

PURPOSEFULNESS OF IMPROVEMENT OF INMATE RE-SOCIALISATION IMPLEMENTED IN THE REMAND PRISON FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS

Laima Liukinevičienė, Donatas Mikalauskas
Šiauliai University, Lithuania

Abstract

Imprisonment establishments face a challenge to prepare an inmate for social integration. The presented research is based on assumptions provided by scientists who suppose that single quantitative indicators are not sufficient to measure effectiveness of re-socialisation of inmates being implemented in imprisonment institutions; subjective opinions of participants of the process are worth investigating, too. A qualitative research employing a semi-structured interview was conducted in Šiauliai Remand Prison in 2017; the results demonstrate the following: personnel working in social rehabilitation divisions notice changes, progress in the system of implementation of punishment, support the policy of modernisation of imprisonment establishments; however, they lack a systematic approach, compliance with the deadlines in implementation of the programmes, observe the problems of workload of the personnel and the lack of competences, environments required for implementation of individualised social rehabilitation of inmates.

Keywords: *re-socialisation of inmates, social rehabilitation of inmates, social rehabilitation management, imprisonment establishment.*

Introduction

Lithuania remains among these EU states where the ratio of inmates serving their sentence in imprisonment institutions per 100,000 inhabitants is the largest: in 2016, the ratio was 239 inmates per 100,000 inhabitants, whereas in Finland there were 57, in Germany 76, in Poland 196 per 100,000 population (Dünkel & Sakalauskas, 2017). At the beginning of 2017, there were 6,049 inmates under custodial sentence in Lithuania (Prison Department, 2017). Even though this decrease is significant in comparison to 2014 (in 2014 inmates comprised 0.31 per cent of the entire population of Lithuania, in 2016 and 2017 they comprised 0.23

per cent), it is high in comparison to other EU states. Scientists suppose that too frequent application of custodial sentence (Mackevičius & Rakštelis, 2010) and long-term custodial sentence (Sakalauskas, 2017) are major drawbacks of the criminal justice in Lithuania. In 2017, the average period of custodial sentence set by the court was over 6.5 years; the length of actually served sentence (counting those who were released) was over 2.5 years. A large amount of inmates and long-term imprisonment require large investment into infrastructure, training and professional development of the personnel as well as re-socialisation of inmates. The state spends 23 euros to sustain one imprisoned person per day (Prison Department, 2016). Bearing in mind that throughout the period of restored independence of Lithuania not a single new prison has been built, it is obvious that such situation limits the work of officers, reduces motivation of inmates to prepare themselves for social integration.

In the current decade, the numbers of scholarly papers disseminating that the criminal law is unable to solve social problems, the states should put more endeavours to develop crime prevention and opportunities for recidivism increased (Heinz, 2017). The obligation of the EU legal acts (*Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers Rec (87) 3 on the European Prison Rules, 2006*) and recommendations of the UN (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2016) must be complied with. It is recommended to achieve the purpose of imprisonment, i.e. protection of society and reduction of crime through society education, comprehensive education, vocational training and labour, social support, health care, leisure time and occupation measures, sports and religious events with regard to individual needs of the imprisoned (Dünel & Sakalauskas, 2017).

Lithuania takes its first steps towards quality process of *re-socialisation*. Still, the process of re-socialisation is not clearly structured in national documents, there is lack of a systematic approach to solution of some questions. Divisions of social rehabilitation have been founded, specialised personnel work in Lithuanian imprisonment establishments coordinated by the Re-socialisation Unit of the Prison Department of the Republic of Lithuania. In present-day scholarly discussions, the decreasing recidivism as a major indicator of the efficiency of *social rehabilitation* of inmates is considered as insufficient. More and more explicitly it is spoken of the need to investigate opinions of the participants (inmates, personnel etc.) of the *re-socialisation* process, even though they can be subjective, too. Vaičiūnienė (2017) has been investigating separate aspects of implementation of the process of social rehabilitation from perspectives of inmates and personnel in Alytus, Vilnius, Marijampolė, Pravieniškės correction houses over the period covering the years 2012–2015.

Šiauliai Remand Prison is one of 11 imprisonment establishments under the Prison Department. This imprisonment establishment has been selected as a study field because of several reasons: 1) one of the authors of the present articles works here, 2) no research on *social rehabilitation, re-socialisation* of inmates have been conducted so far; 3) over the period under investigation, the institution has been operating under conditions of overpopulation. Moreover, it should be noted that conditions of residence of the inmates are poor, turnover of the personnel working with inmates is quite high (in 2017, there were 14 dismissed, 18 hired junior correctional officers). On the other hand, here much is done to involve society into the process of re-socialisation of inmates: in 2017, there were 24 cooperation agreements signed with public organisations and volunteers (Šiauliai Remand Prison. Report on the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan Programme, 2017), many cultural and other events are continuously organised.

The aim of the research is to investigate efficiency of the process of re-socialisation of inmates in Šiauliai Remand Prison as well as to explore the possibilities for improvement of the process from the point of view of social rehabilitation personnel. Striving to reach the aim, the following strategy has been employed: 1) to theoretically define the possibilities to assess the efficiency of the process of re-socialisation in an imprisonment establishment from the participants' point of view; 2) to review the measures being taken over the latter decade in custody establishments of the Republic of Lithuania seeking more efficient re-socialisation of inmates; 3) by employing a qualitative research, to find out the problems of the re-socialisation process being implemented in the remand prison and possible directions for improvement of this process. Efficiency of re-socialisation of inmates in an imprisonment establishment *is the research object*. **Research methods:** analysis of scientific literature, statistical sources, legal acts; qualitative research employing a semi-structured interview.

Theoretical Preconditions for Measurement of Efficiency of Re-socialisation, Social Rehabilitation of Inmates Implemented in Imprisonment Establishments

Usually, concepts *social rehabilitation* (the earlier used concept was “corrective work with inmates”), *re-socialisation* have been used as synonyms in the context of research studies conducted in Lithuania. Legal acts still may deal with both terms. For instance, *the plan for social rehabilitation* has been being used in imprisonment establishments which are subordinate to the Prison Department since 2015. The subdivisions of Lithuanian remand prisons carrying out *re-socialisation* of inmates are called divisions of social rehabilitation, and performance of these subdivisions is coordinated at a central level by the Re-socialisation Unit of the Prison Department. For a long time, *social rehabilitation of inmates* has been introduced by scientists as a comprehensive process encompassing: constructive interaction of the state and self-governance, public organisations and other legal and physical bodies encompassing recovery of the reputation of inmates, humanistic relationships with a victim, moral and material damage, restitution of rights, physical, psychological, pedagogical, medical, legal, moral preparation for social integration, restoration of the social status, education of a full-fledged citizen so that an inmate could function in society quite well and become a useful and valuable personality in terms of one's own life, family and society (Dermontas, 2004). According to Sakalauskas (2015), Vaičiūnienė (2017), these concepts differ at their core. *Social rehabilitation* is more suitable for characterisation of psychological recovery of a personality or redemption of honour, whereas the notion *re-socialisation* covers a much broader context, i.e. development of skills and abilities helping to live without committing crime and to successfully return to the social milieu (Sakalauskas (2015), cited by Vaičiūnienė, 2017). Thus, we can state that *re-socialisation* is a broader concept encompassing both measures of *social rehabilitation* and outcomes of it (social integration of an inmate). According to scientists, the concept of *re-socialisation* may include a forced return process of new socialisation aimed at by the state, which is impossible and has some similar features of operation of the total state, like in the case of striving “to correct” individuals (Kaiser, cited by Sakalauskas, 2015). Currently, it is perceived that custody of a person is not the most appropriate measure of *re-socialisation*, it is hardly implementable in an imprisonment establishment; however, the state must implement it to seek public safety and reduction of crime. Custody applied as an extreme measure by limiting the inmates as little as possible, applied for as a short time period as possible is the reality of the policy of punishment and execution of sentence; therefore, its implementation must be arranged in a pragmatic way, considering public interests, securing human dignity

of inmates, observing key human rights, limiting the inmate's freedom of movement as little as it is necessary, regarding the predicted situation after completion of the served sentence (Sakalauskas, 2015).

