times that of whites and more than twice the rate of Hispanics (Kruttschnitt 2011, table 4). However, this changed precipitously between 2000 and 2009 when the proportion of black women in prison decreased by 31% and the relative proportions of white and Hispanic women increased [47% and 23%, respectively; see Sentencing Proj. (2013)]. Today, black women make up approximately 21% of the total inmate population, nearing twice their representation in the national population (Carson & Anderson 2016, Rastogi et al. 2011).

RESEARCH OF CONTEMPORARY INMATE SOCIETY

Although often limited and exploratory, the work of some penologists has connected the above trends to inmate outcomes and informal prison organization. In this section, we summarize recent research in these areas and note instances where gaps exist so that we may highlight these as important for future study.

Crowding, Violence, and Inmate Society

The explosive growth in the incarcerated population over the past five decades was predicted to markedly increase prison violence and the pains of imprisonment (Hagan 1995, Wacquant 2001). Paradoxically, the most reliable measures of prison violence, rates of prison homicide and suicide, dropped dramatically just as the number of inmates grew exponentially. Prior to 1980, the homicide rate within the nation's state prisons approached 60 per 100,000 inmates, but by 2000 this rate dropped more than 90% to 5 per 100,000 inmates, and recent statistics place the rate at 7 homicides per 100,000 inmates (Mumola 2005, Noonan & Ginder 2013, Sylvester et al. 1977). Reports of prison riots similarly dropped over this time period (Useem & Piehl 2006). Although such statistics by no means capture the extent of inmate violence (as we have no reliable data on nonlethal assaults) and prison overcrowding likely has other negative consequences (Gibbons 2006), the statistics at minimum suggest that the chaos expected to accompany prison overcrowding did not materialize (Travis et al. 2014).

Multilevel studies, including both inmate-level and facility-level characteristics, also produce equivocal findings for the association between overcrowding and inmate violence. Studies that have focused on a broad array of facility environmental (e.g., design capacity and facility overcrowding) and compositional characteristics (e.g., security levels, staff to inmate ratio, proportion of nonwhite staff, proportion of inmates held in punitive segregation) for a large number of (male) state institutions generally find that compositional factors are more important than environmental factors in shaping inmate violence (Steiner 2009, Steiner & Wooldredge 2008, Wooldredge & Steiner 2015). However, there are some compositional factors that may be related to violence that are conditioned by crowding. For example, in prisons that housed a greater proportion of younger (ages 18–25) or more-aggressive inmates, crowding increased levels of misconduct (Franklin et al. 2006, Lahm 2008). Other research, however, finds that facility size is more important than crowding and that higher assault levels occur in larger prisons that house higher custody inmates and a larger proportion of African Americans (Steiner 2009, Wooldredge & Steiner 2009).[1]

---

[1]There is some evidence that crowding and maximum security increase assaults in women's institutions (Steiner & Wooldredge 2009c). More generally, however, the work on violence in women's prisons has focused on the individual

Wacquant (2001) is perhaps the first scholar to connect prison overcrowding to changing inmate society. He argues that overcrowding, along with other changes wrought by mass incarceration, undermines traditional prison social structure founded on the convict code and inmate solidarity. Moreover, he asserts that the explosive growth in the prison population, racial cleavages, and a code of the street (Anderson 1999) imported from the postindustrial hyperghetto make modern prisons increasingly brutish and unstable. However, as outlined above, Wacquant's (2001) description of contemporary prisons appears inconsistent with official statistics of inmate violence, leaving open the question of how inmate society has responded to prison overcrowding.

Skarbek (2014) provides an alternate explanation that connects prison overcrowding with reductions in prison violence and changes in inmate social organization. Using descriptive data from California prisons, he argues that the overcrowded conditions that accompanied mass incarceration helped to destabilize existing inmate norms. In response, inmates turned to prison gangs as extralegal governing bodies that provided security through group allegiances and constant threats of retaliatory force, which in turn deterred inmate-on-inmate violence. This argument is reminiscent of Sykes' (1958) functionalist account of inmate society in that it connects inmate social organization to prison deprivations (i.e., growing insecurity that accompanied overcrowding). Indeed, Skarbek (2014) turns importation theory on its head by contending that modern prison gangs export their structures and illegal markets outside of prison. His theory also provides an intriguing explanation for the mixed results of overcrowding-violence research, in that overcrowding may contribute to violence up to a point when inmates take matters into their own hands and establish gangs for self-protection.

Although Wacquant (2001) and Skarbek (2014) provide intriguing accounts of the links between overcrowding and inmate social organization, it should be noted that neither of these authors directly observed inmate experiences in overcrowded settings. Similarly, studies of prison facility and compositional factors are unable to accurately measure managerial practices and philosophies likely to impact inmate social organization (Feely & Simon 1992, Garland 1990). The lack of embedded research in contemporary prisons leaves the connection between overcrowding and inmate society relatively unexplored.

Conditions in county and city jails have also been underexplored despite the fact that jails hold roughly 10% of the total correctional population and one-third of the incarcerated population (Kaeble & Glaze 2016). Similar to the growth in the prison population, the jail incarceration rate (county and city jails) peaked in 2008 at 340 per 100,000, before dropping to 300 per 100,000 (Minton & Zeng 2016). In contrast to prisons, however, jails are generally not overcrowded. Between 2014 and 2015, 80% of all jail jurisdictions in the United States were operating at less than 100% of their capacity (Minton & Zeng 2016). California represents an important exception and is one of the few jurisdictions with research of confinement conditions. In the wake of the California Public Safety Realignment initiative (which followed the Supreme Court's ruling mandating a reduction in the state's prison population by 137.5% of design capacity within two years), the California jail population increased by an estimated 7,600 inmates (Minton 2013). As of 2014, the statewide average daily population was approximately 2,000 inmates over the rated capacity (see **http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_show.asp?i=1061** on the Public Policy Institute of California website). This overcrowding, accompanied by a shift of prison inmates into the jail population, has increased jail violence (Caudill et al. 2014). Additionally, and perhaps not

predictors of violence (Teasdale et al. 2016); the nature of violence, or the fact that it is more relational/verbal than men's violence (Greer 2000, Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2003, Lahm 2015, Trammell 2009); and the rate of violence relative to the rate in men's prisons (Wolff et al. 2007, Wooldredge & Steiner 2015).

surprisingly since jails are known for having fewer amenities than prisons, inmates report that they would prefer doing time in a state prison rather than a local jail (Petersilia & Cullen 2015, Turner et al. 2015).

Race, Gangs, and Inmate Society

Skarbek (2014) also discusses the impacts of increased prison racial heterogeneity on inmate social order. Specifically, he argues that greater black and Hispanic prison representation resulted in increased racial segregation and between-race antagonisms. This fractionalization, Skarbek (2014) asserts, combined with the rise of prison gangs to create a balkanized social system made up of race-based gangs competing for shares in prison illicit activities, principally the drug trade.

Trammell's (2012) interviews with ex-convicts support Skarbek's (2014) description of the prison racial divide, at least within the Californian correctional system. The men in her study described California's prisons as being highly segregated by race, with violent incidents commonly occurring along racial lines despite the fact that the majority of individual inmates also socialized daily with friends from other races. Inmates thus enforced norms of racial segregation and resisted official mandates, such as the Supreme Court decision, to desegregate prisons. Prison authorities, in turn, acquiesced to inmate racial norms to maintain system stability (Goodman 2008).

