

report -
no #. name



Note: Guards used
Punishment
rather than
reward
Dave Jaffe

Prisoners get ~~the~~ no access to family rewards
Prisoners ~~are~~ ~~not~~ ~~allowed~~ ~~to~~ ~~write~~ ~~letters~~

LOG

Sat. Aug 14 11:00a.m. - 3:30 p.m. Guard Orientation by D.J. Comments (from log -D.J.)
Guards got into role. Much participation in suggestions for punishment and prisoner management etc.
All guards got uniforms - many tried same on immediately with glasses - looked at themselves in mirror.

What behaviors
do you want to
eliminate? a sign.

Schedule:

Sun. Aug 15 10:00 a.m. Arrests began - Prisoners arrived alone or in pairs to prison - blindfolded and cuffed - waited approximately 15 mins. - then stripped, waited 10-15 mins. - then deloused - dressed. Mug shots taken by Warden. This procedure continued until about 4:30 p.m. Regular schedule began at 6:00 p.m. (see schedule sheet)

Initial cell configuration:

- cell #1 7248
- 3041
- 5704
- #2 1037
- 8612
- 819
- #3 2093
- 3045
- 5486

Comments (from D.J. log): Prisoner 8612 smiling when came in, but stopped smiling when standing and waiting. Guard comment: "He didn't think it was such a joke anymore."

3:30 p.m. One prisoner asked about time

1st Count - (day shift still, I think) - prisoners pretty cooperative - Rules read by Warden - prisoners: "Thank you, Mister Chief Correction officer."

Dinner served to 6 and then 3 prisoners. I observed the 3 (from cell #1) - were quiet and cooperative.

Mon. Aug 16

Regular schedule attempted, but many signs of inmate rebellion occurred. Two main incidents:

- 1) cell #1: blockaded door with beds so that door couldn't be opened. Beds removed in other two cells. Door blocked most of morning and early afternoon.
- 2) cell #2: 1:00 p.m. - removed lock from door; attempted escape but foiled by guards. At first guards panicked but finally moved in and chained prisoners together - lock replaced.

Other incidents - earlier in morning - 9:15 or earlier.

- a) Four prisoners pulled off their numbers (uniforms were removed to replace them)

Cells changed:

- #1 819, 5704, 3401
- #2 7258, 1034
- #3 2093, 3045, 3486

b) Verbal rebellion behavior

- "We have demands"
- "We'll wake up, but not if you blow the whistle."

Also verbal abuse of guards and staff - Talk of thinking of ways to look crazy to get out.

- "Cell 1, we're with you."

Cell 3 had been quiet and cooperative all morning - did work (picking nettles out of blanket).

Guards began to bestow favors on Cell 3 (e.g. water turned on in cells - full lunch given, beds returned, etc.)

But then Cell 3 refused to eat lunch. Signs of solidarity with other prisoners. Several prisoners were observed by guards to be showing signs of stress

Levin 819
7025

Cell 3 claimed they'd do whatever told and collect their money - reason to cooperate.

Korpi (8612) requested interview - claimed to be ill. Granted at 3:30 p.m. - "rebellion cures his ills." Wants out.

7:30 p.m. Korpi tore down cover over camera hole - put into isolation for 50 mins. - seen by D.J. (hairy interview) then by Haney - check recording.

Released - 9 or 10 p.m.

John Mark and Geoff Loftus falling into "weak" guard class - Mark offers food to prisoners - stays outside of action, gives no commands, but does not interfere with other guards either.

G. Loftus, "I'd rather be a prisoner."

Most guards zealous ~~zealous~~ in attempt to harass prisoners.

Day shift (10-6) complained to Warden of inadequate sanctions and of consequent helplessness, but seemed to handle crises of the day at least well enough to avoid escapes.

Cells changed: #1 819, 5704, 3401
#2 7258, 1034
#3 2093, 3045, 3486

Tuesday Aug 17 Events: prisoners very cooperative - sharp contrast to Monday, Aug 16.