Various countries choose *the models of re-socialisation of inmates* kept in imprisonment institutions in compliance with their criminal policy (Žilinskienė & Tumilaitė, 2011). In Lithuania, the applied *models of re-socialisation* are closer to the Risk-Need-Responsivity Model which is extensively applied for assessment and rehabilitation of inmates worldwide (Beck, 1992). Here, much attention is paid to management of crime risks, the benefit is defined from the public aspect for the most part. The *Good Lives Model* proposed in the early twenty-first century is being successfully developed in the USA, Australia, England, Sweden etc.: major attention is focused not only on improvement of the environment surrounding inmates, their lives, but also on their needs. An inmate is motivated to have and strive for the goals which are important to him/her. Naturally, the steps in changing the system of execution of punishment in Lithuania modernising custody institutions meet the goals of the latter model: to motivate an inmate to have positive strivings, to stimulate his/her will to socially integrate. When employing this model, a specialist of *social rehabilitation* must identify the goods which are important to a person to select an appropriate instrument. Seeking to prevent the individuals from recidivism, they must be provided with knowledge, skills, possibilities and resources to live the "good" life with regard to their specific preferences, interests and values (Ward & Maruna, 2007).

It is quite difficult to measure the efficiency of the inmate *re-socialisation* process, services, programmes of *social rehabilitation* being implemented in custodial institutions. Scientists discuss the criteria which could be employed to measure efficiency of inmate re-socialisation (Ward & Maruna, 2007; Sakalauskas, 2015, 2017). For a long time, prevention of recidivism was considered as one of major indicators of successful *social rehabilitation*. The talks delivered over the latter years by scientists demonstrate limitedness of such indicators because social integration of a person who had his/her term in a custody establishment is impacted by other factors, too (situation in the labour market, social relationships outside imprisonment establishment, individual social characteristics of inmates, etc.). Efficiency of the *re-socialisation* measures may show itself after many years only, the recidivism may be not as intensive as previous one etc. (Farrall, 2014; Assessment of Probation Effectiveness, 2015).

Having reviewed the criteria for measurement of efficiency of *social rehabilitation* and *re-socialisation* process mentioned and discussed in Lithuanian scientific literature (see Table 1) and the criteria of efficient socialisation and rehabilitation of inmates set to implement the objectives of the programme "The System of Punishment" carried out by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, we see that all of them are of a quantitative nature. When deeply exploring the content of the discussed indicators, we could relatively divide them into several groups: *indicators (effect) demonstrating inmate's successful social integration; indicators of improvement of environments of social rehabilitation; indicators showing progress of inmates' social rehabilitation in an imprisonment establishment; indicators of inmates' engagement in the measures of social rehabilitation in a custody establishment; indicators demonstrating engagement of personnel of custody establishments and society in re-socialisation of inmates.* It is likely that increasing results of (self-)involvement of participants of the process increase the effect (efficiency) of *re-socialisation*.

Table 1. Criteria for measurement of efficiency of re-socialisation/ social rehabilitation

Criteria for measurement of efficiency of re-socialisation/ social rehabilitation	Sources
<i>Indicators proving successful social integration of inmates (the effect):</i> decrease of recurrent criminal acts; part of individuals who covered material damage caused by criminal acts (restorative justice) etc.	Assessment of Probation Effectiveness, 2015; Dobryninas et al., 2008.
<i>Indicators of improvement of social rehabilitation environments:</i> process of prevention of penetration of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances into the premises of custody; number of specialists working in social rehabilitation divisions; number of social rehabilitation programmes being implemented; number of obtained tracker dogs used to detect illegally transported drugs and psychotropic substances, their primary substances and tobacco products, etc.	
<i>Indicators proving the progress of social rehabilitation of inmates in an imprisonment establishment:</i> part of inmates having no disciplinary punishment (percentage), part of working and studying individuals; number of inmates who obtained a speciality; number of inmates who obtained a popular speciality etc.	
<i>Indicators of engagement of inmates in social rehabilitation measures in a custody establishment (the outcome):</i> part of individuals who completed the programmes on changing behaviour; decrease of the number of inmates addicted to drugs and psychotropic substances; percentage of individuals who voluntarily participate in behaviour correction programmes in comparison to the number of all addicted people etc.	
<i>Indicators of engagement of personnel working in custody establishments and society in re-socialisation of inmates:</i> number of specialists who participated in professional development, training events dedicated to the area of prevention of drug addiction; number of specialists working in rehabilitation divisions of imprisonment establishments who participate in training visits to institutions of the EU countries; number of visited inmates in their places of residence etc.	

Source: compiled by the authors grounding on the sources mentioned in the table.

When improving the assessment criteria for the effect and outcome of efficient performance of *re-socialisation* in imprisonment establishments, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania and the Prison Department collaborate with the Law Institute of Lithuania. As pointed out by a scientist of this institution, Sakalauskas (2017), the preconditions, conditions for successful *re-socialisation* of inmates empowering social integration become important in supplementing the criteria for assessment of efficiency of re-socialisation with the qualitative ones:

- 1) empowerment by providing conditions for criminality-free living, e. g. by enhancing their prospects in the labour market, finding out the financial situation, ensuring accommodation, reducing the risks of violence, etc.;
- 2) the imprisonment made as maximally open as possible (short-term visits, work, learning and participation in re-socialisation programmes outside the establishment, holidays etc.);
- 3) involvement of various external services and organisations;
- 4) planned (starting from the first day of imprisonment), consistent and continuous process of (re-) socialisation after being released;
- 5) well-selected, trained, competent personnel who are able to self-evaluate the performance, create positive relations to inmates, well-understanding the problems of the inmates' lives, context of the criminal behaviour and actions, aware of the goal of imprisonment and supporting it, holding means to seek it jointly with the inmates;
- 6) well-thought-of programmes meeting majority of the quality criteria (Sakalauskas, 2017).

Experiences of other countries (Germany, England) demonstrate that a complex approach is recommended when measuring efficiency of the *re-socialisation* process in an imprisonment establishment. Not only official statistics of criminal recurrence but also subjective opinions of re-socialisation participants (inmates and personnel) on the provided services and their quality are employed. Shapland et al. (Germany) have it that efficiency can be measured according to *how an institution manages to provide the outputs stimulating re-socialisation and implement the set outcomes* (Shapland et al., cited in Assessment of Probation Effectiveness, 2015). Analysis of the process from the inside, with regard to attitudes of the participants, can be valuable when striving to improve performance of a separate establishment and, usually, of similar institutions. Being aware of the Prison Department of the Republic of Lithuania submitting quite detailed statistical reports (quantitative indicators of the effect and output) on implementation of the programme “System of Punishment” each year, we have chosen the (qualitative) investigation of the participants’ attitudes for our research, thus hoping to trace other aspects that can improve the process, too.

Lithuania in the Process of Increasing the Efficiency of Re-socialisation of Inmates

The goal to increase the prospects for social integration of an inmate (for the purpose of re-socialisation) is becoming important while changing the Lithuanian system of punishment, modernising imprisonment establishments. The Government of the Republic of Lithuania approved “The Strategy of Modernisation of Custody Establishments and the Annual Plan for Implementation of the Measures over 2009–2017” on 30 September 2009, No. 1248; and “The Programme of Modernisation of Custody Establishments” was approved in 2014; the latter document allocated the financial means and resources for implementation of the programme. Since 2009, the Prison Department has been implementing the programme “Corrections, Including Punishment without Imprisonment” funded by Norwegian financial means (5 projects). Over 2011–2017, articles of the Code of Implementation of Punishment of the Republic of Lithuania (2002) related to re-socialisation of inmates have been reviewed and amended several times (clause 3 “Social Rehabilitation of Inmates Serving the Sentence”, art. 136–145; clause 4 “Comprehensive Education and Vocational Training of Inmates Serving the Sentence”, art. 147–148, 150); in 2015, the Code has been supplemented with a new article 137¹, “Planning of Social Rehabilitation”.