In his ethnography, Irwin (2005) provides a markedly different picture of race relations in California's Solano prison. Irwin (2005) found that, although inmates tended to segregate themselves by race and ethnicity, little racial tension existed and racial boundaries were commonly porous. He argues that this racial détente was the direct result of prison policy, specifically increased surveillance and the constant threat of reassignment to a higher security level supermax prison for any violence. For Irwin (2005), the characteristics of contemporary warehouse imprisonment successfully dismantled the authority of race-based prison gangs and weakened racial barriers within inmate society.

Irwin's (2005) focus on prison management to explain reductions in racial conflict is reminiscent of DiIulio's (1987, p. 239) earlier description of the bureaucratic prison, where strict rules and a strong (militarized) custodial regime atomize inmate society to create "safe, lawful, smooth-running correctional institutions." Where Irwin (2005) and DiIulio (1987) diverge, however, is in the perceived consequences of such penal regimes for inmate rehabilitation and psychological health. For Irwin (2005), the loss of agency and assaults on self that accompany warehouse imprisonment are detrimental to inmate outcomes and outweigh any safety benefits. For DiIulio (1987), inmate rehabilitation cannot begin until safety is ensured. Moreover, he argued that inmates should not be trusted to police themselves or work in concert with institutional goals, so strict bureaucratic prison management is an optimal solution.

Trulson & Marquart (2009) also looked to correctional policy and management to understand prison racial (de)segregation and inmate violence. They focused on the social, legal, and policy changes surrounding racial integration processes in the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC) in the latter twentieth century. Although operating within a highly segregated Southern state, the TDC was forced to respond to incremental federal and state legislation requiring prison racial integration, ultimately resulting in random cell assignment by race. Both prisoners and staff were reluctant to implement these changes, but Trulson & Marquart (2009) found that forced racial integration was not followed by increased interracial violence, system disorder, or feared race wars. Similarly, Steiner & Wooldredge (2009b) examined differences in inmate rule violations across 175 facilities across the United States and found that, net of other individual and contextual factors, racial heterogeneity was associated with significantly fewer drug/alcohol and nonviolent incidents. The authors concluded that increased interracial contact can increase prison social order without also increasing interracial violence.

Drugs and Inmate Society

The influx of drug offenders during the era of mass incarceration, sentenced either for drug possession or trafficking, may have substantially altered contemporary inmate social organization. Crewe (2005, 2009) suggests that the increasing presence of hard drugs (e.g., heroin) affected the informal social system within the medium-security English prison he observed. Specifically, he found that inmates dependent on heroin in prison became disruptive to system stability due to debt problems and unpredictable behaviors that often accompany addiction. Addicted inmates are held in low regard by other inmates and marginalized within inmate society. Simultaneously, Crewe (2005, 2009) asserts that the illicit market surrounding prison drugs increases the power and influence of prison drug dealers. Such dealers often exploit other inmates, both users and nonusers, to maintain their power and profits, further destabilizing inmate social order. In the end, he argues that although heroin may (temporarily) alleviate individual users' pain, it also contributes to the collective pains of imprisonment.

Skarbek (2014) also points to prison drug markets as influential in shaping contemporary inmate society. For him, prison gangs operate as governance structures for prison drug sales and debt collection. This business, he argues, has not only supplanted the inmate code as the formal organization of inmate society but, given the profitability and power of the drug market, it has also allowed gangs to export their activities outside of the prison.

Age and Inmate Society

A growing body of research documents the incarceration experiences of older, long-term, and "lifer" inmates, groups that are increasing in size as the era of mass incarceration reaches its fifth decade (Carson & Sabol 2016). The broad consensus from this research is that, consistent with the age-crime curve, older and long-term inmates typically age out of misconduct and adjust to prison in predominantly prosocial ways as their sentences unfold. Johnson (1987) and Johnson & Dobrzanska (2005) refer to this adjustment process as mature coping, defined as "...one who seeks autonomy without violating the rights of others, security without resort to deception or violence, and relatedness to others as the finest and fullest expression of human identity" (Johnson & Dobrzanska 2005, p. 8).[2] Consistent with this definition, Irwin (2010) found that the 17 lifers he interviewed, each of whom had already served 20 years in prison, progressed through phases of increased conscience, remorse, self-discovery, and redemption through service to others. Most recently, Crewe et al. (2016) covered similar terrain in describing how English prisoners adapted to long-term sentences. The inmates they interviewed came to terms with their offenses and shifted from passive to active agency by making their prison terms meaningful and productive through either redemptive or self-improvement projects.

Less is known about how long-term or older inmates fit into inmate society. Zamble (1992) surveyed 41 long-term Canadian inmates in the first 7 years of their sentences and found that, in general, over time the inmates spent more of their optional time in their cells with a few close friends instead of informally socializing with the broader inmate community. Similarly, Irwin (2005, 2010) and Honeywell (2015) suggest that lifers form small fraternities or niches within the prison, thus avoiding the potential conflicts of "the mix," i.e., the hustles that revolve around the underground economy and drugs. Alternatively, in a recent study that combines social network and inmate narrative data, Kreager et al. (2017) found that older long-term inmates were atop a prison good behavior unit's status hierarchy and were perceived as providing valuable mentoring

---

[2]It is also worth noting the similarity between Johnson's (1987) mature coping and Sykes' (1958) real man argot role.

and inmate-staff brokerage to younger and shorter-term peers. This study suggests that, under the right circumstances, inmate "old heads" may help inmate peers cope with the psychological and physical pains of imprisonment (Adams 1992, Johnson 1987, Zamble & Porporino 2013) and foster a solidary inmate community.

Paralleling the literature on age and prison adaptation is a small body of research on religious conversion and inmate coping. For example, Maruna et al. (2006) found that the conversion experience allowed inmates to cope with incarceration's deprivations and construct meaningful and hopeful self-narratives. Kerley & Copes (2009) also found conversion to be an important turning point in inmates' subjective identities. More important for this review, the latter authors also found that connections with religious peers and an increase in social embeddedness that accompanied conversion were critical in maintaining inmates' prosocial religious identities. Such findings point toward the importance of religious communities in structuring inmate social organization and individual pathways through the prison experience. Unfortunately, rarely are religiosity and conversion approached within the broader inmate context. Indeed, in perhaps the only study that examines religion within the inmate social system, Liebling & Arnold (2012) found that expanding numbers of Muslims in an English prison increased intergroup conflicts and eroded inmate trust. More research is necessary to elucidate the group contexts of inmate religiosity and connect these to prison adaptation, coping, and rehabilitation.

Inmate Society in Women's Prisons

Early depictions of the inmate society in women's prisons were shaped by the classic studies of men's institutions. Researchers focused primarily on the question of whether women's adaptations to prison were a function of the same hallmarks of deprivation and importation that shaped men's adaptations to prison (Giallombardo 1966, Heffernan 1972, Ward & Kassebaum 1965). Although support emerged for both perspectives, the role of gender role socialization in women's adaptations remained a dominant focus of research even as the number of women being imprisoned climbed dramatically and the nature of women's prisons, and the discourse around women's criminality, began to change (see Kruttschnitt et al. 2000). It was not until the late 1990s that scholars started documenting the ways in which the character and meaning of women's carceral lives were changing, albeit in an uneven fashion.