Cells rearranged again to break up "goody-goody" cell #3. (I don't have information on exact cell arrangement from here on)- the cell make up changed often from here, due to release and admission of prisoners.

Work still nettle-picking.

Schedule followed pretty carefully.

3:30 p.m. Grievance Committee Meeting.

Visitors' Night. Place cleaned up in late afternoon. Prisoners fed especially well. Music playing, receptionist (Susie Phillips).

7:00 Visitors arrived. Some interviewed by PGZ - one mother pale and trembling, seemed on verge of tears.

Dave Gorchoff planted as informer - in early afternoon.

Rumors of prison break spread thru staff like wildfire all day. Precise plans of break guessed at--expected visitors to "case the joint" and return later in evening to spring the prisoners.

Action taken: Day shift asked to stay until after visiting hours (about 9:00 p.m.) 2 extra guards (Moreno and Petersen) secured for evening shift.

Plans discussed to move prisoners out of building - Prisoners finally moved to 5th floor Jordan (Janitor closet), from 9:00 p.m. until about midnight. Prisoners allowed to play cards and read.

Guards appeared bored - standing around - cut off prisoners' conversations. Eshleman scooting around on lab cart.

During this time Lee Ross and Susie Phillips talked to 4 prisoners, ostensibly as members of the human subjects' committee. They claimed that prisoners were very open and told feelings and secrets (e.g. Baran and Berkeley Barb story).

Also - Gordon Bower and wife visited late evening, while prisoners were upstairs--Bower became very abusive verbally with prisoners.

After prisoners were brought back to cells (12:30 a.m.) 2 were cuffed together and the cuff key was missing. Stanford police were called to remove the cuffs. (It was discovered the next morning that a prisoner had thrown the key into a heating vent. Gorchoff knew of this but did not tell staff).

Other incidents reported by guards:

5704 was bending cell bars & breaking partition in hole. Observation

by Moses Moreno: (Guard Shift Report) "When in company of their visitors, the prisoners considered their situation light and humorous. They apparently play their roles better for the guards."

Wed Aug 18 Events - Daily schedule followed pretty closely.

Work: moving boxes from one closet to another, cleaning bathrooms (a.m.); and moving boxes and cleaning blankets (p.m.).

Guard Shift Reports indicate that Levin was defying - he refused to get up, refused to do exercises, others were forced to hold arms up until Levin did (and he still refused) - he refused to work. Cellmates told to work till he worked, but again, he did not yield. He also requested a doctor repeatedly.

Levin was released by 9:00 p.m. Incident occurred as he was resting in back room: guards had prisoners chant "819 did a bad thing."

Ramsey brought in that evening (early evening I think).

Guard Shift Reports for this day are very interesting:

- 1) Andre Cerovina (in response to question of whether he observed any laxity on part of guards): "We were all very strict and efficient." Andre observed "depression" on part of 819, "nervous anxiety" on part of 7258, "resulting in speech defects and forgetfulness" when addressing guards correctly.
- 2) Karl Van Orsdol also made the same analysis of 7258's stumbling over words, "He seems to have a reaction of fear associated with the words." ("Mr. Correctional Officer").

4:00 p.m. First Parole Board Meeting. Prisoners 4325, 3401, 1037 and 7258 seen.

Prisoner 3401 (Gee) was paroled for medical reasons (rash) Wednesday evening about 7:00 p.m. Was taken to Cowell first and treated by physician on call.

- 3) Mike Varn - was disturbed by "819's apparent indifference to the travails of his fellow inmates." (Real source of these travails?)
- 4) Eshleman - "On the average they [the prisoners] are unperturbed and unharassed. There could be too much solidarity. They would be more vulnerable if in solitary cells."
- 4)G. Loftus (interpretation of same events): "Just that all the prisoners are resigned and obedient having adopted a 'whatever comes' attitude. Privileges are genuinely appreciated and punishments are genuinely felt. Solidarity is lower than at any time and individuals are easily handled."

C Shift was very disturbed by Gorchoff's disobedience - (he refused to stand when ordered, refused to move boxes etc.). Van Orsdol filled out an incident report on him.

