THE PRISON AND FAMILY MEDIATION. MEANS OF REINTEGRATING PERSONS DEPRIVED OF THEIR LIBERTY INTO SOCIETY

Silica-Valerica FLOREA

PhD Student, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, University of Bucharest (Romania)
E-mail: floreavalerica1996@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This article's aim is to discuss the relationship between the prisoner and the family during the deprivation of liberty of one of the conjugal partners. Thus, the article highlights the maintenance of the prisoner-family relationship during the execution of a custodial sentence of one of the conjugal partners. To maintain the above-mentioned relationship during the execution of the sentence, the prison resorts to a series of strategies to prevent the notion of family from disappearing and the family from dissolving. It often happens that this objective of the prison is not achieved, and the family breaks up because a spouse is deprived of liberty. In addition to maintaining the prisoner-family relationship, the penitentiary must prepare each person deprived of liberty for reintegration into society, which is why this aspect is critical within the total institution, the penitentiary. Therefore, this article is a reflection on the maintenance of the prisoner-family relationship and the reintegration of prisoners into society after serving a custodial sentence.*

Keywords*: prisoner, family, prison strategies, prisoner - family relationship, reintegration.*

1. Reintegration of prisoners into society

According to the National Strategy for the Social Reintegration of Detainees 2015 - 2019, the social reintegration of detainees is "a process that begins in the penal execution phase" (National Strategy for the Social Reintegration of Detainees, 2015 – 2019: 12), which is why the need for the reintegration process to exist as part of the period of detention is extremely important for detainees. "An essential role of the prison service is to prepare persons deprived of their liberty for the post-detention period (ibid.)". To achieve the proposed objective, it was necessary to link the needs that prisoners have with the educational, psychological and social assistance programs and the approach to reintegrating prisoners into society.

Research on the impact of prison punishment on recidivism suggests the need to study possible individual-level mechanisms that influence prisoners' perceptions of life after release from prison. In particular, a better understanding of the role of prison experiences in offending patterns necessarily requires attention to individuals' perceptions and lived experiences. Recidivism is a "return to delinquent behavior for which the person was convicted and which is presumed to have been corrected" (Maltz, 2001 apud Țica, 2014).

In a recent review of the evidence on the impact of imprisonment on recidivism and resilience, Nagin, Cullen and Jonson conclude that incarceration has no or a mildly criminogenic effect on future criminal behavior. However, they acknowledge serious gaps in the accumulated evidence and have called for a program of research in specific areas to illuminate our understanding of how experiences in prison affect future behavior. Most importantly, and unlike much existing research on the impact of prison, research on the 'black box' of prison, including prisoners' perceptions of their risk of reoffending and how they perceive their life chances on re-entry, is sorely needed (Nagin, Cullen and Jonson, 2009 apud Visher and O'Connell, 2012).

It is also necessary to identify the specific mechanisms that influence the impact of imprisonment. A study by two researchers adopts a new concept - the 'black box' - to understand the impact of prison sentences on recidivism, with few studies actually focusing on

the underlying individual-level mechanisms . These mechanisms can be quite diverse, including personal characteristics, the environment, connections to the outside world, and day-to-day activities such as engaging in rehabilitation programming. For example, a central point is that people without family support have more difficulty adjusting to prison life. Other recent research on the role of family support explores the impact of family relationships on individuals' perceptions of self as they prepare to leave prison and return to the community because family plays a crucial role in reintegrating prisoners into society (Visher and O'Connell, 2012).

Looking at the policy of several European countries developed in a project on the National Strategy for the Social Reintegration of Detainees for 2020 - 2024, many European countries are developing very well thought out policies on this issue because the aim is to minimize recidivism and make it easier for former prisoners reintegrate into society. Prisoners have thus to work in prison or attend vocational training courses. In Poland, for example, most prisoners receive 10% of the money they earn and 35% of the money goes to a special fund to create more jobs for prisoners.

In Denmark, prisoners must be active daily, either through work or by participating in vocational or educational activities (e.g. music, painting). Prisoners with health problems are exempt from this rule. If they refuse to work, the amount allocated for food is reduced, but not below a set minimum amount. Prisoners are also involved in communal activities (meal preparation, cleaning) or vocational training and apprenticeships. Some of them can even obtain diplomas and prison staff are actively involved in these activities, being a role model for all prisoners.