The programme “The System of Punishment” being implemented by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania over the latter years aims at creating an economic and efficient system of punishment (a strategic goal of the programme). In compliance with this programme, implementation of punishments is meant for changing thinking and behaviour of a person who has committed crime, helping individuals who committed crime to become socially integrated. Implementation of efficient *socialisation* and *re-socialisation* of inmates is one of the objectives of this programme (Strategic Plan of Performance in the Areas Governed by the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania over the Period 2015–2017, approved by the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania on 20 January 2015, order No. 1R-17). The reports of the programme “The System of Punishment” are publicly available on the web site. The National Audit of the Republic of Lithuania periodically examines implementation of this programme. The report of the National Audit published in 2016 shows that the system of assessment criteria of the programme “The System of Punishment” does not comply with the requirements, the criterion for assessment of the outcome of the implementation of the objective “To implement efficient socialisation and re-socialisation of inmates” has not

been set; therefore, it is impossible to assess whether the outcomes of performance of social rehabilitation and psychological divisions (groups) operating in detention establishments have been achieved by developing social skills of the inmates, implementing measures of positive occupation, programmes intended for correction of behaviour; moreover, it is impossible to assess how these divisions contribute to achieving the goals of the programme and what the benefit imprisoned individuals get from activities of the divisions and services is (The report of the National Audit. Implementation of the programme “The System of Punishment”, 2016).

Re-socialisation in detention establishments in Lithuania is coordinated by the Re-socialisation Unit of the Prison Department. Each imprisonment establishment has a social rehabilitation unit subordinate to the deputy director general; this unit is headed by a chief of the unit; a platoon of specialists of the unit is headed by a chief of the platoon. An individual *Plan of Social Rehabilitation* for a newly imprisoned inmate is drawn by chiefs of platoons of social rehabilitation divisions. Personnel of other divisions (security and supervision, criminal intelligence, health care), departments (psychological service) take part in the process of social rehabilitation of an inmate, too. In recent years, other institutions, NGOs, volunteers have been engaged more actively.

196 staff members (there were 221 full-time positions available) have been working with individuals serving their sentences (5,554 of them in 2017) in social rehabilitation units of Lithuanian imprisonment establishments, i.e. one employee supervised approximately 28 individuals serving their sentences. The inmates were suggested 142 programmes of social rehabilitation; approximately half of the inmates (2,837) were engaged in them. 2,320 inmates were learning (Activity Report of Social Rehabilitation Services, 2017).

Over the recent years, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania and the Prison Department have been actively collaborating with scientists of the Law Institute of Lithuania (Sakalauskas, Jarutienė, Uscila, Nikartas etc.), Vilnius University (Prapiestis) aiming to employ the best experiences of democratic states to increase efficiency of punishment, re-socialisation, while assessing the benefit of applied measures.

This short review of the measures employed to increase re-socialisation of inmates in Lithuania over the latter years demonstrates that Lithuania is making its first steps towards high-quality, consistent, clearly structured implementation of *re-socialisation* in imprisonment establishments. It is obvious that some time should pass until we will have qualitative, in-depth research on efficiency of re-socialisation because the reform is just getting its speed. Also, it is clear that implementers of the *re-socialisation* process are still insufficiently prepared for these processes. The personnel lack competence and time to individualise measures of social rehabilitation, build positive contacts with inmates. There is also lack of motivation in inmates themselves to actively use the suggested measures.

Research Methodology

In 2017, a survey was carried out in Šiauliai Remand Prison (hereinafter referred to as ŠRP or the remand prison); its goal was to find out the attitude of individuals working in the Social Rehabilitation Unit (hereinafter referred to as the SRU) towards the efficiency of re-socialisation of inmates organised here. By employing a semi-structured interview, 6 informants have been surveyed; they have been selected in compliance with the earlier set criteria (experience of work in an imprisonment establishment is at least 10 years, direct engagement in the process of re-socialisation of inmates, higher education at the university level). Informants: deputy director general of ŠRP (16 years in the institution, senior correction

officer's rank 1), chief of the SRU (20 years, senior correction officer's rank 1), 3 chiefs of the SRU platoons (9 years, senior correction officer's rank 3; 18 years, correction officer's rank 1; 20 years, correction officer's rank 1), senior specialist of the SRS (12 years, correction officer's rank 1), including 2 women. While carrying out the analysis of collected materials, the informants were given alphanumeric codes: deputy director general for social rehabilitation – R1, chief of the Social Rehabilitation Unit – R2, senior specialist of the Social Rehabilitation Unit – R3, chiefs of the platoons of the Social Rehabilitation Unit – R4, R5, R6.

During the survey, the interview topics were provided in a question form: 1) *How did the management of re-socialisation, social rehabilitation of inmates change in the imprisonment establishment over the latter decade? What were the causes?* 2) *How does performance of the Social Rehabilitation Unit of Šiauliai Remand Prison influence social integration of inmates?* 3) *What competences are required for individuals working in the area of re-socialisation, social rehabilitation of inmates?* 4) *What changes at both state and organisational levels are required to achieve efficient re-socialisation of inmates?* The collected interview materials have been generalised, significant aspects have been pointed out.

Results of Efficiency and Purposefulness of Improvement of Inmate Re-socialisation Implemented in Šiauliai Remand Prison: Attitude of Personnel of the Establishment

According to Šiauliai Remand Prison's plan of action for 2016, aiming to achieve efficiency of the process of social rehabilitation, the following actions are foreseen: to provide psychological support to both detained individuals and inmates; to develop moral traits in the inmates; to provide social support to both detained individuals and inmates; to perform prevention and elimination of criminal subculture among inmates; to provide educational activities to both detained individuals and inmates on issues of damage done by narcotic drugs and other addictive diseases; to engage inmates in labour activities; to engage both detained individuals and inmates in positive activities; to strive to increase possibilities for inmates to become integrated into the labour market after being released, to arrange and provide conditions for inmates to obtain professional qualification (Šiauliai Remand Prison's plan of action for 2016, 2016). In 2016, Šiauliai Remand Prison implemented 10 programmes of social rehabilitation (9 in 2017), 16 staff members were working in the SRU (14 in 2017, while 16 full-time positions were available).

As expressed by ŠRP personnel-informants, *manifestation of major changes in implementation of the process of inmate social rehabilitation in the remand prison* is linked (see Table 2) to the following aspects: implemented essential changes in the juridical and administrative environment of social rehabilitation; increased occupation of inmates through the alterations in the content of social rehabilitation; improvement of infrastructure; qualitative changes of societal and inmates' attitudes towards social rehabilitation.

