

Witold Kędzierski

University of Rzeszów [doctus@o2.p]

Possibilities of improving the efficiency of social readaptation measures in the conditions of penitentiary isolation

Abstract: The purpose of this article is to show the causes of disfunctionality of rehabilitation as conducted in the Polish penitentiary system, which proves to be inefficient in preparing inmates for social readaptation. It diagnoses the causes of lack of effectivity of individual influence programs and worsening of inmate conduct, which act against forming positive environment in penitentiary institutions. It also outlines the possibilities of improving the efficiency of social readaptation measures that are attainable through changing the organizational structure of penitentiary institutions and shifting the paradigm of the influence of correctional measures.

Key words: Social rehabilitation, penitentiary measures, catamnestic research.

Introduction

Penitentiary rehabilitation nowadays seems to be a concept that has been exploited and discredited, especially under the rule of the Executive Penal Code of 1969, which assumed general rehabilitation, as a result of which it often took on a total form and was associated by the convicts with the indoctrination of the socio-political system they hated, and which “effectiveness” many experienced personally.

Rehabilitation as a term, in view of its poor efficiency in penitentiary conditions, does not withstand confrontation with reality. In the currently binding

executive penal code, the legislator departs from using it, not being convinced of its effectiveness, realizing that its application in the context of interactions in penitentiary units is an abuse no longer suited to reality. This is because the use of this term determines a certain effectiveness of the implementation of rehabilitation measures. Therefore, the legislator prefers to avoid the explicit use of the word rehabilitation (meaning an effective educational process that restores the ward to the society), instead using less literal terms that do not indicate the effective implementation of the rehabilitation process, for example, a legal imperative, but expressed in an imperfective mode: “**inducing** in the convict the willingness to cooperate in shaping socially desirable attitudes...”¹. However, with such formulated wording it is difficult to demand from the penitentiary staff the effectiveness of rehabilitation measures.

The legislator orders the implementation against the convicts of **penitentiary measures**, understood as: “a set of measures and methods applied in the penitentiary aimed at inducing in the convict the willingness to cooperate in shaping his socially desirable attitudes”², as well as the implementation of a **system of programmed impact** (which is a substitute for the rehabilitation system). The process of rehabilitation, however, is a kind of upbringing aimed at the correction of personality in the pro-social direction, carried out with the conscious and active participation of the convicted person. It is based on theoretical scientific foundations, with a clearly defined objective of correcting personality, on psycho-pedagogical theoretical foundations and on the diagnosis of personality of the subject of the measures (Machel, 2003, p.55), as well as on the evaluation of the results of the measures applied. Therefore, it is more appropriate in the reality of penitentiary institutions to call the educational content, carried out as part of the execution of the sentence of imprisonment – penitentiary (alternatively corrective) measures, and not rehabilitation measures, because, unfortunately, they do not exhaust the definition of rehabilitation, and do not even have aspirations to achieve the effectiveness of those measures.

Diagnosis of the functioning of “rehabilitation” in penitentiary conditions

The belief in the effectiveness of the rehabilitation function of the prison and the causative power of rehabilitation or therapeutic programmes in the fossilized, inefficient and costly prison system is naive, as confirmed by practice. The inept,

.....

¹ Art. 67 § 1, Act of 6 June 1997 Executive Penal Code (Journal of Laws 1997 No. 90, item 557, as amended).

² § 1.2 item 1, Ordinance of the Minister of Justice of 14 August 2003 on the method of conducting penitentiary measures in penitentiary institutions and detention centers (as amended).

routine “rehabilitation” carried out by the staff without any professional training is a fiction intended to achieve the propaganda effect and improve statistics, not to improve effectiveness.

In the current situation of the penitentiary system we are dealing with “rehabilitation on paper”, because the Prison Service is unable to get rid of bureaucratic conformism, which is most often an indicator of illusive diligence, rather than an indicator of the level of corrective work (Machel, 2003, p. 330–332), as well as penitentiary entropy in terms of the execution of order and discipline among convicts and the objectives of the functioning of penitentiary units, which is not conducive to the shaping of a positive educational atmosphere and climate of the rehabilitation institution, which should constitute a starting point for all corrective measures.