In France, the effectiveness of social reintegration programs for prisoners has been achieved through the numerous activities for the professional reintegration of prisoners carried out by the ACTA VISTA organization. Prisoners have access to this program from the time of their detention. ACTA VISTA is an NGO, which runs a worksite where prisoners are involved in the restoration of Marseille's cultural heritage. Prisoners are recruited during their last year of detention. Simultaneously, Belgium is also a country that has focused its attention on training and retraining of prisoners and former prisoners to avoid the problem of their social exclusion.

As far as the measures adopted in Germany are concerned, the primary aim is to ensure that prisoners can lead a socially responsible life without committing offences once they are released, and for this to happen, the Germans consider that detention must be similar to life in freedom. Prisoners are given the opportunity to work and those deemed unfit for work can engage in therapeutic activities so that every prisoner can have a job after detention. Prisoners are also given the opportunity to attend school.

Spain is also one of the European countries that have focused on the issue of reintegrating prisoners into society. Although there are many non-governmental associations working toward this goal, there are many areas of interest, but the focus is on vocational integration. The Spanish state is making a considerable financial contribution. Simultaneously, the Spanish state provides prisoners without family support with social housing to go to at the end of their period of detention.

Last but not least, other countries include Poland, which wants prisoners to be able to reintegrate into society and make a decent living through work. Prisoners can gain vocational qualifications in Polish prisons and receive 14 days paid leave/year and some prisoners' rights are supplemented during this period.

So France and Spain are among the European countries where the focus is on the issue of reintegrating prisoners into society and actively participate in achieving this goal. At European level, these countries are among those where the workforce in the social economy accounts for 9%-10% of the total working population, but in countries such as Slovenia, Romania, Malta, Lithuania, Croatia, Cyprus and Slovakia, the social economy is a small sector,

with less than 2% of the working population (National Strategy for the Social Reintegration of Detainees, 2020 - 2024).

According to sociologist Robert Cosmin Popescu, among the most advantageous solutions for the reintegration of prisoners into society is reprofessionalisation (Toma, 2016: 5 apud Popescu, 2020: 10), but it also contributes to the financial sustainability of prisons (Bruno, 2006: 194 apud Popescu, 2020: 10). Thus, training programs for qualification are implemented, which are unfortunately underfunded and funds are not accessed rigorously. Looking from a non-European perspective, prisoners in Texas preparing for release have also had significant employment deficits because the focus in this country is not on reintegrating prisoners into society (La Vigne and Kachnowski, 2005: 1).

Although there are many programs for the reintegration of prisoners based on vocational qualifications, most of the time, once out of prison, the prisoner is forced to find a job by himself. There are several NGOs that can offer assistance to people just released from prison walls because ex-prisoners are a disadvantaged group, but their funding is insufficient and the state is not involved. There is the happy situation where the ex-prisoner is supported by their family and their integration into the community is easier, or at least the cracks created are smaller and stigmatization is reduced. The lack of financial resources, but especially of family support, increases recidivism (Popescu, 2020: 14).

A study conducted by researchers Sandu Mihaela Luminița, Călin Mariana Floricica, and Constantin Marius (2021: 369) supports the fact that inmates believe that social support can help an ex-convict successfully reintegrate into society, with 86.4% of the respondents included in the study supporting its importance to a great and very great extent. The remaining 14.6% opted for moderate importance of social support in the successful social reintegration of an ex-prisoner. People consider that the support provided by the state should cover the following aspects: offering individual and group psychological counseling programs, providing retraining courses, providing a job, organizing cultural and sports activities, carried out in special reintegration centres created to support these people.

As most prisoners will be released back to their community, their community and family ties must be maintained and encouraged while in prison. The family and community each are critical for welcoming the inmate back into the community, normalizing them after their prison institutionalization experience, providing shelter and food, and offering support while the ex-offender attempts to obtain gainful employment. Incarceration, however, often serves to break or damage these important relationships. Although prisons in most of the countries surveyed provided for regular visits to prisoners, the duration of these visits were often too short and visits were allowed arbitrarily. In many places, it was clear that prisoners could not receive visits unless bribes were paid to correctional officials. Many prisoners do not receive visits because relatives live some distance from prisons and travel is expensive and time-consuming. To make it easier for distant relatives visit, Namibian authorities have relaxed regulations to allow for longer visits, which can occur less frequently. Despite this, prisoners have complained that this relaxation has not always been applied correctly. In one prison, staff shortages were cited as a reason why visits were sometimes restricted (Dissel, n.a: 169).