One of the most noted changes in women's conditions of confinement during the era of mass incarceration was crowding. Although there is substantial state-by-state variation in this phenomenon, researchers studying prisons for women in diverse locations (California, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut) note how crowding became a defining feature of women's institutions, spurring the growth of new custodial models of imprisonment for women (Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2005, Owen 1998, Rierden 1997, Silberman 2007). Although crowding and violence are commonly studied in men's prisons, they have rarely been examined in studies of women's prisons, perhaps because they are a relatively new phenomenon. A study by Steiner & Wooldredge (2009a) represents an important exception. Drawing on national state-level data at two points in time that capture the significant growth in the rate of women's imprisonment (1991 and 1997), they found that crowding (the ratio of the daily population to design capacity) resulted in more self-reported physical assaults. Although crowding may well have increased levels of physical aggression among women prisoners, it is important to note that this increase is likely grounded in a low violence base rate. A wide range of research suggests that physical violence is rare in women's prisons but verbal and emotional aggression is quite common (Celinska & Sung 2014, Greer 2000, Harer & Langan 2001, Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2003, Lahm 2015, Owen 1998, Trammell 2009).

The finding that there are relatively low levels of serious physical aggression in women's prisons is underscored by the general absence of gangs in female institutions and the role of race relations in their carceral lives. Two studies that encompassed three of the four prisons for women in California during the 1990s, and thereby a significant proportion of the women imprisoned in the United States at that time, found no evidence of gang activity and little evidence that race was a significant determinant of either the inmate social structure or women's adaptations to prison life (Carbone-Lopéz & Kruttschnitt 2003, Gartner & Kruttschnitt 2004, Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2005, Owen 1998). As Owen (1998) aptly described, race operated as an interesting subtext in the prison, structuring who hung around with whom on the yard and at meals. Race also had little influence on who was politically active,[3] or who participated in the mix, but it could surface in the context of interpersonal relationships and competition over scarce resources.[4] However, if we put aside the conventional (i.e., male) approach to studying race in the context of the inmate society, there is evidence that it affects how women cope with their conditions of confinement. Bosworth's (1999) study of three women's prisons in England revealed that racial and ethnic alliances developed outside of prison were maintained inside and that they were important aspects of the women's identity (along with their age, religion, sexual orientation, and offense of conviction). Kruttschnitt & Hussemann (2008) extended this perspective by examining how race and ethnicity affect women's abilities to cope with their conditions of confinement in two different contexts: California and England. They found that in California, where the conditions of confinement were more severe, racial identity surfaced as important only for white women, who were unaccustomed to holding a minority status. By contrast, in England, white women rarely drew attention to their racial/ethnic identity, and it was the women of color and the foreign-national prisoners who drew attention to how their racial identities shaped their sense of themselves as the other. All of this suggests that race may be a necessary element in understanding how women do time, but it is far from a sufficient explanation for the structure of the social order of women's prisons.

Age and aging are both important elements of understanding women's prison experiences. Younger inmates' experiences are more varied than older inmates', shaped in large part by whether they have done time in prison before. For young women who are new to prison, the experience can be isolating and frightening, but for others, with more prison time under their belts, it can be a chance to get back into the mix hustling drugs and other inmates (Kruttschnitt et al. 2000, Lempert 2016, Owen 1998). Older inmates, by contrast, have always been considered a stabilizing presence in the prison, and they are garnering increasing attention as the age structure of the prison population shifts. The number of female prisoners age 55 and older quadrupled between 1993 and 2013, accounting for 39% of the overall growth in the female prison population during this period (Carson & Sabol 2016). Most of the research on these aging prisoners focuses on health care needs and the attending inadequacies of the health care facilities in women's prisons (see, e.g., Aday & Farney 2014, Fisher & Hatton 2010, Harner & Riley 2013) rather than how this shift in the age structure may be altering the inmate society in women's prisons. However, some attention has been given to lifers, whose presence in the prison population has also increased.

---

[3]An important exception to this may be found in Diaz-Cotto's (1996) description of Latina prisoners' attempts to implement reforms in New York in the 1980s and 1990s.

[4]Few scholars have examined whether, and, if so, how, the underground economy differs in men's and women's prisons. One notable exception, however, is Alarid's (2005) study of workplace deviance in the underground economy in Texas prisons. She found that the overall prevalence of selected deviant activities (i.e., passing contraband, stealing food) did not differ by gender; however, one prominent subcultural difference was that men were more likely than women to use some of their job activities to alter their prison uniforms to signify their gang affiliations.

Between 2008 and 2012 there was a 14% increase in the number of life-sentenced women, and, as of 2012, 5,361 of the life-sentenced inmates in US prisons were women (Nellis & King 2009). Lempert's (2016) study of 72 of the 176 life-sentenced women in Michigan represents one of the few dedicated studies of lifers. Her research encompassed women with a range of precarceral experiences, including their age at the time they received their no-exit sentence. Despite these variations, she found that these women employed four common coping strategies: (a) normalizing activities by using "as if" in the outside world analogies; (b) staying busy; (c) forming affective and instrumental relationships with peers; and (d) becoming spiritual. Her findings also underscore much of what is known about the place of long-termers in inmate society who serve as model inmates by avoiding the mix and by providing needed counseling to neophytes (Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2005, Owen 1998, Silberman 2007).

Inmate Trust in Late Modernity

Within the sociology of punishment, a substantial body of work has documented and explained societal shifts toward coercive control accompanying mass incarceration. Garland's (2001) *The Culture of Control* is perhaps the most well-known example in this area. Central to his thesis is that interrelated political, cultural, and criminological responses to social change created an overarching emphasis on exclusion and control to solve perceived issues of crime and insecurity. The late-modern prison then replaces the rehabilitative functioning of the penal-welfare era with a singular focus on controlling and excluding abstract, deindividuated, and stigmatized offenders. Several penologists have extended these themes to examine how societal-level foci on punitiveness have affected microlevel inmate-staff relationships. For example, Kruttschnitt & Gartner (2005) provide a detailed account of the changing contexts (i.e., 1960s to 1990s) of two California women's prisons. One of their key findings is that macrolevel "changes in penal ideologies, rationales, and practices described in recent prison scholarship translated into changes in the experiences of female prisoners" (Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2005, p. 158). Specifically, they argue that societal views emphasizing punishment and the incorrigible offender are mirrored by prison staff when dealing with rapidly expanding populations within the two prisons. Results include weakened inmate-staff trust, the dismantling of rehabilitation programming, and inmates retreating from the institution and one another. With regard to inmate organization, the authors assert that the political contexts of modern penal policy fractured and atomized inmate solidarity and cohesion.

Liebling & Arnold (2012) cover similar ground in their study of an English maximum security prison. Comparing qualitative data collected in the prison from 1998–99 to 2009–10, they found a deterioration in inmate-staff relationships and a more heterogeneous, balkanized, and distrustful inmate population. Similar to Kruttschnitt & Gartner (2005), the authors assert that the less hierarchical and cohesive inmate society they observed resulted from broader structural and cultural changes that penetrated the prison on multiple fronts, including inmate composition (e.g., age and faith), staff beliefs, and coercive correctional practices.

In another example, Crewe (2007a) collected 10 months of ethnographic fieldwork and hundreds of hours of interview material to document how inmates complied with, resisted, or adapted to increasingly coercive formal controls in an English medium-security prison. Similar to Liebling & Arnold (2012), Crewe (2007a) finds that the majority of inmates resigned themselves to the prison's absolute power and conformed to individualized routines. Although passive resistance and institutional manipulation were rewarded with increased status, such behaviors resulted in individual rather than collective goods, meaning that the solidary society proposed by Sykes (1958) was effectively dismantled by the late-modern prison regime.