Prison should discourage potential criminals, as the main purpose of a sentence is its affliction, rather than attract with good conditions, permissiveness and overprotectiveness of prison staff (there are known paradoxical cases of queues of convicts standing outside the prison after the first winter attack, as well as of convicts refusing to leave prison after serving their sentences).

The permissive policy of the authorities of the Prison Service implemented in recent years towards prisoners leads to **pathological humanization** and is perceived by the prisoners themselves as a weakness of the penitentiary system. This policy has resulted in a significant increase in the number of extraordinary incidents in penitentiary units, which is not conducive to the creation of a positive educational atmosphere (increases were observed in spite of a significant decrease in the number of prisoners – by 20%, between 2012 and 2016)³:

Assault on officers on duty:

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
50	69	75	94	90

Fight or battery:

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
792	823	875	987	1009

Disclosure of substances posing a threat to order or security (including drugs and designer drugs):

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
705	698	799	909	949

.....

³ Based on the Prison Service's annual statistics for 2012-2016, source: <http://www.sw.gov.pl/strona/statystyka-roczna>.

Drastic manifestations of prison subculture:

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
55 (2 rapes 53 abuses)	32 (1 rape, 31 abuses)	26 (0 rapes, 26 abuses)	30 (1 rape, 29 abuses)	38 (4 rapes, 34 abuses)

Also shocking for the society and the officers themselves was the policy of the prison authorities in the proceedings relating to the release from prison of M. Trynkiewicz – February 2014, as well as the spectacular escape of three convicts from the Prison no. 2 in Grudziądz – October 2015, and the discovery of the pimping practice conducted by officers, for which the convicted women were used, in the Prison in Wrocław – February 2017.

The low effectiveness of the measures is also caused by the excessive amount of unnecessary bureaucracy imposed on educators and administrative employees (double record keeping: in the personal records and in the Noe Net system; the necessity to prepare many statistics and analyses for the headquarters, despite the functioning of the intranet system). In recent years, the level of bureaucracy associated with rehabilitation measures has increased, as the educators are obliged to record them both in the part B of the Personal Background Records, as well as in the Noe Net intranet system.

Prisons still accept educators without pedagogical training (almost every third educator currently does not have such training⁴, and the majority of those who do have it are not rehabilitation pedagogues). Therefore, they are not adequately qualified to diagnose the causes of social maladjustment of wards, to select appropriate methods and measures of educational influence and thus limit themselves to the standard filling in of individual influence programme questionnaires. Overburdened with excessive bureaucratic work, they do not have time for a thorough diagnosis of the reasons for entering into conflict with the law, effective influence, not to mention the evaluation of educational programs. This situation is also confirmed by the report of the Supreme Audit Office (NIK) on the social readaptation of people sentenced to long-term imprisonment⁵. According to the report, as many as 44% of rehabilitation programmes were characterized by a lack of or doubtful readaptation effectiveness. From the system approach, there was no analysis of the effectiveness of penitentiary measures applied and their impact on the preparation of convicts for social reintegration. There were also no such studies concerning the effectiveness of those measures after the prisoners left the penitentiary units.

⁴ Source: <http://www.sw.gov.pl/strona/statystyka-roczna2016>.

⁵ See: Information on the result of inspections of the Supreme Audit Office, No. 177/2015/P/14/004, *Readaptacja społeczna osób skazanych na wieloletnie kary pozbawienia wolności [Social readaptation of people sentenced to long-term imprisonment]*, p. 10–12 and 32–33.

In the opinion of the Supreme Audit Office, the assessment of the methodology and evaluation skills was even worse, as almost all, i.e. 93% of the assessed rehabilitation programmes, did not have properly formulated evaluations, methods and tools for measuring their effectiveness. The authors of the programmes do not understand the essence of evaluation and the method of carrying out evaluation studies. It is not possible to undertake rehabilitation work without an objective assessment of the substantive effectiveness of the measures undertaken and without monitoring of the rehabilitation progress, as the lack of such assessment casts doubt on the advisability of implementing the programmes.