Table 2. The factors that influenced the change of management of social rehabilitation in 2008–2017

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants ¹
Alterations in the juridical and administrative environment of social rehabilitation	Amendments in the legal base	<...the biggest changes took place due to the amendments in legal acts regulating social rehabilitation (R2); <...the law on performance of arrest and the code of implementation of punishment were altered (R4);
	Changes in the administrative structure	<the parole release institute has been substantially altered, and now commissions for parole release operate> (R2);
Expansion of social rehabilitation through increased occupation	More occupation programmes, services	<A constantly increasing number of events and their diversity, created new occupation services (R1); <...new methods for designing correctional programmes. In compliance with them, new programmes designed for inmates have been approved (R2); <...more services of social occupation appeared (R3); <...more new correction programmes designed for inmates appeared (R4);
	Engagement of all inmates in occupation programmes	<...we are glad that all inmates taking part in the social rehabilitation process have jobs (R1); Occupation increased not only with inmates but also with individuals held in custody (R4);
	More and more diverse occupation services	<...the biggest change was related to organisation of occupation of inmates, meeting their needs...occupation services increased (R5); <...more social occupation services appeared (R3); <...occupation services increased (R6);
Created infrastructure for occupation	A division for adult training has been founded	<...over the period under investigation, the division of Šiauliai Adult School has been founded (R2); <...a full-fledged division of Šiauliai Adult School has been opened in the institution (R4);
	More premises for occupation	<...five new premises have been equipped for occupation of individuals who are held in custody in our institution (R2); <...body-building, tennis court, basketball court for inmates have been established (R4);
	Better infrastructure and provision with the means	<...better infrastructure...chiefs of the platoons of the Social Rehabilitation Unit are provided with personal computers and other technical facilities (R3)
Alteration of the societal attitude towards inmates	Engagement of NGOs and volunteers	<...when volunteers, members of NGOs, specialists of various fields, individuals of various walks of life participate, diversity of occupation measures significantly increases in their content (R2); <...volunteers, NGOs help in the process of social rehabilitation. (R4);
Alteration of inmates' attitude towards social rehabilitation	Motivation for socialisation increases in the inmates	<...inmates started (and it should be emphasised that they did it willingly) participating in volunteering activities (R4);

Over the period under investigation, all surveyed informants-officers have been working in the establishment; therefore, they witnessed the changes being implemented. The

¹ The language of the informants is retained close to the original linguistic expression.

pointed out nominal categories demonstrate the changes both in the system of imprisonment establishments (juridical, increased funding aspects) and separate institution (more measures, environments for social rehabilitation, increased requirements for personnel). The changes taking place in society are highly important: 2 informants paid attention to the fact that NGOs, volunteers became engaged in social rehabilitation. An observation of one of the chiefs of the SRU platoon noticing that motivation of inmates themselves to participate in social rehabilitation is increasing is of not less importance. All these observations of the informants are grounded: issues of social rehabilitation have been dealt with in legal acts on implementation of punishment in the Republic of Lithuania. The institute of parole release has changed at its core, the probation process is being developed. The process of parole release involves society members; this function has been commenced to be applied to a broader circle of inmates. New methods for designing correction programmes conditioned occurrence of broader, more diverse programmes. In compliance with the amendments in the Law on Execution of Arrest, a possibility to provide social occupation to a broader circle of inmates appeared.

The informants shared the opinion that *the processes of change were slowed down, implementation of alterations in social rehabilitation in an imprisonment establishment was obstructed* (see Table 3) *by the following factors*: problems in administration of processes, increased workload and responsibility of personnel, frequent amendments of legal acts, still quite low motivation of inmates to engage themselves into programmes of social rehabilitation.

Table 3. Problems which obstructed improvement of social rehabilitation in imprisonment establishments

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Problems in administration of social rehabilitation and occupation	Lack of permanently working psychologists	<...if psychologists have no possibilities to periodically assess the condition of an inmate and the progress made, it is difficult to decide what is happening with him/her (R1);
	Problems in combining several social rehabilitation measures	<...inmates stay in the institution to carry out maintenance work; therefore, they have less time for more extensive social rehabilitation (R1); <...the biggest challenge is to coordinate the time of occupation of inmates because they work (R2); <...it is difficult to apply other measures of rehabilitation (occupation) for working inmates during their working hours (R4);
	Lack of differentiation of inmates	<...only when sending inmates to correction institutions they are differentiated to separate institutions according to set criteria (R2);
Increased workload and responsibility of personnel of the SRU	High workload for chiefs of platoons with functions of management, administration, selection of measures	<Moreover, it is a challenge for a chief of the platoon to select and arrange all measures because high requirements and very large workload are set (R2); <...we face a huge amount of problems with individuals held in custody (inmates) on the daily basis; therefore, we must be flexible to perform all the tasks appointed to us (R3); <...increasing requirements set for social rehabilitation of inmates, number of applied measures and documentation (bureaucracy), also set "norms" for a single chief of a platoon that existed N years ago. (R4);
	Problems in ensuring quality of services	<All these activities are time consuming and a single chief of a platoon physically lacks the time; therefore, quality of performed work gets poorer (R4); <...because high requirements and large workload are set (R2);

Continued Table 3

Insufficient motivation of inmates	Negative attitude, aggression of inmates	<Inmates are usually dissatisfied, demotivated, tending to engage into a conflict (R3); <...high risks in communication with individuals who are attributed to a risk group, those present in the abstinence condition (R4); <...the non-prognosticated mood and behaviour of individuals held in custody, inmates make solution of problems more difficult in the rehabilitation and psychological sense (R6);
	Lack of motivation	<Very low personal motivation is observed in majority of individuals held in custody (R2);
Instability of legal regulation of social rehabilitation	Frequent amendments in legal acts	<...very large amendments in legal acts (R5); <...frequent amendments in legal acts as well as problematic application of them in the working environment are the largest challenges (R6);

While mentioning problems in administration of the processes (lack of psychologists, difficulties in engaging full-time working inmates in other measures), managers of the organisation also expressed their idea that full-time occupation with work was not a less efficient measure of social rehabilitation in comparison to other ones.

Informants' opinions *on the measures being implemented by the Prison Department modernising subordinate establishments* demonstrate that employees of the ŠRP support the processes of modernisation and observe their effect on social rehabilitation of inmates (see Table 4).

Table 4. Effect of modernisation of custody establishments on the processes of organisation of social rehabilitation

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Qualification development of personnel	Training of personnel	<...personnel often take part in training aiming at more professional work with inmates (R1); <in 2015, the training on integration of lower level officers in the process of inmate re-socialisation was conducted (R3);
	Feedback from personnel on improvement of performance	<...the need for dynamic surveillance occurs (R1); <...the establishment seeks to introduce dynamic surveillance (R3);
Renewed infrastructure	Improving work conditions for personnel	<...we try to solve a problem of infrastructure, conditions of residence, work. ...a new building of Šiauliai Remand Prison is being currently built (R1); provision of personnel with technical facilities (computers, printers etc.) increased, ...better provision with maintenance facilities (R5);
	Improving living conditions for inmates	<...we try to solve a problem of infrastructure, conditions of residence, work. ...a new building of Šiauliai Remand Prison is being currently built (R1); <...inmates may and do make their living rooms, territory of the platoon and the institution more beautiful, grow flowers, vegetables (R4);
	Occupation is related to improvement of own environment	<...inmates may and do make their living rooms, territory of the platoon and the institution more beautiful, grow flowers, vegetables (R4);

Improvement of the results of re-socialisation	Diversity of programmes increases the outcomes of re-socialisation	<...more modernisation, activities, occupation, re-socialisation of the individuals held in custody (inmates) improves (R6);
Improvement of interaction between inmates and personnel	Relationships between individuals held in custody (inmates) and officers are changing	<...perhaps communication with inmates changed, it became slightly more free, "human" (R4); <...communication between personnel and inmates changed (R5);
	Fewer of those who are dissatisfied with provided services	<...the number of submitted claims is decreasing (R6);

Back in 2009, the *Strategy for Modernisation of Custody Establishments* has set a strategic goal for the Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania to ensure safe and economic performance of custody establishments, conditions of custody set in legal acts for individuals held in custody and inmates, and the work conditions for personnel. Statements of the surveyed informants show that the strategy and programme of modernisation of imprisonment establishments have made a positive effect on organisation of social rehabilitation. Almost all respondents emphasised that relationships between officers and inmates improved. R6 notes that the result of better relationships is reflected by a lower amount of written complaints submitted by individuals held in custody and inmates. Another aspect deals with improving work environment, conditions of residence. The programme of implementation of the discussed strategy seeks to essentially improve the conditions of residence of inmates and also the work conditions of the personnel. Currently, a new remand prison is being built in Šiauliai; it is planned to end the construction work in 2026. All surveyed informants agreed with the importance of professional development of personnel: in 2015, all lower rank officers working in the remand prison took part in the training on integration in re-socialisation of inmates.