A study in Mauritius argues that prisoners should have access to religious practitioners of their choice, that they should be able to participate in that person's services, and that they should be able to meet the needs of religious life. Religious workers also are critical to the spiritual and moral development of prisoners, as well as providing ongoing guidance and support. In some countries, religious organizations provide support and materials for education, training and employment opportunities. They can also provide an important link between family and prisoner. The role of meditation and yoga as spiritual practices are beneficial in countries such as Mauritius. Religious ministries and bodies are as prolific in Africa as they are in other parts of the world. They are often more visible in prisons and have greater access than non-faith-based service providers. While they provide much-needed contact with the outside world, as well as several services, supplies and support, they come with a particular

religious agenda. Their acceptance by prison authorities indicates greater reliance on rehabilitation as measured by religious conversion rather than addressing many of the other risk factors associated with offending (ibid.).

Some countries recognize the importance of civil society involvement in prison. In South Africa corrections is seen as a societal responsibility, where the involvement of other government departments, social institutions, civil society organizations and private individuals is considered essential. Even here, however, NGOs still complain about the difficulty of gaining access to prisons. Some organizations form a partnership with a particular prison, while others have more extensive provincial or national programs. Many civil society interventions are led by faith-based organizations. Some organizations are involved in human rights work - monitoring, educating and providing direct assistance or legal advice to prisoners. Others are involved in rehabilitation and reintegration work with offenders. However, there are still few organizations in Africa providing services to prisoners. Rehabilitation services offered by NGOs include education and training of prisoners, counseling, social services, religious care and services, awareness programs, handicraft making, life skills, sports, arts and cultural activities, and assistance with the relocation of offenders after release. Services are often targeted to a sector of the prison population - often women or children and young prisoners (ibid.).

Increasingly, NGOs are trying to strengthen the impact and effectiveness of their interventions. A recent conference attended by prison administrations and NGOs in Africa, held in Nairobi, Kenya, identified good practices in the reintegration of offenders. These practices included

- Better coordination of activities between civil society service providers to avoid duplication and encourage information sharing;

- provision of industry-standard training and certification that is independent of the prison administration;

- encouraging restorative justice practices, including victim compensation;

- preparing prisoners for release;

- involving local organizations (churches, traditional leaders) in welcoming prisoners on release and thus helping alleviate prison stigma;

- assisting offenders with job opportunities and finding housing;

- civil society organizations working to promote alternatives to prison to reduce levels of overcrowding (Rhodes, 2004 apud Dissel: 172).

Imprisonment is something meant for "the others", those who act against the law, and therefore it frees us from them and at the same time frees us from the responsibility of having to think about the real problems of society - those that lead to individuals being arrested every day (Ferreira, 2020: 245). However, prisons have not proven to be a factor in reducing anti-social activity. In contrast: in some cases they encourage its increase. Prisons are a system of deprivation of liberty that does not rehabilitate prisoners and makes them less and less fit for social life; that is, it is a system that does not achieve its intended goals (Kropotikin, 2012 apud Ferreira, 2020: 246).

In support of the idea that the prison is an institution that only formally fulfills its purpose of reintegrating inmates into society, researcher Helena Ferreira states that although Portuguese legislation provides for creating employment programs for inmates in various fields, the reality is that most of the work available is institutional cleaning. Employment opportunities are insufficient, which means that prisoners spend their days without any purpose and cannot acquire the necessary skills for future integration into the labor market (Dores, 2013 apud Ferreira, 2020: 247). We observe how Portugal is a country that fails to actively and considerably participate in the reintegration of prisoners in society.

The researcher's study focuses on the situation of female criminals, the vast majority of whom, in situations of extreme poverty and discrimination, are subjected to precarious work, in poor conditions, with wages that do not cover their basic needs. To try to escape from these situations, they enter the world of crime, which leads them to prisons. We can see how the

Portuguese state disadvantages female people, as they often resort to actions aimed at criminal life to survive (Ferreira, 2020: 249). To find an alternative for the reintegration of female prisoners into society, given the fact that many women end up in prisons, Portugal has found an alternative of holding female prisoners in ecosate, conventional prisons, a movement developed by feminist movements. Eco-schools are the most favorable social contexts for putting into practice the ecological principles of the ecofeminist movement. They presuppose relations of equality that respect differences, as opposed to gender domination, and the principles of environmental sustainability. These spaces aim to: decentralize power and create a non-hierarchical and democratic system; support a green and solidarity economy and fair trade (Flores şi Trevisan, 2015 apud Ferreira, 2020: 252). This alternative is not meant as a definitive answer; it is merely a path toward the goal of replacing the outdated prison and, simultaneously, building a more equitable and sustainable society, especially for women - who, over the years, have been the main target of patriarchy and, in turn, capitalism.