As a result, the effectiveness of rehabilitation in prisons is poor, which is also reflected in the high rates of return to crime and the number of recidivists in Polish prisons at the level of about 56%⁶.

In the pursuit of adapting the standards of Polish prison system to those of the European Union in recent years, there has been a great deal of focus on humanitarianism in the treatment of inmates and on ensuring their civil rights. This concern for the rights of prisoners in fact constitutes a compensatory curtain for the impossibility of providing appropriate conditions for imprisonment, e.g. the requirement to provide them with an area of 6 m² in a residential cell.

The scale of subjectivity and humanity in the treatment of convicts must, however, be subject to certain limits, since violations of this principle increase the sense of impunity among prisoners and leads to their worse conduct in prisons, and on the other hand cause frustration among victims of crime, a large part of society and officials whose rights are often not respected as much as those of prisoners. Focusing excessively on the subjective approach to the convicts, respecting all their rights resulting from the existing laws emphasizing the right to unlimited lodging of complaints – it is unconsciously forgotten about the subjective treatment of officers, who become “machines” for executing orders commanding, even at the cost of concessions, the permissive treatment of prisoners, so that they do not write complaints that would damage the statistics.

The fear of deterioration of statistics: complaints, use of measures of direct coercion or extraordinary incidents in the unit, often paralyzes superiors and determines the penitentiary policy of the prison! The effect of such a policy is actually the opposite of the expected one, since the concessions made to the convicts lead to an escalation of the claimant and instrumental attitudes, since they perceive it as a weakness and submissiveness of the administration. It also affects the educational atmosphere and lowers the morale and motivation of officers. In the current reality, prisons no longer deter potential criminals, but have begun to attract them with a vision of free accommodation, food, medical and educational care, paid work, and the possibility of having a TV set without paying a monthly fee (their victims can only dream of such privileges).

.....

⁶ Source: <http://www.sw.gov.pl/strona/statystyka-roczna2016>.

Failure to impose disciplinary sanctions for slander and defamation in their complaints results in prisoners becoming unpunished, uncritical and increasingly bold. This seemingly flexible but in fact labile and inconsistent policy in approaching prisoners leads to deterioration in their conduct, attempts to blackmail superiors and to teaching them opportunistic and manipulative attitudes. The prison officers are under stress because they believe that prisoners have more rights and are treated better and with more tolerance by their superiors than they are themselves. This phenomenon takes the form of pathological humanization towards prisoners and false rehabilitation based on permissiveness, causing the deterioration of interpersonal relations with prisoners, which may result in a return to confrontational relations, only based on completely different premises than before the political breakthrough.

The prison officers are subjected, on the one hand, to constant psychological pressure resulting from their work with prisoners who often have mental disorders and demonstrate a significant degree of social demoralization, and on the other hand to the pressure of their superiors resulting from the supervision of their work and burdening them with additional duties. This results in the professional burnout syndrome, which appears much faster in this group than in officers who do not work in direct contact with prisoners.

The penitentiary policy implemented so far seems to confirm the regularity that the more humanitarianism and subjectivity there is in the treatment of prisoners, the less of them there are towards the officers, who are burdened with increasing responsibilities, as well as the blame for the increase in complaints and extraordinary incidents. The officers become a tool in creating often too liberal and inconsistent penitentiary policy. In the perception of prisoners, the tendency of the administration to make concessions is a sign of its weakness and encourages further demands, which can lead to anarchy, loss of control and destabilization of prisons. Therefore, the functioning in a total institution destroys the psychophysical condition not only of the prisoners, but also of the officers. The more emphasis is placed on stress-free conditions of imprisonment for prisoners, the more stressful it is for the officers, who are increasingly burdened with responsibilities and are demanded to maintain peace and quiet in prisons even at the price of concessions to prisoners. Such a policy leads to a gradual reduction in the level of motivation of officers to work with convicts due to their premature professional burnout. They often underline that the rights of prisoners are now more respected than those of officers.