Another topic of the interview with the informants was directly related to social work activities with inmates of the ŠRP Social Rehabilitation Unit: ***How does performance of the Social Rehabilitation Unit of Šiauliai Remand Prison impact social integration of inmates?*** Responses of the informants divided into two directions: discussed changes in management of social rehabilitation (see Table 5) and discussed efficiency of re-socialisation measures.

Table 5. Analysis of performance of the Social Rehabilitation Unit of Šiauliai Remand Prison

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Planning of social rehabilitation activities	More purposeful	<...aim to design more purposeful programmes (R1); <...reduction of recidivism is one of major goals of implementation of social rehabilitation (R2).
	Result-oriented	<...to increase efficiency of the process of re-socialisation (R3); <...improvement of psychological condition of individuals is a major sought outcome; <...this aims at helping solve their problems and provide as much positive and meaningful occupation as possible (R2); <...to organise their occupation, to adapt a newcomer (R5);
	Needs of inmates are regarded as well	<...I can single out the occupation programmes, such as clubs of fishing, clay pottery, being designed by chiefs of the platoons for social rehabilitation this year (R1);
	Diversity of services has increased	<...we seek the goal by designing new programmes, increasing the number of social occupation services (R3); <...to design as many occupation services as possible (R6); <...various sports events, quizzes are arranged (R1);
Organisation of social rehabilitation	A possibility to choose the measures of occupation	<The individuals held in custody (inmates) can freely choose activities that interest them (R1);
	A priority is given to target programmes	<...in order to direct their energy to a positive direction and have as little destructive, negative and personality-focused processes as possible (R2);
	Coordination of programme's purposefulness and inmate's need	<... the most important target correction programmes are those which are properly adapted to each inmate according to one's needs (R2);
Managing social rehabilitation	Involvement of chiefs of platoons in designing the measures	<...I can single out the occupation programmes, such as clubs of fishing, clay pottery, being designed by chiefs of the platoon for social rehabilitation this year (R1);
	Participation in individualisation of programmes	<...the most important target correction programmes are those which are properly adapted to each inmate according to one's needs (R2);
Control and evaluation of a process	Assessment of results according to instructions	<...we seek the results in compliance with the Code of Implementation of Punishment (R4);
	Assessment by applying feedback	<... survey of inmates can be used for assessment of an event or activities (R4);
	Complex assessment	<...effectiveness of applied measures is usually assessed in a complex way (R4);

The nominal categories that have been singled out prove that personnel of the SRU observe the changes in all stages of implementation of the inmate social rehabilitation process (planning, organisation, management and control). It is important to note that the informants, observing the major goal of such units, i.e. prevention of recidivism, already notice other

goals more focused on a person (improvement of psychological wellbeing of individuals; adaptation of newcomers by helping them solve their problems; increase of efficiency of the re-socialisation process etc.). They emphasise larger possibilities for inmates to choose the measures of occupation; assessment of the results of performance becomes relevant as well.

After the informants were asked to list *which activities out of the number of them being implemented by the SRU were the most efficient in social rehabilitation of inmates* (solution of applications/requests, psychological support, occupation programmes, individual conversations, labour, education and training programmes, social rehabilitation programmes), all informants noticed the benefit of occupation (first of all, sports) in general. The opinions differed in some aspects; however, these differences were related to activities performed by a particular officer. Managers of the SRU (R1, R2) emphasise efficiency of social rehabilitation programmes, labour activities, psychological support as making the long-lasting effect. Chiefs of the platoons (R4–R6) and the female specialist of the unit (R3), whose major functions are to implement operational plans, emphasise daily work with an inmate (consideration of applications and requests). We paid attention to the fact that the SRU personnel did not attribute the education and training programmes to those being effective, even though scientists single these measures out as having long-lasting effect. The earlier conducted survey of opinions of the inmates held at ŠRP (Mikalauskas, 2017) indicated that one-fourth of the ŠRP inmates were not aware of the opportunity to learn here.

The analysis of the statements expressed by the SRU personnel on the topic allows drawing the assumptions that there is lack of the following: 1) longitudinal investigations whose results would help personnel of imprisonment establishments to be aware of what social rehabilitation measures make the biggest effect in preparing individuals for social integration, 2) support to personnel on how to select the most effective measures according to personal individual features, level of sociality. For ŠRP personnel it is also important to see not only the effect of their direct performance, but also to become aware of efficiency of the entire process being implemented in the establishment.

Knowing that personnel of the imprisonment establishment lack knowledge, abilities on how to make socialisation of an inmate more active and efficient due to a changing policy of implementation of punishment and occurring challenges, the informants were asked *what competences were required of individuals working in the area of re-socialisation, social rehabilitation of inmates?* The descriptor of a job position lists an entire complex of competences for those who apply to become statutory staff members. We can group the competences highlighted by the surveyed informants:

- 1) *specific-professional* (emphasised by all informants);
- 2) *social* (communication, social skills, positive attitude towards inmates), highlighting importance of communication abilities; positive attitude towards inmates was underlined by informants (independent of their position); social skills as a necessary competence are seen by one of the managers of the unit (R1);
- 3) *personal* (high morality, self-control, motivation, creativity): self-control and creativity were mentioned as necessary competences by 2 chiefs of the platoons (R4–R5), one chief of the platoon emphasised high morality and motivation (R6).

It is obvious that permanent employees of the social rehabilitation unit do not hold all required competences needed to implement extensive re-socialisation of inmates. 10 programmes of social rehabilitation, training, psychological support require a broad spectrum of specific professional competences, the changing processes require transferable skills.

Therefore, imprisonment establishments more and more often use other establishments subordinate to the Ministry of Justice, municipality institutions, NGOs, volunteers for implementation of the programmes.

The informants were asked *what role is performed by other institutions, NGOs, volunteers, etc. in organising the process of social rehabilitation of inmates*. Personnel of ŠRP support the use of society to implement re-socialisation of inmates (see Table 6), are aware of the comprehensive benefit of this collaboration to both inmates (their motivation, interest in social rehabilitation increase, they get more diverse services, social skills, emotional condition improves) and imprisonment establishment (it obtains required competences and services, motivation of personnel increases), also to the common society (people engage in implementation of the re-socialisation process, their attitudes change). Five out of six informants indicated that inmates willingly and numerously participated in the events organised by NGOs and volunteers.

Table 6. The use of activities of volunteers, NGOs and GOs to implement social rehabilitation of inmates

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Benefit to both institution and society	Positive effect on motivation of personnel of the establishment	<...volunteers have a high level of motivation, our personnel can learn from them, too (R1);
	Positive effect on volunteers themselves	<...activities of all volunteers prove to be useful (R5);
Competent support to imprisonment establishments	Support in social rehabilitation	<...volunteers, NGOs help in the process of social rehabilitation (R4); <...the listed groups significantly help to the process of rehabilitation of individuals held in custody (inmates) (R3);
Developed opportunities for occupation of inmates	Increasing services of social occupation	<...diversity of occupation significantly increases in terms of content (R2);
		<...occupation of not only inmates but also individuals who are held in custody increased; various events, activities of various therapies are organised (R4);
Changing inmates' attitude towards social rehabilitation	Motivation of inmates increases	<...individuals who are held in the establishment willingly participate in activities of such a type (R1); <...motivate and encourage all individuals who are engaged in the process of re-socialisation and occupation to more actively participate (R6);
	Positive effect on emotional condition of inmates	<...activities of such a type positively impact the emotional condition of individuals held in custody (inmates) (R1);
	Encouragement to maintain communication and social skills	<...inmates get an opportunity to communicate to people who live free, not only with personnel of the correction establishment; this helps them to not distance themselves from society, improves communication and other social skills (R2); <...individuals who are held in custody enjoy communicating with people who live free (R5); <...for many who reside here it is interesting; therefore, lectures, activities of the mentioned organisations are actively attended (R6);

The informants were asked about *the possibilities to improve implementation of the processes of social rehabilitation and occupation in imprisonment establishments*, being aware of the potential of the establishment itself and measures coming from the central governing bodies. The informants project the following possibilities in the imprisonment establishment (see Table 7): 1) by increasing the number of personnel and improving work conditions; 2) by increasing possibilities for inmates to work and participate in various occupation activities, and this requires higher funding, more premises for additional activities. The changing of inmates' attitudes, point of view towards social rehabilitation is another objective which would be taken by the institution.