Although the above literature paints a dour picture of inmate trust and social organization in modern prisons, alternative images exist. For example, Schaefer et al. (2017) examine friendship networks in a Pennsylvania medium-security men's prison unit and find them to be very dense, composed of reciprocated ties, and with almost no social isolates. The proposed mechanism for this more cohesive structure is that the unit comprised inmates who had demonstrated good behavior and therefore were permitted by staff to socialize and were not confronted with a highly repressive prison regime. The examined prison unit thus had a more supportive and solidary social organization, which inmates did not want to jeopardize with misbehavior that would result in their being returned to general population. Research in this vein can demonstrate that even in an era that prioritizes punishment and control, conditions may exist for the establishment of inmate trust and the harnessing of this trust toward rehabilitation ideals.

Comparative Approaches

Up to this point, we have focused our discussion on prison conditions and inmate society within the contemporary United States and England. England adopted much of the neo-liberal approach to punishment that has characterized American penal policy over the past two decades (Garland 2000, Pratt 2000), which affected both who goes to prison (more violent and drug offenders and more women) and, presumably, life inside prison, as sentences lengthened, crowding and violence increased, and the average age of the inmate population increased (Allen & Dempsey 2016).[5] Prisoner and staff interactions were also altered, as risk assessment, classification, and responsibilization became the order of the day (Crewe 2011a, Minist. Justice 2013). Although strong similarities exist and we may assume similar processes across the two countries, it remains useful to directly compare the two countries and extend these comparisons to other nations with alternative correctional regimes. Indeed, during the era of mass incarceration, penal research in non-US contexts has outpaced its domestic counterpart, providing exemplars for how we might proceed.

On the broadest level, Ross and colleagues (2008) examined the prison climate in ten federal prisons in the United States and three English prisons. The characteristics of the inmates sampled differed significantly, but there was no significant difference in the factor-scored scales that measured personal well-being (i.e., psychological and somatic complaints), suggesting that the pains of imprisonment are largely the same across prison contexts. However, what distinguished the two prison systems were the measures of environmental quality (e.g., cleanliness, safety, noise, crowding) and safety and security. Perceived safety/security was higher in England than the United States. Although there were no national differences in inmates' influence on one another or the frequency of assaults, staff were seen as having more influence on inmates in England than in the United States. This may reflect the UK prison system implementing more environmental controls (e.g., extensive use of CCTV) and the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme after the prison disturbances of 1990. IEP gives prisoners the chance to earn various privileges (in-cell TV, additional visits, and spending money) and is designed to get prisoners to take responsibility for their conditions of confinement. As Crewe (2007a, 2011a,b) documented in a series of articles, this scheme profoundly shifted the inmate culture. He suggests that "compared to only two decades ago, prisoners in England and Wales are less likely to live in fear of their captors, to be systematically brutalized, to share triple-bunked cells with their own excrement and to be deprived for days

---

[5]In 2015, England and Wales had the highest rate of prisoners per 100,000 (148) among all western European jurisdictions (Aebi et al. 2017).

on end of showers, fresh air and clean clothing" (Crewe 2011a, p. 524). Instead, with the extensive use of responsibilization, prisoners now endure the pains of self-governance and engage in various forms of compliance (e.g., fatalistic, detached, and strategic or manipulative) to get through their prison sentences.

Additional comparative research suggests that although this new scheme may have altered the weight of imprisonment, the tenor of staff-inmate interactions in England remains extremely problematic. A particularly cogent analysis of these interactions first appeared in David Downes' (1988) *Contrasts in Tolerance*, a comparative analysis of crime control and penal policy in England and the Netherlands. As part of his comparative study, Downes interviewed 13 English prisoners held in Dutch prisons and 14 Dutch prisoners housed in English prisons. These interviews led him to conclude that the Netherlands provides a more open and humane environment for prisoners. A recent replication of Downes' (1988) comparative analysis of the penal systems in the Netherlands and England drew particular attention to the stark contrasts in prisoner-staff inter-actions in these two countries. Despite efforts to improve prison life in England, Dutch prisoners found the English correctional officers largely unresponsive to their needs, dehumanizing in their interactions, and particularly hostile to nonwhite foreign-national prisoners (Dirkzwager & Kruttschnitt 2012, Kruttschnitt & Dirkzwager 2011, Kruttschnitt et al. 2013). Although this may seem like a somewhat lopsided comparison, given the penal standards upheld in the Netherlands, others have also found that frontline correctional officers in England are punitive and disrespectful in public sector prisons and that staff racism remains a problem (Cheliotis & Liebling 2006, Crewe et al. 2015).

Other attributes of the prison society, e.g., gang activity, drug trafficking, and the adaptations of an aging inmate population, are largely consonant with the United States. Empirical research on both prisoner and staff perceptions of gang activity in nine prisons suggests that it is a frequent occurrence in male prisons among younger inmates and recidivists. Like gang activity in the United States, its focus is primarily on drug possession and distribution (Wood 2006, Wood & Adler 2001); in fact, Crewe (2005 p. 462) has suggested that drugs may be the "main motor of social dynamics" in English prisons today, thereby eroding the culture of solidarity.[6] But a fundamental difference between US and English prison gangs is their locus of formation: In the United States, it tends to be along racial lines, whereas in the United Kingdom, it is formed along the regional lines of nationality, region of the country, or neighborhood (Crewe 2009, Harvey 2007, Phillips 2012). Aging and the mechanisms associated with coping with different stages of a prison career also have some consistency across borders. English prisoners serving life sentences of 15 years or more identified different sets of concerns in early and later stages of their prison careers that required different coping mechanisms. In the early stages, they reported missing little luxuries, heterosexual relations, and specific individuals. But by the latter stages, individuals became more isolated and emotionally detached (Frank & Gill 2015, Hulley et al. 2015). Further, inmates who have grown old in prison, by virtue of the length of their initial sentence or as a result of being sentenced to prison late in life, draw attention to the problems of both psychological and physical self-maintenance (Sykes 1958). Physically, they must find ways to adapt to the structure and routines that have been designed for much younger prisoners; psychologically, they must confront their loss of contact with the outside world and their fear of death (Crawley & Sparks 2005, 2006).

A somewhat different picture emerges when we examine inmate society in women's prisons in England and the Netherlands. Although women's prisons have always been imbued with distinctive

---

[6]Trammell (2009) also suggests that the influx of gangs and the underground drug economy have reshaped the inmate code in California.

programs and settings, reflecting society's changing views of women's criminality, they have not been impervious to the larger shifts in penal policy and the changes in discourse that stress risk, classification, and control. However, relative to the United States, where one-third of the women held in prisons throughout the world are housed (Kruttschnitt 2011), the implications of new penal policies for women in England and the Netherlands may, in some respects, be more benign. Because California is often considered the bellwether state in penal policy, and we have empirical evidence about the character of women's penal experiences during the era of mass incarceration (Kruttschnitt & Gartner 2005, Owen 1998, 2005), we consider how the experiences of women in California compare to those of women in England and the Netherlands.