Exercising authority in prisons means constantly manipulating the threat. It should skillfully balance between the necessity of maintaining order and discipline among prisoners and the need to shape a proper educational atmosphere in prison, which is based on the principles of individualism in the approach to prisoners, normality, responsibility and openness (Rentzmann after: Machel, 2003, pp. 275–276).

Shift of the paradigm of rehabilitation measures

The starting point for any rehabilitation measures taken in prisons should be care for the safety of penitentiary units and consistent implementation of order and discipline. This will improve the educational atmosphere and climate of the rehabilitation institution, as confirmed by many years of penitentiary practice. Only in such conditions is it possible to carry out corrective measures against convicts. Therefore, a new algorithm of penitentiary measures should be created, based on pragmatism and praxeology, and not on the illusion of rehabilitation based on a bureaucratic and statistical approach, as exemplified by the multiplicity of unprofessional, routine individual programmes of measures.

Following the example of Western European countries, we should perhaps introduce into penitentiary measures a paradigm of well-organized social work, supported and propagated by P. Stępnia (Stępnia, 1998), with additional participation in educational, corrective and therapeutic measures with the convicts of civilian specialists, rather than to feed public opinion with sublime but utopian rehabilitation, identified with the multiplicity of ineffective programmes, carried out by officers who, in the vast majority, are not rehabilitation pedagogues, for whom a good adaptation to the conditions of prison isolation resulting from **prisonization** (e.g. the lack of disciplinary conclusions) is often identified with **rehabilitation**.

It is obvious that it is not possible to apply a uniform paradigm, either in terms of rehabilitation or social work, to all prisoners, as this is dependent on many factors, including: the degree of demoralization, endogenous deficits and the motivation of the convicted person to improve. In general, however, the paradigm of social work should be applied to convicts participating in the regular system, while the rehabilitation/revalidation paradigm should be applied to convicts serving their sentences in the programmed influence and therapeutic system. In the implementation of the programmed influence system and in the preparation of the rehabilitation diagnosis, diagnostic teams (consisting of three persons) should be appointed, consisting of specialists with substantial knowledge and experience, and not individual educators, who often do not have qualifications in the field of rehabilitation diagnostics and are not methodically prepared for the implementation of programmes. Therefore, the programmes are implemented routinely, with greater concern for their number than quality (a higher percentage of convicts in the system of programmed influence has a positive impact only on statistics, but unfortunately does not have an impact on the quality of the programmes).

Legal and organizational changes

– the concept of functional models of prisons

The improvement of the effectiveness of institutional rehabilitation measures should start with the proper determination of the parity of importance of the isolation and rehabilitation function in particular types of prisons (closed, semi-open and open). Therefore, from an organizational and pragmatic point of view, it would be justified to separate in penitentiary practice (within the current executive penal code) – four functional models of prisons, characterized by gradation of the applied rigor and varying degrees of intensity of the isolation or rehabilitation function implemented there (higher polarity of functions than at present):

- **isolation model** – implemented in the case of prisoners posing a serious threat to society or a serious threat to the security of the prison – with maximum rigor reflected in the subjection of convicts to order and discipline and a definite priority of the security function, with certain elements of penitentiary (corrective) measures possible to implement in extremely isolated conditions;
- **isolation-correctional model** – implemented in a prison of the closed type, with the predominance of the isolation function over the corrective one, with strict regime (subjecting convicts to order and discipline). Prisoners who, for health (physical or mental defects) or personal safety reasons (predestination to become a victim), cannot serve their sentences in a semi-open prison, would be subject to revalidation and therapeutic measures;
- **rehabilitation and protection model** – implemented in a semi-open facility with a predominance of the rehabilitation component over the isolation one, with limited regime and social security protection adequate to the nature of the population of prisoners and the threats they may present during their sentence;
- **rehabilitation (readaptation) model** – with the definite priority of the rehabilitation function, with the implementation of rehabilitation programmes (preparing for readaptation) by appropriately prepared specialist staff, with minimum regime and isolation from the society limited to the necessary minimum – implemented in an open type facility.