2. Prisoner and family. Prison strategies for mediating the prisoner-family relationship

When we talk about deprivation of liberty, we are talking about the transposition of people from their everyday life into a totally closed environment where links with the outside world are extremely restricted. Inside the prison the individual learns how to reintegrate back into society and adapt to the rules it imposes. Inside the prison there are rules and norms, including mechanisms to encourage, to some extent, contact with the outside world. The family is one of the most important relationships from which an individual deprived of liberty is distanced, and to ensure that family relationships are not completely severed, prisons allow, to a certain extent, family visits. The right to visit a prisoner is present in Article 68 of Law 254/2013 concerning the execution of sentences and measures of deprivation of liberty whereby the penitentiary encourages family ties of the institutionalized person. According to the article, a prisoner has the right to receive visits in specially arranged spaces by the institution under visual supervision.

The right to private access is one of the most important rights a prisoner has. It is set out in Article 69 of that law, and to benefit from this right prisoner must meet several conditions: there is a marriage relationship, proven by a certified copy of the marriage certificate or, where applicable, a partnership relationship similar to the relationship established between spouses; they have not been disciplined for 6 months before the request for intimate visits, or the sanction has been lifted; they actively participate in educational, psychological and social assistance programs or work, etc. All these conditions are restrictive to the individual to receive the right to intimate visitation, how the individual communicates best in a space arranged by the institution with the person with whom he or she has established a family because the convicted married person can only benefit from intimate visitation with his or her spouse, and through this right a function of the family is ensured to a certain extent. Another mechanism by which the total institution tries keeping the relationship between prisoner and family close is the right to marry, also specified in the same law. Paragraph 3 specifies that after the conclusion of the marriage, spouses may be granted intimate visits for 48 h. The State thus encourages family relations despite the deprivation of liberty of a partner. In addition to the conclusion of the marriage, the relationship with the outside world is facilitated for the individual in prison through the right to petition and correspond, the right to telephone calls and online communications. All these rights encourage the institutionalized person's links with the outside world so that the frustrations created by deprivation of liberty are to some extent removed.

When they hear about visitation, inmates can't help enjoy this right they have because it's a way to partially transpose them into the world outside the prison walls. After a long research of the prison environment, Lucian Rotariu (2016a: 38) states that the visit is the space that separates two social worlds separated by the prison. Through this right individual

deprived of liberty have the possibility of exposure to outside information provided by their social proximity, and visitors benefit from maintaining a palpable relationship with the inmates. Among the main roles of visiting listed by Lucian Rotariu (2016a, p. 39–40) are maintaining a direct form of interaction with the family, providing economic support, building loyalty and emphasizing the roles assigned before institutionalization in prison, creating a momentary link with the outside environment through the exchange of information, managing and ensuring a social organization of the family or group of origin. A negative role of visiting can be represented by the creation of weak links between visitors and visited because the person deprived of liberty is in a state of vulnerability.

An important aspect captured through the prism of the visit was the relationship between visitation and recidivism. In their paper "Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?", Wiliam D. Bales și Daniel P. Mears identified numerous relationships between visitation (frequency and social status of the visitor) and the degree of recidivism associated with an inmate. Hirschi's theory of social ties identifies that visitation compels the individual to commit certain illicit actions through relatives, friends and the community. Thus, it is concluded: the more intense the interaction between visitors and visited individuals, the greater the likelihood of engaging in prosocial actions and facing the challenges of readjustment and reentry into society (Bales and Mears, 2008, p: 291 apud Rotariu, 2016: 57). What the system wants is that through the interaction between prisoners and visitors the degree of recidivism is reduced because the support group - the family - establishes and orient part of the behavioral make-up of an inmate after the transition period from the prison to the everyday world, so that the individual can resume the former social role he or she had before institutionalization, individuals being surrounded by stimuli unfavorable to prosocial behavior.