Table 7. Possibilities for the improvement of social rehabilitation at the organisational level

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Improvement of social rehabilitation processes	Recruitment of more personnel members	<...while developing occupation, the need for additional human resources occur – there is lack of employees (R2);
	Implementation of dynamic security	<...it is likely that processes of social rehabilitation and management will be positively impacted by implementation of the dynamic surveillance (R2);
	Changing of the process of adaptation of individuals held in custody	<...the work should start with a newcomer because this is the time when most of the problems occur (R3);
	Reduction of the workload at the SRU	<...implementation of the dynamic surveillance would reduce the load for a chief of a platoon (R4); <...it would be easier to manage the process if each chief of a platoon had smaller amount of individuals who are held in custody (R5);
Increase of occupation of inmates	Increase of diversity of measures, occupation environments, meaningful activities	<...as many diverse activities as possible, ...to make inmates spend as much of their time outside prison cells as possible (R1); <...a possibility for individuals who are held in custody to work should be implemented because occupation and meaningful activities do not allow a person to think of illegal matters (R3);
	Alteration of inmates' attitude towards social rehabilitation	<...more time should be allocated to inmates, restoration of the functions of their personality (R5); <...the negative attitude of not only working officers but also individuals who are held in custody (inmates) to the mentioned processes should be changed (R6);
Proper management of funding and further improvement of infrastructure	Proper funding	<...lack of funding is one of major problems of improvement of implementation of social rehabilitation (R6).
	Further improvement of infrastructure	<...processes of social rehabilitation could be improved, first of all, by improving physical conditions in the establishment (R2); <...there is lack of premises which could be used for provision of additional occupational services (R6).

At the national level (see Table 8), the informants foresee very concrete actions. Measures of social rehabilitation in imprisonment establishments are no longer efficient if a person after being released loses support as a free human being in finding a job etc.; therefore, questions on integration should be continuous ones.

Table 8. Possibilities for improvement of social rehabilitation in imprisonment establishment at the national level

Nominal categories	Partial categories	Statements of the informants
Continuous more active solution of the question of integration of inmates	Continuous integration of inmates	<...at the national level, centres for adaptation should be established; former individuals held in custody and inmates could receive required support for some time there (R1); <...labour is the most important thing – vocational training, obtaining professional qualifications and practical skills to maximally increase the opportunities to integrate into the labour market after being released from the prison (R2);
	Employment of inmates outside prison	<At the national level, I suppose, the priority should be focused on work of inmates (R2);
Improvement of physical and mental health of inmates	Better health care for inmates	<...treatment and rehabilitation (addictions, mental diseases etc.) of inmates is very important (R2);
Changing of the attitude towards inmates	Dissemination of a humanistic attitude towards inmates	<...a more humanistic attitude towards inmates is needed (R3); <...an attitude to individuals who are held in custody should change (R5);
Optimisation of work and proper funding of officers working in social rehabilitation	Financial incentive for officers	<...the problem of motivation of officers which occurred due to low salaries ...should be solved at the national level (R3);
	Development of the SRU	<...not to reduce, like it is now, but to increase the number of personnel implementing rehabilitation and recruitment of them (R4); <Reduction of the workload of chiefs of the platoons should be considered (R5);
	Improvement of the functions of the SRU	<...to seek quality, not quantity, to seek less “paper-based” outcomes (R4);
Increase of funding for infrastructure of social rehabilitation and its implementation	Improvement of infrastructure	<...better infrastructure would allow to organise more activities (R1); conditions of inmates ...should be solved at the national level (R3);
	Implementation of dynamic security	<...it is a must to start implementation of dynamic security (R6);
	Proper funding	<...funding is needed for improvement of infrastructure, rehabilitation services (R6);

While talking about **possibilities to increase efficiency of the social rehabilitation process**, the informants foresee several directions which must be the focus of endeavours and measures of the state and separate imprisonment establishments:

1. Alteration of inmates' and officers' negative attitudes towards the process of social rehabilitation. Appropriate and trained personnel is required to implement the change of the relationships between officers and inmates; the personnel should be aware of how to properly build their relationships with inmates. Aiming to individualise measures of social rehabilitation, personnel working in social rehabilitation units should have lesser amounts of individuals held in custody.

2. More rapid modernisation of imprisonment establishments by providing normal living conditions for both personnel and inmates.
3. More rapid installation of dynamic security in establishments.
4. Increase of possibilities for inmates to work outside prison.
5. Increase of opportunities for individuals held in custody (inmates) to spend more time outside their prison cell. This would help to solve the issues of improvement of physical conditions, lack of personnel, too.
6. Increase of inmates' motivation to recover from addictions, mental diseases.
7. Solution of personnel-related issues. Still, the number of people working in social rehabilitation area in Lithuania is linked to the number of inmates. When the numbers of inmates decreases, job positions of chiefs of platoons and other personnel are reduced; whereas processes of rehabilitation become more complex, more programmes are being implemented, and this requires more personnel, broader competences.

Aiming to find out purposefulness of necessary reforms in the institution under investigation, i.e. ŠRP, we compared the results of the earlier conducted research on assessment of efficiency of re-socialisation in this imprisonment establishment (Mikalauskas, 2017) with the results of the research presented in this paper (see Table 9). The comparison demonstrates that in the reform process greater progress in *re-socialisation* is mostly obstructed by living and work conditions in the institution that are inappropriate in terms of human dignity, high workload and insufficient competences required for implementation of the changes, occurring tension in performance of specialists and personnel.

Table 9. Assessment of efficiency of re-socialisation activities in Šiauliai Remand Prison: attitudes of both personnel and inmates

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (attitude of the personnel)	QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH (attitude of the inmates)
Positive changes in inmate social rehabilitation implemented in ŠRP	
Large changes in the legal and administrative system. Increased numbers of occupation services, programmes, first of all, those of social rehabilitation, provided to inmates, premises for their implementation. Moreover, a possibility for individuals who are held in custody to engage in occupation programmes. A possibility to learn at a division of Šiauliai Adult School. Better work conditions for personnel of the SRU, prospects to have modern infrastructure. Changes in the social attitude towards inmates (NGOs, volunteers), slightly increasing motivation of inmates to socialise.	A higher number and diversity of social services, programmes and activities; higher qualification of providers of the services.
Factors that obstruct re-socialisation in ŠRP	
Increased workload (administrative load), responsibility of personnel of the SRU, increasing requirements for quality and inappropriate financial reward for complex and insecure work (conflicts, aggression of inmates). Frequent amendment of legal acts and problematic implementation of them. Lack of psychologists. A problem of combining social rehabilitation measures. Lack of inmates' motivation to more actively engage in social rehabilitation measures.	Unfavourable living conditions (noted by 68.1 per cent) and psychological condition (43 per cent), constant conflicts with ŠRP personnel.