Therefore, the implementation of the system of programmed influence in its full form would be possible in semi-open and open facilities, where the possibility of verifying the effects of the measures in social contacts is much wider than in closed facilities. The rules of rehabilitation proceedings require gradual expansion of the sphere of freedom during the imprisonment, especially before the expected release from prison – in accordance with the principle of progression, which involves changing the type of prison to semi-open, and then to the open one, where the intensity of contacts between the convicts and the society is the highest. In

the current conditions of the penitentiary system, the lack of a clear polarization of these functions and the decrease in the level of order and discipline leads to chaos in the implementation of the objectives of the functioning of penitentiary units, in which in prisons of the closed type, and even in units for the so-called dangerous prisoners, attempts are made to excessively focus on the rehabilitation function, where the obvious priority should be effective isolation from the society and the safety of the institution (see Kędzierski, 2009, pp. 305–308).

It happens that in closed prisons there are attempts to implement a rehabilitation model of prison, with an excessive number of various types of programmes, which for objective reasons is doomed to failure or at most to their low rehabilitation efficiency. In semi-open and open facilities, however, the conservatively promoted model is closer to the isolation one, excessively focused on the prevention of escapes, and less on the corrective and therapeutic (psycho-corrective) measures that can be implemented in the conditions that are closer to natural ones. This type of facilities should function as prisons that reintegrate socially, reduce the isolativeness of the facilities in favor of wider contacts with the social environment and prepare for proper functioning there after serving a sentence.

It also seems necessary to change the concept of the legal system and the functioning of the prison system and its priorities, because long-term imprisonment sentences, which constitute a significant percentage of all sentences imposed in the Polish legal system, are more of a prisonizing nature, destroying the psychophysical condition of the prisoner rather than a rehabilitating one, improving it and socializing the ward. From this point of view, in the perspective of the effectiveness of later social readaptation, it would be more advantageous to apply short-term penalties, but implemented with stricter regime, subjecting the convicts to order and discipline, with the basic scope of application of penitentiary measures, so that only in the case of a transition to a semi-open facility, in conditions of reduced isolation from the society, would it be possible to fully implement effective rehabilitation and subsequently pre-release programmes. This is because destigmatization, which is a process of limiting the deviant identity of a criminal and depriving him of the stigma of a deviant, is possible during social contacts in natural conditions of freedom, and almost impossible during long term imprisonment in a closed facility.

The implementation of the proposed concept would give more guarantees of shaping the proper climate of the penitentiary institution and a positive educational atmosphere being the sine qua non of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation measures. It also seems justified, given that in prisons there is often a lack of a clear polarization of functions, where the priority of the rehabilitation or isolation function in individual types of prison is sometimes blurred, and juvenile prisoners do not know which system they are serving their sentences in, despite the fact that the current system obligatorily places them in the system of programmed influence. In case of prisoners with endogenous deficits that hinder

their functioning in semi-open facilities (mainly due to the threat to their safety), therapeutic and revalidating measures should be implemented in closed facilities. Such a solution would also increase the chance to protect convicts from the syndrome of learned helplessness (see Clemmer 1958), associated with long-term, prisonizing stay in prison isolation, and also resulting from the overprotective system limiting autonomous decision-making and organizing the life of convicts in every aspect of it.

The concept of penitentiary wards as a new organizational structure of prisons

The prison system reform of the Minister of Justice K. Kwiatkowski which consisted in introducing into its organizational structure **penitentiary wards** (PW) was to be a great success. The Ministry announced an epochal change in the quality of functioning of units, and then resigned from most regulations concerning penitentiary wards and returned to an old, ineffective concept (illusory reforms aimed at the media and personal success of their creators) The very idea of implementing the PW and its assumptions were correct, but they were incompetently introduced and distorted by inept officers isolated from prison reality.