I also noted some observations on guards on Wednesday. Karl reported that he had caught himself bossing his mother around. Andre said he wanted to be a prisoner so he could become a "human being again."

Thur. Aug 19 Again, basic schedule followed pretty closely.

5704 rebellious - abusive language and refusing to exercise. Complained of sore foot (after having kicked down the wall in the Hole). When removed, he evidently struck or attempted to strike guards on duty (C Shift). He was restrained and returned to Hole in chains.

Ramsey began his "refusing to eat" Thursday. Just prior to visiting hours (7:00 p.m.), prisoners were told they could not have visitors until Ramsey ate. Prisoners turned on Ramsey at dinner, calling him, according to report by G. Loftus, "childish," "stupid," and "a pussy." Finally Ramsey was placed in Hole.

3:30 p.m. Second session of Parole Board met. Decided to parole Yacco who left with parents during visiting hours.

Another prisoner (3041) I think) showed severe stress reaction - similar to Levin and Korpi before, and was released sometime during the day, after parole meeting, I believe.

Arrangements made with Hubbell's to have a lawyer for Friday.

Fri. Aug 20 Remaining prisoners: 416, 7258, 5704, 5486, 2093.

Prisoners given questionnaires and final interviews. Saw lawyer (2nd year law student) in the late morning.

Press arrived - great commotion.

Prisoner encounter	1:00 p.m.)	
Guard	"	2:00 p.m.) approximately
Group	"	3:00 p.m.)

Morning incident - reported by C Shift:

Ramsey refused to eat breakfast. Attempt at force feeding, reported by Van Orsdol - that guards asked 2 other prisoners to feed him.

Cerovino reports Ramsey "made love" to his dinner - (sausages).

Self Perception

Dave Jaffe

I find it quite difficult to provide a clear evaluation or explanation of my behavior during prison week. This difficulty is due partially to the lack of frequency with which I engaged in self-observation. Indeed, one of the clearest recollections I have of prison week is that of having been very busy almost all of the time I was awake (which was most of the time). I am also having trouble, however, because of my confusion of roles. Let me point out that I am even more confused now than during prison week as to what my appropriate role was. It seemed clear to me that I was asked to assist Dr. Zimbardo in creating a simulation. Having created a simulated prison on a smaller scale earlier in the year, it seemed plausible that (a) I could be useful in helping to create the aspects of the simulation that produced the startling results we had found and (b) that I should be "in" on the improved version of the original simulation. Having served as Warden and principle investigator in the original simulation, it also seemed plausible that I could be an assistant experimenter and act the part of warden at the same time.

During the prison week, I identified myself primarily as a research assistant. In fact, I remember having become increasingly irritated every time I was introduced to someone as "the Warden." My success as a research assistant however depended partly on the success with which I played the role of warden. (Again, it is not uncommon for a social psychologist to deceive by play-acting in a more traditional type of experiment). I believed (and still do), that without rules, without gruff and mildly realistic guard behavior, the simulation would have appeared more like a summer camp than a prison. (I think that prisoner-subjects indicated on their final interviews that the thing they disliked most was the guards and also that the guards were an important factor in making the prison seem "real" to them). Furthermore, even before I arrived, Dr. Zimbardo suggested that the most difficult problem would be to get the guards to behave like guards. I was asked to suggest tactics based on my previous experience as master sadist, and, when I arrived at Stanford, I was given the responsibility of trying to elicit 'tough-guard' behavior.