California demonstrates the most obvious movement away from the domestic rehabilitative models that have long characterized women's prisons, despite the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) rhetoric of engaging in a gender-responsive approach to women prisoners (Calif. Dep. Correct. Rehabil. 2016a). Although the size of the female inmate population has dropped by 49% since 2007 (Calif. Dep. Correct. Rehabil. 2016b), all three of the women's prisons are at, or well above, their capacity, and dealing with long sentences, inadequate health care, and abusive interactions with staff appears to be a significant problem for the inmates (Thompson 2016).[7] England also has embraced a gender-responsive approach to female inmates that puts considerable emphasis on domestic comforts (see Corston 2007, HM Prison Serv. 2008), but it is unclear how, if at all, this has changed the inmates' lives. The number of women incarcerated has been relatively stable over the past 15 years (hovering around 4,000) and most of the women are serving sentences of 6 months or less in 12 relatively smaller prisons; nevertheless, problems with health care and suicide are ongoing concerns (Plugge et al. 2006, Short et al. 2009, Wolff et al. 2007). By contrast to California and England, the Netherlands has no specific gender response scheme. Its crime rate has declined so much that it has closed, or is closing, 19 prisons, including one for women. Sentences are short and in the last three months of their sentences, women can spend up to 60 days outside of the prison looking for work and reestablishing family connections.

What do these distinctions mean for the tenor of inmate interactions? Survey data collected in two women's prisons in California, three women's prisons in England, and four women's prisons in the Netherlands provide an assessment of the effects of demographics, prior prison experiences, and relations with staff and other inmates on prisoners' well-being. These data revealed that staff-inmate interactions had the largest impact on inmates' well-being, and they were significantly worse in California and England relative to the Netherlands (Kruttschnitt et al. 2013). More generally, despite the differences in scale and nods to gendered approaches, the women in California and England provide similar descriptions of their conditions of confinement and the characteristics of inmate societies: the problem of missing their families, the distrust of other prisoners, the conflicts that emerge over the underground economy, and the general lack of gangs and racial hostilities (Cheliotis & Liebling 2006, Kruttschnitt 2005, Owen 1998).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

When compiling a review such as this, one is immediately struck by how little recent research has been conducted within US prisons, a prerequisite for understanding inmate society in the era of mass incarceration. Although IRB approval remains a hurdle for future prison research,

---

[7]The phenomenon of staff sexually and verbally abusing women inmates is not unique to California; it appears to be a more widespread problem in women's prisons in the United States (Buchanan 2007).

what can be improved are the institutional relationships between academics and correctional practitioners. Such partnerships become increasingly feasible as cracks in current criminal justice policies widen and stakeholders across the political spectrum understand the need for reform. Social scientists would be instrumental in producing and evaluating the evidence-based policies undergirding criminal justice reform. For their part, prison scholars need to tailor their research to, or at least acknowledge, the practical needs of prison administrators (Wacquant 2002). To only critique the status quo or focus solely on general science research questions will not foster researcher-practitioner partnerships or open the gates to prison research. We live in a time when the need for embedded prison research is recognized by all sides, but steps remain to break down preexisting institutional barriers.

There are several paths for scholars to connect research of inmate society with practical programs, policies, and outcomes important for prison administrators. Much of the current sociological research of incarceration has, perhaps rightly so, focused on the impacts of incarceration on post-release individual, family, community, and societal outcomes (Travis et al. 2014, Wakefield & Uggen 2010, Western et al. 2015). Missing from this research are connections between post-release outcomes and the experience of incarceration (Travis et al. 2014). What is then needed is longitudinal research that begins in prisons (including pre-prison data and records) and prospectively moves toward parole and community re-entry processes (Kreager et al. 2016c, Volker et al. 2016). Such research can answer long-dormant questions about inmate structure and culture while simultaneously connecting prison experiences to successful community reintegration and criminal desistance. The combination of pre-prison, in-prison, and post-prison data allows for the estimation and evaluation of individual health and behavioral trajectories that include the incarceration experience. Answers from such research are easily framed as contributions to sociological and life-course perspectives, as well as correctional policy.

Relatedly, inmate treatment programming and interventions provide attractive avenues for connecting inmate relational experiences with prison policy. Interventions based on inmate peer interactions—such as therapeutic communities, group-based prevention programs, educational classrooms, and group work assignments—could benefit greatly from sociological and system-level approaches. There is now a substantial body of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that have evaluated the effectiveness of correctional programs, including boot camps, scared straight programs, cognitive-behavioral therapy, and therapeutic communities (MacKenzie 2006). The contributions of these RCTs often lie in discrediting the effectiveness of popular, but often costly, correctional programs. However, in cases in which programs are evaluated as effective (e.g., therapeutic communities), the treatment effects are often modest and the RCT is unable to explain weak program impacts in terms of proposed theoretical mechanisms. In other words, RCTs are poor tools for understanding why a program works and thus have little to say for how ineffective programs can be improved. Combined with thorough program fidelity and integrity assessments (Duwe & Clark 2015), prison-embedded sociological research has tremendous potential for understanding the mechanisms of effective correctional treatment programming. In the tradition of Moreno's (1932) early work on prison-based group therapy, the burgeoning area of network science offers a particularly useful approach for understanding and improving prison programs (Kreager et al. 2016a, Schaefer et al. 2017). Specifically, such studies can identify optimal social structures and structural dynamics necessary for the diffusion of valued treatment outcomes. The lessons learned from such research can be returned to correctional practitioners to evaluate and refine prison programming.

Network science also offers a valuable tool for understanding incarceration's impacts on social capital over time. There is a growing literature on the associations between visitation and inmate misconduct and ex-inmate recidivism (Cochran & Mears 2013, Mears et al. 2012). Missing

from this research, however, is how visitation relates to inmates' positions within inmate society. Network surveys administered both inside and outside of prison can fill this gap and describe incarceration's effects on trajectories of social capital accumulation/erosion and how variations in these social ties impact criminal recidivism upon release.

There has also been little research on inmate social organization within local jails. In 2015, one-third of the nation's incarcerated population was housed in local jails (Kaeble & Glaze 2016), but research on jail inmates' experiences falls well behind the already limited research on state and federal prisoners. One can imagine that high turnover of jail populations undermines and atomizes inmate social organization, potentially resulting in greater disorder and violence. Indeed, in one of the few studies of inmate networks in temporary detainment facilities, Kreager et al. (2016b) found that detainees in the Netherlands who did not create trusting peer ties had better mental health and behavioral outcomes than those who did. Contrary to much research on social integration and health (e.g., Berkman et al. 2000), this finding suggests that social isolation and keeping one's head down benefits short-term inmates. More research is needed to replicate this finding in the American context, compare it to inmate networks in prisons, and understand the connections between social integration and health and recidivism.

Finally, extant studies within American prisons have been confined to a narrow number of states connected with enterprising researchers and/or progressive correctional departments. We thus know far more about prison experiences in California and Pennsylvania than we do about similar experiences in Southern states, where correctional regimes, overcrowding, and inmate demographics may differ substantially. California has the largest correctional population in the United States, providing some justification for its central place in prison research, but Georgia is a close second and has an incarceration rate that is more than five times that of California (Kaeble & Glaze 2016). Indeed, all of the Deep South states (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi) have incarceration rates that surpass California's and are among the highest in the nation. Researching inmate life in these understudied states may identify processes, norms, and social structures that differ substantially from what is already known. Accessing such prisons may not only contribute to long-standing perspectives of inmate social organization but also point to ways that the era of mass incarceration has differentially impacted inmate experiences across geographical and institutional contexts.

CONCLUSION

The groundwork has been laid for a resurgence in embedded prison research and explorations of inmate society. With mass incarceration showing some signs of receding and criminal justice reform receiving increased bipartisan political support, correctional administrations may have room to search for alternative prison policies. There is also growing recognition that such re-forms should have their basis in research rather than anecdotal evidence, just desserts punishment philosophies, or institutional immediacy. More than at any time within the past four decades, social scientists have a role to play in prisons, increasing the prospects for researcher-correctional practitioner partnerships. The challenge for penal scholars is then to directly engage the priorities of correctional staff to build trust and open the doors for further research.