The concept of implementing WPs into the organizational structures of the penitentiary system was already present in the experiences of Opole and Płock, as well as in penitentiary units subordinate to the District Inspectorate of Prison Service in Białystok (Keller et al., 2007). Such an attempt was also made by the author of this article in the Prison in Rzeszów in the years 2007–2008 (more broadly: Kędzierski, 2010), taking into account the experience of his predecessors, as well as theoretical concepts of internal dysfunctionality of the institution and the principles of efficient management of the organization (Kieżun, 1998).

The **Internal Ward** (IW), separated from the organizational structure of the Prison in Rzeszów, comprises all three existing wards for recidivists serving sentences in closed prisons, and also, although to a lesser extent, in semi-open prisons (those employed to work in the unit) in the regular system and the programmed influence system.

The relative uniformity of the population of convicts (clean profile) has created a cohesive and largely autonomous organizational structure, which does not generate conflicts of interest with other residential wards in terms of the movement of convicts between wards. It also allowed for a clearer and more coherent penitentiary policy towards the convicts under single-person management.

The concept of implementing the IW did not require to liquidate any of the departments functioning in the existing organizational structure of the prison or to obtain additional work positions. The personnel of the IW were completed through organizational changes or staff shifts aimed at strengthening the so-called

first line, and thus improving the speed and efficiency of the execution of tasks related to its functioning. It is managed by the deputy director, with the office located directly on its grounds, and the logistics coordinator who handles the requests of the convicts concerning non-penitentiary matters.

The most difficult task in the process of reforming the organizational structures of the prison system was to make decision-makers responsible for the functioning of the service and administration departments aware that the prison does not function for the administration but rather the administration functions for the prison, as well as of the need to organize units in which the front-line departments will not waste time and energy on the fulfillment of duties belonging to other departments (the phenomenon of negative autonomy of service and administration departments) so that they can focus on ensuring the order and security of the units and on the implementation of penitentiary measures aimed at effective enforcement of imprisonment sentences (more broadly: Kędzierski, 2009, pp. 305–308).

After analyzing the results of the research, it was found that after a year of functioning, there was a significant increase in the organizational efficiency of the newly established structure, reflected both in a decrease in the number of extraordinary incidents – by almost 11%, and in the level of complaints of the convicts – by as much as 41%. The research was also conducted among the staff, using a pre-designed questionnaire evaluating the functioning of the Internal Ward of the Prison in Rzeszów. The research involved 27 officers serving in the IW (coordinators, educators, psychologist, wardens and warden assistants).

The highest approval rate for the newly established structure was achieved by changes in the following fields:

- understanding by the department head (deputy director) of the problems occurring in the IW,
- speed of decision-making,
- speed of handling of the convicts' requests,
- speed of handling of the officers' requests.

According to the respondents, there has been a significant improvement in the organization of work in the IW, e.g. by flattening of the organizational structure – the branch head in the rank of deputy director exercising organizational supervision. This influenced the speed of decision making, shortened the circulation of information and better understanding of the problems occurring in the IW. In the opinion of respondents, there has also been an improvement in the atmosphere among officers, their identification with the department and their influence on decisions related to its functioning (increase in rank).

Effects of the implementation of the concept of the Internal Ward in the Prison in Rzeszów:

1. Improvement of the effectiveness of management and the speed of decision-making processes by flattening of the organizational structure of the department (direct reporting to the deputy director responsible for the IW).