However, we can take an opposite view of visitation and understand it as a factor that favors a relapse, which is supported by the process of differential association advocated by Sutherland. If prisoners are visited by people who engage in illicit and lawless behavior, they are more likely to be lawless after release, with recidivism increasing in this sense through desirous behavior (Bales and Mears, 2008: 293). The frequency of visits is also considered an important predictor in explaining the post-incarceration illicit behavior of individuals because the number of visits received by an inmate in prison can downwardly influence recidivism or at least postpone the moment of committing a new crime (Rotariu, 2016b: 59). Wiliam Bales and Daniel Mears (2008: 305) through research conducted, conclude that an inmate visited 10 times (the average number of visits received by an inmate) will have a probability of recidivism of 32. 3%, a lower rate than prisoners who have not been visited, frequency also being an important factor explaining the relationship between visitation and recidivism, but this number is true for male respondents, among female respondents recidivism decreased with frequency of visits.

Another important aspect captured by L. Rotariu (2016b: 53) is the complexity of conjugal visits, which is a way to encourage the bond between prisoner and family and is a mechanism to prevent marital dysfunction within the prison. Conjugal visitation is also a possibility through which the previously formed roles of the individuals are emphasized, and the closer the bond between the partners was appreciated, the more the visit is valued. Some prisoners consider it excellent, but others as unhelpful because of the shame created by the looks of other prisoners. The sociologist finds that, simultaneously, the conjugal visit contributes to the continuity of the relationship between the two people, where continuity expresses either the stability of the couple or the ability to provide motivation.

Regarding the family, it represents for a prisoner "everything", being the main form to which the prisoner relates and creates a connection with the outside (ibid, 2016: 59). The discussions captured during the visit also capture aspects related to the behavioral components that partners suggest prisoners, giving them advice on conduct. The family makes the greatest sacrifices for a prisoner, and the family is almost the only economic, but also emotional or moral

support (ibid, 2016b: 60). The sociologist concludes that without the family connection, the possibility of reintegration of the institutionalized would be very low in the absence of other alternatives.

3. From prison to family dissolution

The problem of family dissolution due to the deprivation of liberty of a partner has been studied by many scholars. Nothing is more important than freedom, which is also the only thing given to us without being subjected to certain financial expenses, freedom being considered free. Because of certain actions that violate social norms, some social actors end up curtailing this right for some time, many of them curtailing their freedom for good and ending up behind prison walls.

With imprisonment comes the severance of social relations that individuals had formed before the moment of deprivation of liberty. The main bond that contributes to the stability of prosocial relationships between the individuals - the family - is in a state of decay, and in many cases of deprivation of liberty of a partner, it may even disappear.

To underline the importance of the family in a society, researchers Alexander (2010) and Clearer (2007) concluded that an incarcerated body inevitably contributes in the long run not only to the deterioration of the family, but also of the whole community (Alexander, 2010 and Clearer, 2007: 460 apud Tasca M., Mulvey P. and Rodriguez N., 2016: 460). We see, therefore, how important the family is, its role contributing to the well-being and functioning of society. At the same time, prison reduces the likelihood of marriage, despite the right of prisoners to marry in prison, and leads to the degradation of the relationship between partners which is followed by an effect that predisposes to the instability of the whole family (Geller, 2011, Lopoo and Western, 2005: 460 apud ibid.). Incarceration greatly reduces the likelihood that men and women will marry. Analysis of data from a study by 3 scholars in the United States shows that men with a history of incarceration are much less likely to marry compared to men with no history of incarceration (Western, Lopoo and McLanahan, 2004: 13 apud Herman-Stahl şi Kan and McKay, 2008: 13). Incarceration in men is also strongly correlated with a lower likelihood of marriage and dissolution of existing marriages, says Robert Apel (Apel, 2016: 104).

However, the deprivation of an individual's liberty creates other consequences for the almost broken family. Incarceration can lead to economic exacerbation for economically disadvantaged families, and the only contributors to the education and upbringing of minor family members, of children, remain the non-incarcerated, upon whom a very high degree of deprivation is exerted (Hanlon, 2007: 460 apud Tasca M., Mulvey P. and Rodriguez N., 2016: 460), and in addition to this, partners of prisoners serve as the primary source of monetary support for the incarcerated (Braman, 2004: 460 apud ibid.). In addition, parental incarceration has led to poor outcomes for children, including mental health difficulties, problems in school, and delinquency - which can perpetuate an intergenerational cycle of family imprisonment (Cho, 2009, Murray, 2012 and Tasca, 2014: 460 apud ibid.).