Continued Table 9

Factors making effect on efficiency of the re-socialisation process in ŠRP	
Planned, purpose-oriented performance of the institution when implementing social rehabilitation of inmates. Qualification development of the personnel. Better physical infrastructure for personnel and inmates (creating living conditions close to those outside prison). Diversity of occupation programmes. Humanity-based relationships between personnel and inmates.	More than a half of surveyed inmates state that the process of social rehabilitation directly impacts the living in prison.
Assessment of efficiency of the measures of occupation and social rehabilitation suggested by ŠRP	
Differentiation of attitudes is observed in relation to job positions held: managers of the SRU emphasise long-lasting effect of social rehabilitation programmes, labour activities, psychological support. Chiefs of platoons and the female specialist of the unit emphasise daily work with an inmate (consideration of applications and requests). Personnel of the SRU did not attribute education and training programmes to those listed as efficient measures.	They value programmes of leisure activities, physical training, education the most. Are less interested in programmes on civic education, suicide and self-inflicted injury, positive thinking, social integration. They treat sports and occupation programmes as the most efficient, emphasise that their use is limited. Majority share an opinion that programmes of quality leisure time, informative programmes are also efficient. Inmates still do not tend to trust in support of ŠRP personnel and learning measures.
Assessment of personnel implementing social rehabilitation	
They see a challenge to constantly develop their qualification and meet the increasing requirements. They emphasise necessity of specific-professional competences, point out communication abilities, positive attitude towards inmates, social skills among social competences. They mention self-control and creativity as well as high morality and motivation as required personal competences.	Absolute majority (over 80 per cent) emphasise activities of health care specialists, chiefs of platoons, psychologists, wardens. 72.8 per cent consider participation of representatives of the education field as important. Input of chiefs of platoons is the highest when they consider applications, requests, suggestions (72.4 per cent), provide information (54.8 per cent).
Assessment of engagement of NGOs, volunteers in re-socialisation of inmates	
The benefit to an inmate (increase of motivation to socially integrate, better emotional condition, social skills, feedback from outside of the prison), establishment (motivates personnel, develops programmes, events on occupation and social rehabilitation), society (public opinion on inmates is being altered; volunteers, NGOs engage in solution of problems etc.).	Support better possibilities to communicate with specialists “from outside of the prison” (lawyers, social workers, psychologists), those who can inspire. More clubs, lectures, occupation activities.

Possibilities for improvement of performance of ŠRP in terms of re-socialisation of inmates	
Improvement of management of the re-socialisation process by reducing workload for SRU personnel, recruiting competent officers to occupy vacancies; paying more attention and allocating more time to individualised work with an inmate (adaptation, selection of appropriate measures for social rehabilitation, feedback, increase of motivation to socially integrate themselves). Improvement of living and work conditions. Development of occupation programmes.	To alter officers' attitude towards inmates. To increase efficiency of re-socialisation by developing abilities of adaptation required outside prison, increasing and individualising psychological support with regard to special needs. To increase occupation in the imprisonment establishment: higher availability of employment possibilities, better conditions for sports activities, training are developed, more outdoors activities are provided. Living and occupation conditions are being improved. Quality of work of officers is being improved.

Conclusions

Having perceived re-socialisation of inmates as a broad process encompassing various environments and measures of social rehabilitation, impacted and activated personal purposeful and motivated endeavours to socially integrate oneself, the complexity of implementation of this process at both national and institutional levels becomes clear. High expenses on the reorganisation of the punishment system, modernisation of imprisonment establishments suppose the need to have the criteria for assessment of the re-socialisation process, efficiency of social rehabilitation measures being implemented in the establishments.

Scientists who investigate social rehabilitation, re-socialisation of inmates inside imprisonment institutions underline the problem of assessment of efficiency of the re-socialisation process because usually applied and periodically observed indicators are of a quantitative nature and insufficient because a complex approach is required to assess efficiency of re-socialisation. The countries which are more advanced in terms of such assessment (Germany, England) do not reject investigation of re-socialisation participants' (inmates, personnel) opinions on received benefit, too.

Having reviewed the criteria of performance assessment used in strategic documents of the Prison Department of the Republic of Lithuania, reports of social rehabilitation units, they can be divided into several groups: *indicators (effect) demonstrating inmate's successful social integration; indicators of improvement of environments of social rehabilitation; indicators showing progress of inmates' social rehabilitation in an imprisonment establishment; indicators of inmates' engagement in the measures of social rehabilitation in a custody establishment; indicators demonstrating engagement of personnel of custody establishments and society in re-socialisation of inmates.* These quantitative indicators of (self-)engagement of participants of the process in re-socialisation partly demonstrate efficiency of the measures of social rehabilitation of inmates being implemented; however, they are insufficient in terms of efficiency of re-socialisation.

The results of the qualitative research conducted in 2017 in Šiauliai Remand Prison show that personnel of social rehabilitation units observe and support the changes being implemented both in the entire system and ŠRP. Purposeful management of the process of social rehabilitation (planning, organisation, assessment, control), individualisation of social rehabilitation, higher occupation of inmates, larger diversity of social rehabilitation programmes, engagement of NGOs and volunteers being perfected over the latter decade create

preconditions for social integration of inmates. On the other hand, since there is lack of high quality basic aspects, i.e. suitable living conditions, respectful relationships with personnel, the results of re-socialisation of inmates become poorer.

The investigation of ŠRP demonstrates that implementation of re-socialisation of inmates requires more attention to be paid to a participant of the process: both inmate and personnel member.

References

- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Dermontas, J. (2004). *Nuteistųjų socialinė reabilitacija [Social Rehabilitation of Inmates]*. *Jurisprudencija [Jurisprudence]*, 51 (43), 108–123.
- Dobryninas, A., Sakalauskas, G., & Žilinskienė, L. (2008). *Kriminologijos teorijos [Theories of Criminology]*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
- Dünel, F. & Sakalauskas, G. (2017). Įkalinimo praktikos Europos šalyse palyginimas [Comparison of imprisonment practice in European countries]. In: G. Sakalauskas (Ed.), *Bausmių taikymo ir vykdymo tarptautinis palyginimas, tendencijos ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje [Sentencing and the execution of sentences: an international comparison. Trends and perspectives in Lithuania]* (pp. 91-116). Vilnius. Retrieved from <http://teise.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Bausmiu-tendencijos-ir-perspektyvos-2017.pdf> on 20.07.2018.
- Europos Tarybos Ministrų Komiteto rekomendacija Rec (87) 3 dėl Europos kalėjimų taisyklių [Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers Rec (87) 3 on the European Prison Rules]*. Retrieved from: <http://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/home>, on 06.03.2017.
- Farrall, S. (2014). *Criminal Careers in Transition*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Heinz, W. (2017). Alternatyvos įkalinimui: bausmių taikymo teorija ir praktika Vokietijoje, bausmių veiksmingumo ir recidyvo tyrimų rezultatai [Alternatives for imprisonment: theory and practice of sentencing in Germany, research results on the effectiveness of sanctions and recidivism]. In: G. Sakalauskas (Ed.), *Bausmių taikymo ir vykdymo tarptautinis palyginimas, tendencijos ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje [Sentencing and the execution of sentences: an international comparison. Trends and perspectives in Lithuania]* (pp.15-90). Vilnius. Retrieved from <http://teise.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Bausmiu-tendencijos-ir-perspektyvos-2017.pdf>.
- Kalėjimų departamentas [Prison Department]*. (2016, 2017). *Metinės ataskaitos [Annual Reports]*. Vilnius: Kalėjimų departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos teisingumo ministerijos [Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania]. Retrieved from: http://www.kaldep.lt/lt/kalejimu-departamentas/administracine_informacija/ataskaitos/metines.html.
- Kalėjimų departamentas [Prison Department]* (2017). Socialinės reabilitacijos tarnybų veiklos ataskaita [Activity Report of Social Rehabilitation Services]. Vilnius: Kalėjimų departamentas prie Lietuvos respublikos teisingumo ministerijos [Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania]. Administracinė informacija [Administrative information]. Ataskaitos [Reports]. Retrieved from: http://www.kaldep.lt/lt/kalejimu-departamentas/administracine_informacija/ataskaitos/metines.html.
- Kalėjimų departamentas [Prison Department]* (2016). Šiaulių tardymo izoliatoriaus 2016 metų veiklos planas [Šiauliai Remand Prison's plan of action for 2016]. Vilnius: Kalėjimų departamentas prie Lietuvos respublikos teisingumo ministerijos [Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania]. Administracinė informacija [Administrative information]. Retrieved from: http://www.kaldep.lt/lt/kalejimu-departamentas/administracine_informacija/planavimo-dokumentai.html.
- Laisvės atėmimo vietų modernizavimo strategija, patvirtinta Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 2009 m. rugsėjo 30 d. nutarimu Nr. 1248 [The Strategy of Modernisation of Custody Establishments approved by a resolution of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on 30 September 2009, No. 1248]*. Retrieved from: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.354370?jfwid=je7i1syyn>
- Laisvės atėmimo vietų modernizavimo programa, patvirtinta LR Vyriausybės 2014 liepos 22 d. nutarimu Nr. 740 [The Programme of Modernisation of Custody Establishments approved by a resolution of*