I suppose I should record the events of the Saturday, August 14 session I held with the guards as there has been some confusion and contention regarding

the nature and importance of this session. After introducing myself and explaining the purpose of the experiment I discussed my role in the previous study in order to establish myself as having had experience with the problems the guards would be facing. It was then decided that the first step was to establish a daily schedule from which could be derived a set of rules and suggested punishments for failure to obey those rules. The guiding principle here was to involve the guards themselves in planning the schedule, in making the rules, and in devising appropriate punishments. Generally, the guards participated actively in the planning of schedule, rules, and especially rewards and punishments. My function in these discussions was generally to set limits, make exemplary suggestions for each task, and serve as moderator and arbiter of conflicting suggestions. I also described some of the procedures used in the earlier simulation which we used as a base from which to construct procedures for prison week. After this discussion, the guards were shown the facility, and then some of them went to select uniforms, while others stayed to help make the 'prison' ready for the arrival of prisoners the next day. When the guards returned with the uniforms, there was a general excitement, and many of the guards tried on their uniforms and glasses with relish. It was after 5:00 p.m. before the guards went home that evening.

I suppose that during prison week, there were times when I was insensitive to the human problems and needs of the subjects (both prisoners and guards) in an attempt to maintain this prison harshness and discipline that we had decided was necessary for an adequate simulation. I recall, for example, that I began the interview with Korpi playing the role of stern Warden. Despite the fact that Korpi was quite upset, I began speaking to him with his blindfold and handcuffs on. At first, I reprimanded him for having attempted to grab the video tape camera. It was only later that I realized he was very disturbed, at which time, of course, I slipped out of the role of warden and I began to react more as one human to another, although I suppose I was still acting as a person in a position of responsibility and authority.

While I believe that it was necessary for staff to enact the Warden role, at least some of the time, I am startled by the ease with which I could turn off my sensitivity and concern for others for "a good cause."

No understanding of my behavior during prison week would be complete without consideration of problems connected with my perception of my place

Dave Jaffe

among the experimental quartet of Zimbardo, Banks, Haney and Jaffe. I arrived on the scene at the last minute, and, although I had made a few suggestions to Dr. Zimbardo by telephone, I had not done any of the preliminary work, although I did bring with me a limited expertise on prison simulations, I perceived myself as low man on the totempole. Even from the beginning, then, I was reluctant to be too assertive about my own ideas. This pattern was strongly reinforced early in the study in a discussion I had with Curt or Craig. I was told very clearly that Dr. Zimbardo was the principal investigator in the study and that things were to be done his way. I guess I took this discussion a bit too seriously, because I recall having worried about doing something that might ruin Dr. Zimbardo's study. I thus became dependent on the other "staff" for decisions on matters large and small, even though I had been able to make the same type of decisions myself in the original simulation. I also became super obedient. I recall having been told on Monday (rebellion day) to talk to John Mark immediately off the sidelines and into the fray. While I didn't want to talk to him at the time, I did it anyway because Dr. Zimbardo had asked me to. Similarly, I made what I often considered to be stupid announcements over the intercom every time Dr. Zimbardo or Craig or Curt asked me to. Evidently this dependence or obedience became noticeable enough so that Dr. Zimbardo talked to me about not feeling cramped because of Craig's, Curt's or his own presence. My biggest problem then, was one of defining my own competence. I was caught between being afraid of ruining Dr. Zimbardo's expensive experiment on one hand and behaving like an ineffectual "little twerp" on the other. It is not surprising then, that I was affected by Gorchoff's report of the prisoners' perception of my meekness or uselessness. Indeed, there were times when I felt relatively useless. It is probably also not surprising that, especially at times when none of the other 'staff' was present, I behaved with more authority and decisiveness than at other times. Perhaps, then, rather than having experienced a conflict between the roles of experimenter and warden, my greatest concern became demonstrating my competence in each role. Of course, problems arose in deciding exactly how to do this. Is a competent research assistant obedient or independently decisive, and what about a competent warden? Furthermore, to what extent did I have to be a competent warden to be a competent research assistant? Again, some of these confusions over the

Self Perception

Dave Jaffe

are retrospective, but the basic confusion over the appropriate level of independence and decisiveness was there.