On the other hand, an eminent way to keep the family as close as possible at the time of deprivation of liberty of one of the partners is visiting. This becomes the only mode of interaction for the family. Visitation allows families to communicate face to face about various issues, society and family welfare (Arditti, 2005 and Christian and Kennedy, 2011, p. 460 apud ibid.). Also, meetings held in prison allow for a maintenance or repair of relationships interrupted by incarceration (Comfort, 2008 and Einat, 2013, p. 460 apud Tasca M. et al., 2016: 461). There are many families who reunite during visitation, these families highlight their commitment to maintaining or rebuilding family ties during detention (Christian, 2005 and Maruna and Toch, 2005, p. 462 apud Tasca M. et al., 2016: 462). In addition to this, caregivers want to keep the family together and live with the hope that the incarcerated person will correct their behaviour while deprived of liberty (Cecil, 2008: 462 apud ibid.). Through visitation rights, prisoners, their caregivers and children can work towards these goals and establish a

sense of normalcy in family relationships despite incarceration and other stressors (e.g. addiction, unemployment) (Arditti, 2005 and Snyder, 2009, p. 462 apud Tasca M. et al., 2016: 463). What I can also add regarding prisoner visitation as a possible way of maintaining family relationships between prisoners and their families is that many prisoners are not incarcerated all the time in an institution that is in close proximity to their family, and visitation from the family becomes very difficult, thus leading to marital instability between prisoners and their partners (Wildelman, Turney and Yi, 2016: 81-82).

In addition to this, there is also the situation where a prisoner is in a closed regime of incarceration and the visit is mediated by a glass that separates the two worlds: the free society and the closed community within the walls. In many cases prisoners become frustrated by this separation and their children embrace the glass that separates the two worlds. We see how the prison does not favour the relationship between parents and children in some situations, which does not contribute to maintaining stable marital and family relationships. In a study looking at the relationship between prisoners and their families, researcher Johnna Christian finds that before being incarcerated, most prisoners had minor children and lived with them in their homes. When the male parent is incarcerated, in 90% of the cases researched by the author, the children's caregiver is the mother, with minor exceptions, and when the mother is incarcerated or both parents, the caregivers remain the children's grandparents. Children without family members to care for them are placed in foster care, children's homes and orphanages, their whole lives disrupted (Christian, 2005: 32).

However, more than half of the male prisoners never had personal visits with their children, but the contact between them took place by phone or e-mail. These figures indicate that the majority of male prisoners are not connected to their children at the highest level. Such contact could be a good starting point for developing closer bonds and attachments that facilitate the prisoner's integration into the family unit while incarcerated, which provides the basis for a strong support system for successful reintegration into the family and community upon release (Casey-Acevedo, Bakken, 2002 and Petersilia, 2003: 32 apud Christian, 2005: 32).

On the other hand, Carlson and Cervera (1992) found that wives of incarcerated men experience a great deal of the incarceration experience, including feelings of guilt and stress due to the pressure to fulfill the multiple roles of the incarcerated man (Carlson și Cervera, 1992: 33 apud Christian, 2005: 33). The literature suggests that the prison experience becomes an integral part of life for both spouses and that incarceration affects the family on many levels. At the same time, it has been concluded that incarceration is also negative in that it leads to consequences that reach beyond the prisoner, with the prisoner's family suffering greatly because the stigma attached to incarceration is so great that many families have isolated themselves from the people in their lives who could have helped them by providing the necessary support (Carlson și Cervera, 1992: 33 apud ibid.).

So these are many consequences of the effect of incarceration on the relationship between prisoner and family. We see how many of these relationships change, even to the point of family breakdown. These consequences lead to a malfunctioning of society, created by a poorly functioning prison system.

Conclusions

As we have seen, deprivation of liberty is a social phenomenon that entails the emergence of other social phenomena that generate effects on the notion of family. The family is the main link of the whole society, which is why the maintenance of the relationship between prisoner and family has become for the total institution, the penitentiary, an objective of rigorous importance. With the help of the family, inmates can feel the effects of detention more easily and adjust to the status of "prisoner" more quickly. The family is the prisoner's main carer and the only connection to the world outside the prison walls, which is why it is very important that the prison's strategies are really successful in order to avoid family breakdown.