The perceived irrelevance, and even suspicion, often placed on sociological research by prison managers (Jewkes & Wright 2016, Wacquant 2002) may be allayed with studies offering quantifi-able and replicable products relevant for correctional policies and institutional concerns. As stated in the previous section, network science offers one promising avenue for future research of inmate society (Kreager et al. 2016c, 2017; Schaefer et al. 2017). Network approaches provide intuitively appealing and tangible visualizations and statistics for complex concepts, such as unit hierarchy,

groups/gangs, peer influence, and social integration. Results from prison-based network studies are not only capable of testing long-standing questions about the structure and culture of inmate society but can also be easily conveyed to prison administrators and policymakers. Moreover, the quantifiable metrics associated with network data allow for comparisons across contexts, increasing generalizability, and permitting hypothesis tests of the association between inmate experiences and health and health-related behaviors.

We are not Pollyannaish in our perceptions of future prison research. We live in a time of tremendous uncertainty on multiple fronts, including crime trends, criminal justice policy, and state and federal politics. The atmosphere today, at least at the state level, appears opportune for research aimed at increasing the humanity, rehabilitation potential, and, simply, understanding of prison processes, but there is no guarantee that this situation will carry forward to the near future. The risks and uncertainties of prison research are even greater at the project level. Changes in prison administrative personnel or local prison circumstances (e.g., inmate lockdowns) can easily delay or derail the best-laid plans. Indeed, setbacks and uneven progress are normative for prison research. It takes persistence, patience, adaptation, and negotiation to conduct such research, particularly when it is geared toward the inmate experience. Ideally, the needs of scholars and correctional practitioners will further align to lessen barriers and illuminate the inmate social world. Potentially, such research can improve inmate safety and reduce the direct and collateral consequences of incarceration while also answering general social science questions.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LITERATURE CITED

Adams K. 1992. Adjusting to prison life. *Crim. Justice* 16:275–359

Aday R, Farney L. 2014. Malign neglect: assessing older women's health care experiences in prison. *J. Bioethical Inq*. 11(3):359–72

Aebi MF, Tiago MM, Burkhardt C. 2017. *SPACE I—Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics: Prison Populations Survey 2015*. Strasbourg: Counc. Eur.

Alarid LF. 2005. Turning a profit or just passing the time? A gender comparison of prisoner jobs and workplace deviance in the sub-rosa economy. *Deviant Behav*. 26(6):621–41

Allen G, Dempsey N. 2016. *Prison population statistics*. Brief. Pap. SN/SG/04334, House Commons Libr., London

Anderson E. 1999. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: WW Norton

Andrews DA, Bonta J. 2010. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Co. 5th ed.

Andrews DA, Bonta J, Hoge RD. 1990. Classification for effective rehabilitation: rediscovering psychology. *Crim. Justice Behav*. 17(1):19–52

Andrews DA, Bonta J, Wormith JS. 2006. The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime Delinquency* 52(1):7–27

Beck AJ. 2015. *Use of restrictive housing in U.S. prisons and jails, 2011–12*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 249209, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Belbot B. 2004. Report on the prison litigation reform act: What have the courts decided so far? *Prison J.* 84:290–316

Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I, Seeman TE. 2000. From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 51(6):843–57

Bosworth M. 1999. *Engendering Resistance: Agency and Power in Women's Prisons*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate

Buchanan KS. 2007. Impunity: sexual abuse in women's prisons. *Harv. Civ. Rights Civ. Liberties Law Rev.* 42:45

Calif. Dep. Correct. Rehabil. 2016a. *Female Offender Program and Services*. Sacramento, CA: CDCR. **http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Adult_Operations/FOPS/index.html**

Calif. Dep. Correct. Rehabil. 2016b. *Spring 2016 Population Projections*. Sacramento, CA: CDCR. **http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/Projections/S16Pub.pdf**

Camp SD, Gaes GG, Langan NP, Saylor WG. 2003. The influence of prisons on inmate misconduct: a multilevel investigation. *Justice Q.* 20(3):501–33

Carbone-Lopéz KC, Kruttschnitt C. 2003. Assessing the racial climate in women's institutions in the context of penal reform. *Women Crim. Justice* 15(1):55–79

Carson EA, Anderson E. 2016. *Prisoners in 2015*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 250229, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Carson EA, Golinelli D. 2014. *Prisoners in 2012: trends in admissions and releases, 1991–2012*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 243920, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Carson EA, Sabol WJ. 2016. *Aging of the state prison population, 1993–2013*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 248766, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Caudill JW, Trulson CR, Marquart JW, Patten R, Thomas MO, Anderson S. 2014. Correctional destabilization and jail violence: the consequences of prison depopulation legislation. *J. Crim. Justice* 42(6):500–6

Celinska K, Sung H-E. 2014. Gender differences in the determinants of prison rule violations. *Prison J.* 94(2):220–41

Cheliotis LK, Liebling A. 2006. Race matters in British prisons: towards a research agenda. *Br. J. Criminol.* 46(2):286–317

Clear TR, Frost NA. 2013. *The Punishment Imperative: The Rise and Failure of Mass Incarceration in America*. New York: NYU Press

Clemmer D. 1940. *The Prison Community*. New Braunfels, TX: Christopher Publ. House

Cochran JC, Mears DP. 2013. Social isolation and inmate behavior: a conceptual framework for theorizing prison visitation and guiding and assessing research. *J. Crim. Justice* 41(4):252–61

Corston J. 2007. *The Corston Report: A Review of Women with Particular Vulnerabilities in the Criminal Justice System*. London: Home Office

Crawley E, Sparks R. 2005. Hidden injuries? Researching the experience of older men in English prisons. *Howard J. Crim. Justice* 44(4):345–56

Crawley E, Sparks R. 2006. Is there life after imprisonment? How elderly men talk about imprisonment and release. *Criminol. Crim. Justice* 6(1):63–82

Crewe B. 2005. Prisoner society in the era of hard drugs. *Punishm. Soc.* 7(4):457–81

Crewe B. 2007a. Power, adaptation and resistance in a late-modern men's prison. *Br. J. Criminol.* 47(2):256–75

Crewe B. 2007b. The sociology of imprisonment. In *Handbook on Prisons*, ed. Y Jewkes, pp. 123–51. New York: Routledge

Crewe B. 2009. *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation and Social Life in an English Prison*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Crewe B. 2011a. Depth, weight, tightness: revisiting the pains of imprisonment. *Punishm. Soc.* 13(5):509–29

Crewe B. 2011b. Soft power in prison: implications for staff-prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *Eur. J. Criminol.* 8(6):455–68

Crewe B, Hulley S, Wright S. 2016. Swimming with the tide: adapting to long-term imprisonment. *Justice Q.* 34:517–41

Crewe B, Liebling A, Hulley S. 2015. Staff-prisoner relationships, staff professionalism, and the use of authority in public- and private-sector prisons. *Law Soc. Inq.* 40(2):309–44

Diaz-Cotto J. 1996. *Gender, Ethnicity, and the State: Latina and Latino Prison Politics*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press

DiIulio JJ. 1987. *Governing Prisons*. New York: Free Press

Dirkzwager AJE, Kruttschnitt C. 2012. Prisoners' perceptions of correctional officers' behavior in English and Dutch prisons. *J. Crim. Justice* 40(5):404–12