2. Unification of the penitentiary policy implemented in the ward with single-man management (consistent policy of punishment and rewarding, consideration of requests, complaints and applications of convicts, formulation of social and criminological predictions, granting permission to leave the prison area, etc.).
3. Increase of possibilities and effectiveness of implementation of penitentiary measures, active social and professional readaptation programmes for the convicts and of shaping proper educational atmosphere.
4. More efficient and oriented towards the main objective – effective execution of a prison sentence – use of officers of service and administrative departments (elimination of negative autonomy of these departments).
5. Creation of a complementary team with a higher level of motivation, responsibility and efficiency of activities in the implementation of tasks related to the operation of the IW.
6. Increase of the internal security of the prison (officers and convicts) due to better awareness of the environment of the convicted recidivists and a significant decrease in the number of extraordinary incidents.
7. Increase of motivation of the convicts to improve their conduct and increase of their self-control and self-discipline in connection with the implementation of the **system of internal progression**⁷.

It should be noted that the functioning of internal (penitentiary) wards is justified especially in large penitentiary units (with a nominal capacity of over 600 prisoners), because it allows to organize the functioning of the facilities, contributing to greater efficiency of management of a smaller organizational structure under a single-person management.

Changing the paradigm of corrective measures in order to increase their effectiveness

In order to improve the effectiveness of measures taken in prisons, penitentiary measures should be taken, the aim of which should be the continuous “stimulation with freedom” by showing real perspectives of functioning in freedom and proper preparation for it, by teaching, courses, organization of employment, participation in cultural, educational and sports activities, contacts with families and the outside world, as well as participation in pre-release programmes enabling

.....

⁷ This system creates opportunities for intensification of penitentiary measures and the use of exceptions from the regulations in the form of opening a cell during the day, at specified times, by the convicts impeccably functioning in the IW, employed and participating in the system of programmed influence. It makes it possible to monitor the functioning of the convicts in conditions of reduced isolation, and increased privileges, before sending them to a semi-open prison.

apprenticeship and providing practical knowledge about, e.g. functioning on the labor market, location of institutions providing assistance to released prisoners, etc. The prisoner should see freedom as a more attractive than prison. This argument will be irrelevant when freedom is associated with unemployment, lack of life perspectives and an unfair social system.

While implementing the educational measures, one should remember not to deprive prisoners of hope for the improvement of their fate, because it conditions a positive motivation for pro-social changes, even of those sentenced to life imprisonment. It is necessary to be aware that these prisoners, even if they will never function in freedom, will have to live for many years in a prison community which usually functions according to socially approved interpersonal relations and the generally binding axionormative system (apart from pathological, destructive norms of the prison subculture, followed by a part of the prison community). Therefore, it is important to keep convicts in good psychophysical condition and to shape their pro-social attitudes. When in prisons there is no possibility of sufficient implementation of penitentiary measures in the form of work and education, it is necessary to ensure the maximum possible use of free time and increase the time prisoners spend outside the cells, because the activity of inmates aimed at socially acceptable forms improves their psychophysical condition and teaches them how to function in a social group (educational, therapeutic, revalidation, cultural, educational, sports activities). The initiative of the Ministry of Justice to significantly increase the number of employed prisoners, resulting in an increase in the employment rate to over 40%, was a very positive development.

A certain convicted recidivist found a trivial, but very accurate phrase to describe the need to make use of the prisoners' free time: "your hands must be busy so that your head can rest". When the educators, because of the excess of bureaucratic work – often not connected with the rehabilitation activity – do not dispose of the prisoners' time, the prisoners will do so themselves in a pathological way (battery, rape, psychotropic substances, drugs). The educator should therefore be more of a trustee, an advisor to the convicts, rather than an officer or an official who, due to the need to fill in excessive amounts of documents, does not have time to listen to the prisoners' problems. Specialized corrective or therapeutic measures should be implemented by qualified civilian specialists, e.g. aggression replacement training, programmes for addicts, perpetrators of domestic violence or those with impaired sexual preferences, and it should be possible to continue treatment after serving a sentence.

Final thoughts

Penitentiary facilities will never be universal institutions for collective (mass) improvement of convicts, it is also difficult to require from them high rehabilitation

efficiency (especially in closed institutions for recidivists), just as no one in society expects high efficiency of treatment from hospices.