- the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on 22 July 2014 No. 740*]. Retrieved from: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/426d8e40170c11e4aa9bb36470fb9e6e>.
- Lietuvos Respublikos bausmių vykdymo kodeksas [*Code of Penal Execution of the Republic of Lithuania*] (2002). In: Valstybės žinios [State News], 2002-07-19, No. 73-3084. Retrieved from: the consolidated version of 01.07.2018: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.A0A0CCC6B997/uLwTMfwZqh>.
- Mackevičius, T., & Rakštelis, M. (2010). Laisvės apribojimo bausmės įgyvendinimas [Realization of the penalty of restriction of liberty]. *Jurisprudencija [Jurisprudence]*, 4 (122), 261–277. Retrieved from: https://www.mruni.eu/upload/iblock/90e/14_Mackevicius_Rakstelis.pdf.
- Mikalauskas, D. (2017). Įkalinimo įstaigų *socialinės rehabilitacijos valdymo kaita: Šiaulių tardymo izoliatoriaus atvejis [Change in the management of social rehabilitation of custody establishments: the case of Šiauliai Remand Prison]*. Magistro darbas [Master's Thesis]. Šiaulių universitetas [Šiauliai University].
- Probacijos veiksmingumo vertinimas [Assessment of Probation Effectiveness]*. Mokslo studija [*Scientific study*]. (2015). Comp. G. Sakalauskas, & L. Jarutienė, Vilnius. Retrieved from: <http://teise.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Mokslo-studija-probacijos-veiksmingumo-vertinimas.pdf>.
- Sakalauskas, G. (2015). Kalinimo sąlygos ir kalinių resocializacijos prielaidos [Prison conditions and preconditions for the resocialisation of inmates]. *Teisės problemos [Legal Issues]*, 2(88), Vilnius.
- Sakalauskas, G. (2017). (Re)socializaciją skatinantis įkalinimas [Imprisonment promoting (re) socialisation]. In: G. Sakalauskas (Ed.), *Bausmių taikymo ir vykdymo tarptautinis palyginimas, tendencijos ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje [Sentencing and the execution of sentences: an international comparison. Trends and perspectives in Lithuania]*, (pp.159-180). Vilnius. Retrieved from: <http://teise.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Bausmiu-tendencijos-ir-perspektyvos-2017.pdf>.
- Šiaulių tardymo izoliatorius [Šiauliai Remand Prison] (2017). *Strateginio veiklos plano programos vykdymo ataskaita [Report on the Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan Programme]*. Vilnius: Kalėjimų departamentas prie Lietuvos respublikos teisingumo ministerijos [Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania]. Administracinė informacija [Administrative information]. Retrieved from: http://www.kaldep.lt/lt/siauliuti/veikla-mpn_255_511/ataskaitos_242_260_516/veiklos-ataskaitos.html.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)* (2016). Wien: Vienna International Centre. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/GA-RESOLUTION/e_ebook.pdf.
- Vaičiūnienė, R. (2017). Įkalinimų asmenų resocializacijos galimybės kolektyvinio kalinimo ir kalėjimo subkultūros sąlygomis [Opportunities for the resocialisation of convicted persons under the conditions of collective imprisonment and prison subculture]. In: G. Sakalauskas (Ed.), *Bausmių taikymo ir vykdymo tarptautinis palyginimas, tendencijos ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje [Sentencing and the execution of sentences: an international comparison. Trends and perspectives in Lithuania]*, (pp.181-204). Vilnius. Retrieved from <http://teise.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Bausmiu-tendencijos-ir-perspektyvos-2017.pdf>
- Valstybinio audito ataskaita. Programos „Bausmių sistema“ įgyvendinimas. 2016 m. lapkričio 28 d., Nr. VA-P-40-3-24 [The report of the National Audit. Implementation of the programme “The System of Punishment”, 28 November, 2016, No. VA-P-40-3-24]*. Retrieved from: https://www.vkontrolė.lt/audito_ataskaitos.aspx?tipas=2.
- Ward, T., & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation. Beyond the Risk Paradigm*. New York: Routledge.
- Žilinskienė, L., & Tumilaitė, R. (2011). Resocializacijos modeliai ir jų taikymas [Contemporary models for convict resocialisation]. *Sociologija [Sociology]*. *Mintis ir veiksmas [Thought and Action]*, 2(29), 285–313.

PURPOSEFULNESS OF IMPROVEMENT OF INMATE RE-SOCIALISATION IMPLEMENTED IN THE REMAND PRISON FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS

Summary

*Laima Liukinevičienė, Šiauliai University, Lithuania
Donatas Mikalauskas, Šiauliai Remand Prison*

Allocating large funding to the reform of the system of punishment, re-socialisation of inmates in custody establishments, the state must have criteria of how to assess efficiency of the measures of social rehabilitation being implemented. Scholarly discussions focus on efficiency of the process of re-socialisation, perceiving complexity of this objective. Currently, the Prison Department of the Republic of Lithuania runs social rehabilitation divisions in 11 subordinate establishments; quantitative criteria and indicators are applied to evaluate their performance, to observe efficiency of the inmate re-socialisation process. Experiences of other countries demonstrate that it is useful to employ investigation of subjective opinions of participants of the processes, too.

The aim of the qualitative research conducted in Šiauliai Remand Prison (ŠRP) in the beginning of 2017 is to investigate efficiency of the process of re-socialisation of inmates in ŠRP as well as to explore the possibilities for improvement of the process from the point of view of social rehabilitation personnel. The interviews have been conducted with 6 personnel members who are involved in social rehabilitation of inmates, have over 10 years of work experience in the system. Efficiency of re-socialisation of inmates in an imprisonment establishment **is the research object**. **Research methods:** analysis of scientific literature, statistical sources, legal acts; qualitative research employing a semi-structured interview.

During the survey, the interview topics have been provided in a question form: 1) *How did the management of inmate re-socialisation, social rehabilitation change in the imprisonment establishment over the latter decade? What were the causes?* 2) *How does performance of the Social Rehabilitation Unit of Šiauliai Remand Prison influence social integration of inmates?* 3) *What competences are required for individuals working in the area of re-socialisation, social rehabilitation of inmates?* 4) *What changes at both state and organisational levels are required to achieve efficient re-socialisation of inmates?*

The results of the research show that personnel of social rehabilitation units observe and support the changes being implemented both in the entire system of implementation of punishment in the Republic of Lithuania and their particular establishment. Purposeful management of the process of social rehabilitation (planning, organisation, assessment, control), individualisation of social rehabilitation, higher occupation of inmates, larger diversity of social rehabilitation programmes, engagement of NGOs and volunteers being perfected over the latter decade create preconditions for efficient re-socialisation. On the other hand, since there is lack of high quality basic aspects, i.e. suitable living conditions, respectful relationships with personnel, the results of re-socialisation of inmates become poorer.

The investigation of ŠRP demonstrates that implementation of inmate re-socialisation requires more attention to be paid to a participant of the process: both inmate and personnel member. As provided services of re-socialisation are becoming more complex, the numbers of personnel working in imprisonment establishments do not increase. Since there is high workload, personnel of social rehabilitation units find it problematic to individualise the process of re-socialisation of an inmate. The lack of competences needed to implement complex processes is obvious, too.

Corresponding author's email: laima.l@cr.su.lt