Downes D. 1988. *Contrasts in Tolerance: Post-War Penal Policy in the Netherlands and England and Wales*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press

Duwe G, Clark V. 2015. Importance of program integrity. *Criminol. Public Policy* 14(2):301–28

Feely MM, Simon J. 1992. The new penology: notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology* 30(4):449–74

Fisher AA, Hatton DC. 2010. A study of women prisoners' use of co-payments for health care: issues of access. *Women's Health Issues* 20(3):185–92

Frank JB, Gill EA. 2015. The negotiated identities of long-term inmates: breaking the chains of problematic integration. *West. J. Commun.* 79(5):513–32

Franklin TW, Franklin CA, Pratt TC. 2006. Examining the empirical relationship between prison crowding and inmate misconduct: a meta-analysis of conflicting research results. *J. Crim. Justice* 34(4):401–12

Frost NA, Monteiro CE. 2016. *Administrative segregation in U.S. prisons*. Natl. Inst. Justice Rep. NCJ 249749, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Garland D. 1990. *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Garland D. 2000. The culture of high crime societies. *Br. J. Criminol.* 40(3):347–75

Garland D. 2001. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Gartner R, Kruttschnitt C. 2004. A brief history of doing time: the California Institution for Women in the 1960s and the 1990s. *Law Soc. Rev.* 38(2):267–304

Giallombardo R. 1966. *Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison*. New York: Wiley

Gibbons JJ. 2006. *Confronting confinement: a report of the commission on safety and abuse in America's prisons*. St. Louis, MO: Wash. Univ. J. Law Policy. **http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1363&context=law_journal_law_policy**

Goffman E. 1961. On the characteristics of total institutions: the inmate world. In *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change*, ed. DR Cressey, pp. 15–67. New York: Holt Rinehart Winston

Goodman P. 2008. "It's just Black, White, or Hispanic": an observational study of racializing moves in California's segregated prison reception centers. *Law Soc. Rev.* 42(4):735–70

Greer KR. 2000. The changing nature of interpersonal relationships in a women's prison. *Prison J.* 80(4):442–68

Hagan J. 1995. The imprisoned society: time turns a classic on its head. *Sociol. Forum* 10(3):519–25

Harer MD, Langan NP. 2001. Gender differences in predictors of prison violence: assessing the predictive validity of a risk classification system. *Crime Delinquency* 47(4):513–36

Harner HM, Riley S. 2013. Factors contributing to poor physical health in incarcerated women. *J. Health Care Poor Underserved* 24(2):788–801

Harvey J. 2007. *Young Men in Prison. Surviving and Adapting to Life Inside*. Devon, UK: Willan Publ.

Heffernan E. 1972. *Making It in Prison: The Square, the Cool, and the Life*. New York: Wiley-Interscience

Her Majesty's Prison Service. 2008. *Prison Service Order 4800: Women Prisoners*. London: Home Office

Honeywell D. 2015. Doing time with lifers: a reflective study of life sentence prisoners. *Br. J. Community Justice* 13(1):93

Hulley S, Crewe B, Wright S. 2015. Re-examining the problems of long-term imprisonment. *Br. J. Criminol.* 56:769–92

Irwin J. 1970. *The Felon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Irwin J. 2005. *The Warehouse Prison: Disposal of the New Dangerous Class*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury

Irwin J. 2010. *Lifers: Seeking Redemption in Prison*. New York: Routledge

Irwin J, Cressey DR. 1962. Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Soc. Probl.* 10(2):142–55

Jacobs JB. 1977. *Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Jewkes Y, Wright S. 2016. Researching the prison. In *Handbook on Prisons*, ed. Y Jewkes, B Crewe, J Bennett, pp. 659–76. London: Routledge

Johnson R. 1987. *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

Johnson R, Dobrzanska A. 2005. Mature coping among life-sentenced inmates: an exploratory study of adjustment dynamics. *Correct. Compend.* 30(6):8–9

Kaeble D, Glaze LE. 2016. *Correctional populations in the United States, 2015*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 250374, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Kerley KR, Copes H. 2009. "Keepin' my mind right": identity maintenance and religious social support in the prison context. *Int. J. Offender Ther. Comp. Criminol.* 53(2):228–44

Kreager DA, Davidson KM, Whichard C. 2016a. A network approach to understanding prison-based therapeutic communities. *Addict. Newsl.* 25(2):20–22. **http://www.addictionpsychology.org/sites/default/files/public/pubs/tan-summer-2016.pdf**

Kreager DA, Palmen H, Dirkzwager AJE, Nieuwbeerta P. 2016b. Doing your own time: peer integration, aggression and mental health in Dutch male detainment facilities. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 151:92–99

Kreager DA, Schaefer DR, Bouchard M, Haynie DL, Wakefield S, et al. 2016c. Toward a criminology of inmate networks. *Justice Q.* 33(6):1000–28

Kreager DA, Young JTN, Haynie DL, Bouchard M, Schaefer DR, Zajac G. 2017. Where "old heads" prevail: inmate hierarchy in a men's prison unit. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 82(4):685–718

Kruttschnitt C. 2005. The politics of confinement: women's imprisonment in California and the UK. In *The Effects of Imprisonment*, ed. A Liebling, S Maruna, pp. 146–73. Devon, UK: Willan Publ.

Kruttschnitt C. 2011. Women's prisons. In *The Oxford Handbook of Crime and Criminal Justice*, ed. M Tonry, pp. 897–924. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Kruttschnitt C, Dirkzwager A. 2011. Are there still contrasts in tolerance? Imprisonment in the Netherlands and England 20 years later. *Punishm. Soc.* 13(3):283–306

Kruttschnitt C, Dirkzwager AJE, Kennedy L. 2013. Recounting the experiences of a racialized group of foreign national inmates. *Br. J. Sociol.* 64(3):478–500

Kruttschnitt C, Gartner R. 2003. Women's imprisonment. In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, ed. M Tonry, pp. 55–135. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Kruttschnitt C, Gartner R. 2005. *Marking Time in the Golden State: Women's Imprisonment in California*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Kruttschnitt C, Gartner R, Miller A. 2000. Doing her own time? Women's responses to prison in the context of the old and the new penology. *Criminology* 38(3):681–718

Kruttschnitt C, Hussemann J. 2008. Micropolitics of race and ethnicity in women's prisons in two political contexts. *Br. J. Sociol.* 59(4):709–28

Lahm KF. 2008. Inmate-on-inmate assault: a multilevel examination of prison violence. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 35(1):120–37

Lahm KF. 2015. Predictors of violent and nonviolent victimization behind bars: an exploration of women inmates. *Women Crim. Justice* 25(4):273–91

Langan PA. 1991. *Race of prisoners admitted to state and federal institutions, 1926–86*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 125618, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Lempert LB. 2016. *Women Doing Life: Gender, Punishment and the Struggle for Identity*. New York: NYU Press

Liebling A, Arnold H. 2012. Social relationships between prisoners in a maximum security prison: violence, faith, and the declining nature of trust. *J. Crim. Justice* 40(5):413–24

MacKenzie DL. 2006. *What Works in Corrections: Reducing the Criminal Activities of Offenders and Delinquents*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Martinson R. 1974. What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *Publ. Interest* 35:22–54

Maruna S, Wilson L, Curran K. 2006. Why God is often found behind bars: prison conversions and the crisis of self-narrative. *Res. Hum. Dev.* 3(2–3):161–84

Mathiesen T. 1965. *The Defences of the Weak: A Study of Norwegian Correctional Institution*. London: Tavistock

Mears DP, Cochran JC, Siennick SE, Bales WD. 2012. Prison visitation and recidivism. *Justice Q.* 29(6):888–918

Minist. Justice. 2013. *Story of the prison population: 1993–2012 England and Wales*. London: Minist. Justice **https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/218185/story-prison-population.pdf**

Minton TD. 2013. *Jail inmates at midyear 2012—statistical tables*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 241264, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Minton TD, Zeng Z. 2016. *Jail inmates in 2015*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 250394, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Moreno JL. 1932. *Application of the Group Method of Classification*. New York: Natl. Comm. Prisons Prison Labor

Mumola CJ. 2005. *Suicide and homicide in state prisons and local jails*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 210036, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Mumola CJ, Beck AJ. 1997. *Prisoners in 1996*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 164619, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Nellis A, King RS. 2009. *No Exit: The Expanding Use of Life Sentences in America*. Washington, DC: Sentencing Proj.