In corrective measures, it is difficult to concentrate with equal intensity on all categories of convicts. The main focus should be on juveniles, those serving their first sentence and those convicts who demonstrate motivation for pro-social changes (real, not opportunistic). Considering that a significant percentage of convicts are alcohol and psychoactive substances addicts (the main crime-inducing factor), they should be subjected to a greater extent to addiction therapy in therapeutic wards. Meanwhile, only about 2.5% of convicts undergo this therapy⁸. Educators should improve their interpersonal relations with wards, motivate and reward their positive aspirations – this way we will avoid the phenomenon of secondary stigmatization. As the correction process progresses, reduce disparities in meeting psychophysical needs that exist between prison and freedom conditions⁹. These factors contribute to the improvement of the functioning of inmates, the predictability of their conduct, and reduce the number of protests and auto- and allo-aggressive behaviors.

In order to verify the effects of rehabilitation measures, **catamnestic research** should be conducted on a nationwide scale, taking into account not only the observance by the paroled of legal norms, but also the degree of their integration with society (interiorization of pro-social models of attitudes), especially towards the paroled, who received a positive social and criminological prognosis, previously participating in the system of programmed influence, and then the research should be compared with the research on the remaining paroled prisoners. This would make it possible to make a realistic assessment of the effectiveness of individual programmes of influence and the accuracy of the formulated social and criminological prognoses.

References

- [1] Clemmer D., *The prison community*, Holt, Reinehartant Winston, New York 1958.
- [2] Keller K., Kopczyk J., 2007, *Oddział penitencjarny. Nowa struktura organizacyjna jednostki penitencjarnej*, OISW-Białystok, Białystok.
- [3] Kędzierski W., 2009, *Organizacyjno-prawne i psychospołeczne uwarunkowania resocjalizacji instytucjonalnej (wybrane aspekty)*, [in:] *Prawne i socjokulturowe uwarunkowania profilaktyki społecznej i resocjalizacji*, (ed.) F. Kozaczuk, Rzeszów.
- [4] Kędzierski W., 2010, *Oddział Wewnętrzny Zakładu Karnego w Rzeszowie – sukces czy porażka koncepcji?* [in:] *Zachowania przestępcze. Przyczyny i zapobieganie*, (ed.) F. Kozaczuk, Rzeszów.

.....

⁸ Source: <http://www.sw.gov.pl/strona/statystyka-roczna2016>.

⁹ See Rules 1–7, Council of Europe. Recommendation Rec (2006)2 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the European Prison Rules.

- [5] Kieżun W., 1998, *Sprawne zarządzanie organizacją: zarys teorii i praktyki*. Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH, Warszawa.
- [6] Machel H., 2003, *Więzenie jako instytucja karna i resocjalizacyjna*, Arche, Gdańsk.
- [7] Stępiak P., 1998, *Wymiar sprawiedliwości i praca socjalna w krajach Europy Zachodniej*, PDM Ławica, Poznań.
- [8] Informacja o wynikach kontroli NIK nr 177/2015/P/14/004, *Readaptacja społeczna osób skazanych na wieloletnie kary pozbawienia wolności*.
- [9] Rekomendacja Rec. (2006) 2 Komitetu Ministrów do państw członkowskich Rady Europy w sprawie Europejskich Reguł Więziennych (Przyjęta przez Komitet Ministrów 11 stycznia 2006 r. na 952. posiedzeniu delegatów).
- [10] Rozporządzenie Ministra Sprawiedliwości z 14 sierpnia 2003 r. w sprawie sposobów prowadzenia oddziaływań penitencjarnych w zakładach karnych i aresztach śledczych (z późn. zm.).
- [11] Ustawa z 6 czerwca 1997 r. Kodeks karny wykonawczy (Dz.U. z 1997 r. nr 90, poz. 557, z późn. zm.).

Internet sources:

- [12] Statystyka roczna Służby Więziennej za lata 2012–2016, <http://www.sw.gov.pl/stro-na/statystyka-roczna> [accessed on: 1.03.2017].