Finally, as far as self-observations are concerned, I should note that since the conclusion of the study, I have been plagued by mixed feelings. On the one hand, I'm glad about the publicity we've gotten and about positive effects we may have on prison reform. I'm glad to have been a part of such a visible and novel study. At the same time, however, I can never think back on the week itself without twinges of disgust and shame about my own performance. For whether I behaved like a 'twerp' or a 'pig,' (I probably behaved like both at times), let me say that it is difficult to continually keep dredging up instances of my own behavior that demonstrate what a classic subject I was in a study on institutional brutality that was originally my own creation. Nor am I pleased with the ambiguity of my role in the experimental setting. Thus, I have found myself a bit uncomfortable both on occasions when I have run into other participants in the prison study, and when I have met with the other 'staff.'

Additional Anecdotes and Perceptions

Dave Jaffe

In addition to some of the self-perceptive recollections discussed above, there are a few important incidents that I can recall.

The first set of these incidents can be categorized as evidence of humanity among certain guards. Just as there were prisoners who seemed to have been less affected by the 'prison atmosphere' (I am thinking especially of Jerry Shue, whose interviews indicate that he consistently maintained the perspective of the prison as an experiment) so there were guards who were less cruel, creatively sadistic, etc. John Mark, for example, brought fruit into the prisoners on at least one occasion early in the study. Indeed, John was noticed by all of the staff because he sat on the sidelines during the attempt to quell the 'rebellion.' I remember Dr. Zimbardo having told me to talk to John and get him to participate in guard activities more frequently. Even after this talk, I cannot remember John ever having led a count or barking orders, or engaging in Barnett-like sarcasm. It is true that he did write guard-like and, at times, scathing parole evaluations. This difference between John's written and verbal behaviors is interesting, but I don't believe his Shift Reports showed the same insensitivity. It will also be remembered that at the final session John Mark suggested that it was unfair to pay the guards more than the prisoners. (It is interesting that none of us, from Dr. Zimbardo on down, took his suggestion seriously). It is true, of course, that John Mark never tried to prevent any of Terry Barnett's or John Loftus' behavior. The same indictment, however, can be brought against all of us (with the possible exception of Curt, who did intervene to prevent Dave Eshleman from leaving Clay Ramsey in the Hole for an entire evening.

John Loftus vacillated between the roles of tough guard and good guy. The specific incidents of his 'good guy' behavior I have in mind concern Paul Baran and his cigarettes. I believe that John frequently allowed Baran to smoke at times prohibited by prison rules. John Loftus was also the guard who communicated the most prisoner complaints to me. One such note is in one of the guard files (along with the Shift Reports). Of course, John Loftus is also the guard who had the most 'fun' with the fire extinguisher. In addition, and quite unlike John Mark, when there was a clash between guards and prisoners, John Loftus did not hesitate to join in.

Dave Jaffe

Finally, Geoff Loftus, as has probably been noted, became very slack in terms of 'tough guard' duties. He stopped wearing sunglasses, and often wore his own shirt instead of the guard uniform. My impression is that Geoff stopped barking orders at the prisoners and began to relate to them more naturally as time progressed. My guess is that Geoff was troubled by Eshleman's and Burton's behavior, and also that he was preoccupied enough with his life outside of the prison that he was able to dissociate himself mentally from his experience in prison. I got the impression, especially in the later part of the study, that Geoff was 'not all there.'

These observations are presented not to contradict any basic conclusions or interpretations, but rather to insure that the bits of seemingly contradictory evidence are at least considered. If we believe that there were different levels of responses and involvement both by guards and prisoners, then we must account for some of these differential reactions. I realize, of course, that this question of individual differences is an unresolved question at the heart of personality and social psychology. It may be possible, however, for the Prison Life Study to shed some light on the matter.

Another incident I observed that is probably generally known, but that may not have been recorded is Gordon Bower's visit. He visited on Tuesday night when the prisoners had been moved to the fifth floor closet. He and his wife went up to see the prisoners. Mrs. Bower passed out cupcakes, while Dr. Bower made at least two comments ridiculing the prisoners, one concerning their manner of dress, and the other concerning the stench of the place. This pattern of "getting into the act" occurred with almost every outside visitor we had, including Lee Ross, Susan Phillips, the priest, the parents, the lawyer, the police, etc.