Noonan M, Ginder S. 2013. *Mortality in local jails and state prisons*, *2000–2011*, *statistical tables*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ 242186, US Dep. Justice, Washington, DC

Owen BA. 1998. *In the Mix: Struggle and Survival in a Women's Prison*. New York: SUNY Press

Owen BA. 2005. The case of women. Gendered harm in the contemporary prison. In *The Warehouse Prison*, ed. J Irwin, pp. 261–89. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury

Petersilia J, Cullen FT. 2015. Liberal but not stupid: meeting the promise of downsizing prisons. *Stanf. J. Crim. Law Policy* 2:1–43

Phillips C. 2012. "It ain't nothing like America with the Bloods and the Crips": Gang narratives inside two English prisons. *Punishm. Soc.* 14(1):51–68

Plugge E, Douglas N, Fitzpatrick R. 2006. *The Health of Women in Prison Study Findings*. Oxford, UK: Dep. Public Health Univ. Oxford

Pratt J. 2000. The return of the wheelbarrow men; or, the arrival of postmodern penality? *Br. J. Criminol.* 40(1):127–45

Rastogi S, Johnson TD, Hoeffel EM, Drewery MP. 2011. *The Black Population: 2010*. Washington, DC: US Census Bur.

Rierden A. 1997. *The Farm: Life Inside a Women's Prison*. Amherst: Univ. Mass. Press

Ross MW, Diamond PM, Liebling A, Saylor WG. 2008. Measurement of prison social climate: a comparison of an inmate measure in England and the USA. *Punishm. Soc.* 10(4):447–74

Schaefer DR, Bouchard M, Young JTN, Kreager DA. 2017. Friends in locked places: an investigation of prison inmate network structure. *Soc. Netw.* 51:88–103

Sentencing Proj. 2013. *The Changing Racial Dynamics of Women's Incarceration*. Washington, DC: Sentencing Proj. **http://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/the-changing-racial-dynamics-of-womens-incarceration/**

Short V, Cooper J, Shaw J, Kenning C, Abel K, Chew-Graham C. 2009. Custody versus care: attitudes of prison staff to self-harm in women prisoners—a qualitative study. *J. Forensic Psychiatry Psychol.* 20(3):408–26

Silberman M. 2007. The Muncy Way: the reformatory ideal at the end of the 20th century. *Prison J.* 87(3):271–94

Simon J. 2000. The 'society of captives' in the era of hyper-incarceration. *Theor. Criminol.* 4(3):285–308

Skarbek D. 2014. *The Social Order of the Underworld: How Prison Gangs Govern the American Penal System*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Steiner B. 2009. Assessing static and dynamic influences on inmate violence levels. *Crime Delinquency* 55(1):134–61

Steiner B, Wooldredge J. 2008. Inmate versus environmental effects on prison rule violations. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 35(4):438–56

Steiner B, Wooldredge J. 2009a. Rethinking the link between institutional crowding and inmate misconduct. *Prison J.* 89(2):205–33

Steiner B, Wooldredge J. 2009b. The relevance of inmate race/ethnicity versus population composition for understanding prison rule violations. *Punishm. Soc.* 11(4):459–89

Steiner B, Wooldredge J. 2009c. Individual and environmental effects of assaults and nonviolent rule breaking by women in prison. *J. Res. Crime Delinquency* 46(4):437–67

Sykes GM. 1958. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Sykes GM, Messinger S. 1960. The inmate social system. In *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*, ed. RA Cloward, DR Cressey, pp. 5–19. New York: Social Sci. Res. Counc.

Sylvester SF, Reed JH, Nelson DO. 1977. *Prison Homicide*. Jamaica, NY: Spectrum Publ.

Teasdale B, Daigle LE, Hawk SR, Daquin JC. 2016. Violent victimization in the prison context: an examination of the gendered contexts of prison. *Int. J. Offender Ther. Comp. Criminol.* 60(9):995–1015

Thompson D. 2016. California wardens retire amid prison abuse, suicide claims. *AP News*, August 5. **https://apnews.com/fe8ad716d69749cbb24e3805238cfd69/california-wardens-retire-amid-prison-abuse-suicide-claims**

Trammell R. 2009. Relational violence in women's prison: how women describe interpersonal violence and gender. *Women Crim. Justice* 19(4):267–85

Trammell R. 2012. *Enforcing the Convict Code: Violence and Prison Culture*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publ.

Travis J, Western B, Redburn S. 2014. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington, DC: Natl. Acad. Press

Trulson CR, Marquart JW. 2009. *The First Available Cell: Racial Desegregation and the Erosion of the Color Line in the Texas Prison System*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Turner S, Fain T, Hunt S. 2015. *Public Safety Realignment in 12 California Counties*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.

Useem B, Piehl AM. 2006. Prison buildup and disorder. *Punishm. Soc.* 8(1):87–115

Volker B, De Cuyper R, Mollenhorst G, Dirkzwager A, van der Laan P, Nieuwbeerta P. 2016. Changes in the social networks of prisoners: a comparison of their networks before and after imprisonment. *Soc. Netw.* 47:47–58

Wacquant L. 2001. Deadly symbiosis: when ghetto and prison meet and mesh. *Punishm. Soc.* 3(1):95–133

Wacquant L. 2002. The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration. *Ethnography* 3(4):371–97

Wakefield S, Uggen C. 2010. Incarceration and stratification. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 36(1):387–406

Ward DA, Kassebaum GG. 1965. *Women's Prison: Sex and Social Structure*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publ.

Western B, Braga AA, Davis J, Sirois C. 2015. Stress and hardship after prison. *Am. J. Sociol.* 120(5):1512–47

Wolff N, Blitz CL, Shi J, Siegel J, Bachman R. 2007. Physical violence inside prisons: rates of victimization. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 34(5):588–99

Wood J. 2006. Gang activity in English prisons: the prisoners' perspective. *Psychol. Crime Law* 12(6):605–17

Wood J, Adler J. 2001. Gang activity in English prisons: the staff perspective. *Psychol. Crime Law* 7(1–4):167–92

Wooldredge J, Steiner B. 2009. Comparing methods for examining relationships between prison crowding and inmate violence. *Justice Q.* 26(4):795–826

Wooldredge J, Steiner B. 2015. A macro-level perspective on prison inmate deviance. *Punishm. Soc.* 17(2):230–57

Zamble E. 1992. Behavior and adaptation in long-term prison inmates: descriptive longitudinal results. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 19(4):409–25

Zamble E, Porporino FJ. 2013. *Coping, Behavior, and Adaptation in Prison Inmates*. New York: Springer-Verlag