At the same time, the family contributes to the reintegration of the prisoner into society after the period of detention. The prison provides a number of strategies and methods to prepare the prisoner for the world outside the prison walls. It happens that the existing strategies are not always guaranteed to be successful or that they exist in too small a number, which is why the existence of these strategies is of rigorous importance for prison life, they are important reasons why the prisoner can accept his condition of being deprived of liberty and wishes to correct his behaviour, thus being prepared for release.

References:

1. Apel, R. (2016). The Effects of Jail and Prison Confinement on Cohabitation and Marriage. *ANNALS, AAPSS,* 665: 103-126.
2. Bales, W. D. and Mears, D. P. and Florid. (2008). Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 45 (3): 287-321.
3. Christian, J. (2005). Riding the Bus: Barriers to Prison Visitation and Family Management Strategies*. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 21(1): 31-48.
4. Herman-Stahl, M., Kan, M. L., and McKay, T. (2008). *Incarceration and the family: A review of research and promising approaches for serving fathers and families*. Washington: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation Administration for Children and Families/Office of Family Assistance.
5. La Vigne, N. G. and Kachmowski, V. (2005). Texas prisoners'reflections on returning home. *Urban Institute*. 1-12.
6. Popescu, R. C. (2020). Pedeapsa privativă de libertate ca traumă. Traseul deținutului spre reintegrare în societate și idealul instituției penitenciare. *Revista română de sociologie.* 3–4: 189–208.
7. Rotariu, L. (2016a). *Jilava: o radiografie socială a unui penitenciar*. Bucharest: Ars Docendi.
8. Rotariu, L. (2016b). *Studii și aspecte teoretice în universul penitenciar*. Bucharest: Ars Docendi.
9. Sandu, M. L., Calin, F.M. and Constantin, M. (2021). Social reinsertion of former detainees: Between perception and attitude. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 25: 352-379.
10. Secret, M. (2012). Incarcerated fathers: Exploring the dimensions and prevalence of parenting capacity of non-violent offenders. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research & Practice about Men as Fathers*, 10(2).
11. Tasca M. și Mulvey P. and Rodriguez, N. (2016). Families coming together in prison: An examination of visitation encounters. *Punishment și Society*, 18(4): 459-478.
12. Țica, G. (2014). *Factorii sociali care influențează recidiva infracțională*. Oradea: University Publishing House.
13. Visher, C. A. and O'Connell, D. J. (2012). Incarceration and inmates' self perceptions about returning home. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40*(5):* 386–393.
14. Wildeman, C., Tourney, K. and Yi, Y. (2016). Paternal Incarceration and Family Functioning: Variation across Federal, State, and Local Facilities. *ANNALS, AAPSS,* 665: 80-97.
15. ***ANP. (2015). *Strategia națională de reintegrare socială a persoanelor private de libertate 2015-2019*. Bucharest [online] available at: https://anp.gov.ro/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Strategie-v5.pdf
16. ***ANP. (2020). *Strategia națională de reintegrare socială a persoanelor private de libertate 2020-2024.* [online] available at: http://sgg.gov.ro/1/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ANEXA-14.pdf.
17. ***Dissel, A. (s.a.). Rehabilitation and reintegration in African prisons. [online] available at: https://www.academia.edu/26713399/Rehabilitation_and_reintegration_in_African_pri

sons?bulkDownload=thisPaper-topRelated-sameAuthor-citingThis-citedByThis-secondOrderCitations&from=cover_page

18. ***Ferreira, H. (2020). *Prison as a solution? – The principles of ecofeminism applied to the social reintegration of women detainees.* [online] available at: https://www.academia.edu/44935873/PRISON_AS_A_SOLUTION_THE_PRINCIPLES_OF_ECOFEMINISM_APPLIED_TO_THE_SOCIAL_REINTEGRATION_OF_WOMEN_DETAINEES_1?from=cover_page.

19. ***HotNews.ro (2019). *Cum sunt reintegrați deținuții în societate în alte state europene. Polonia - 10% din banii câștigați prin munca în penitenciar, primiți ca ajutor după eliberare.* [online] available at: https://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-esential-23547555-cum-sunt-reintegrati-detinutii-societate-alte-state-europene-polonia-10-din-banii-castigati-prin-munca-penitenciar-primiti-ajutor-dupa-eliberare.htm.

20. ***Legea de la A la Z. (s.a.). *Organizarea și funcționarea penitenciarului în România.* [online] available at: https://legeaz.net/dictionar-juridic/organizare-functionare-penitenciar-inchisoare.