

**ANALELE ȘTIINȚIFICE
ALE
UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI
(SERIE NOUĂ)**

**SCIENTIFICAL ANNALS
OF
„ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI
(NEW SERIES)**

**SOCIOLOGIE
ȘI ASISTENȚĂ SOCIALĂ
SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK**

TOM XII / Nr. 2

December 2019



Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași

**ANALELE ȘTIINȚIFICE ALE UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI
(SERIE NOUĂ) SOCIOLOGIE ȘI ASISTENȚĂ SOCIALĂ**

ISSN: 2065-3131 (print); **ISSN:** 2066-8961 (online); **ISSN-L:** 2065-3131

The journal is edited by the Department of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences and is published by the Publishing House of „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași.

Editor in Chief:

Daniela Șoitu, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România

Guest Editors:

Sorina Poledna, Babeș Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Maria Sandu, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași

Members:

Gabriela Irimescu, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Mihaela Rădoi**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Romeo Asiminei**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Cristina Gavriluță**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Camelia Medeleanu**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România

Scientific and Editorial Board:

Asunción Llana Berñe, University of Barcelona, Spain; **Michèle Baumann**, Université du Luxembourg, Luxembourg; **Doru Buzducea**, Universitatea București, România; **Teresa Careira**, Universidade do Algarve, Portugal; **Michael Cernea**, The George Washington University, USA; **Liviu Chelcea**, University of Bucharest; **Dan Chiribucă**, Universitatea Babeș Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, România; **Ayça Ergun**, Middle East University, Turkey; **Gilles Ferreol**, Université de Poitiers, France; **Nicu Gavriluță**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Patrick Gibbons**, University College Dublin, Ireland; **Moshe Idel**, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel; **Ion Ionescu**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Emmanuel Jovelin**, Université Catholique de Lille, France; **Sana Loue**, Case Western Reserve University, USA; **Sofia Koukouli**, TEI Creta, Greece; **Antonio Maturo**, University `Gabriele D`Annunzio` Chieti-Pescara, Italy; **André Moisan**, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, France; **Aine Ni Leime**, National University of Ireland, Galway; **Liam O`Dowd**, Queen`s University Belfast, UK; **Marian Preda**, University of Bucharest; **Marius Proftoroiu**, Academy of Economic Sciences, Bucharest; **Nadji Rahmania**, l`Université de Lille I, France; **Maria Roth**: Universitatea Babeș Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, România; **Dumitru Stan**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Conțiu Șoitu**, Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, România; **Alain Vilbrod**, L`Université de Bretagne Occidentale, Brest, France.

Editorial Contact Information /

Address for submissions:

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași
Facultatea de Filosofie și Științe Social-Politice
Redacția Analelor UAIC de Sociologie și Asistență socială
Bd. Carol I nr. 11, Iași, România, 700506
Phone: 00 40 0232 201280; Fax.: 00 40 232 201154
Web address: anale.fssp.uaic.ro
Email: an-soc-as@uaic.ro;
Contact person: Prof.Ph.D. Daniela Șoitu

Publisher Contact Information

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași
Adress: Str. Pinului nr. 1A, Iași,
România, 700109
Phone: 00 40 0232 314947
Fax.: 00 40 232 314 947
Web address: www.editura.uaic.ro
Email: editura@uaic.ro
Contact person: ing. Lucian Leonte

All submissions will undergo a peer-group review process.

The journal is published bi-annually. Number of copies / issue : 200 copies.

Web page: <http://anale.fssp.uaic.ro/index.php/asas>

Aims: *Analele Științifice ale Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași. (Seria nouă). Sociologie și Asistență Socială* aims to promote the remarkable results of scientific and empiric researches of professorates, researchers, students, and practitioners in the field of humanist sciences in order to stimulate the optimal functioning of academic and social fields. Analyses and theoretical-methodological sociological explanations as well as the exemplification of their values at the political and social work strategies and interventions level are welcome.

Abstracting and indexing services: *Scientific Annals of the “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iasi (New Series). Sociology and Social Work Section* are covered by several major indexing services including: **EBSCO**, **PROQUEST CSA-Sociological Abstract**, **PROQUEST-Social Services Abstracts**, **PROQUEST-Worldwide Political Science Abstracts**, **CEEOL**, **Ulrich**, **IBSS**, **INDEX COPERNICUS**, **SCIOPIO** and **CNCIS** (2008-2011: **B+** category).

Any views expressed in this publication are the views of the authors and are not the views of the editors or publishing house.

“You! Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow” from Juvenile Delinquency to Recidivism

Norberth-Ioan OKROS¹

Abstract

The present paper is a summary of some studies in the Romanian space on the influence of social factors on the individual who is in a restrictive environment, such as the penitentiary or in various reeducation centers. The structure of the paper consists of three sections, namely: the social characteristics of juvenile delinquency, the social factors in the penitentiary environment, and the third refers to the social factors involved in the relapse. The three sections best define the title of this article: “You! Yesterday, today and tomorrow.”

The aim is to highlight the main social factors that lie in the three timeframes to provide a better insight into social reintegration strategies and awareness of the need for active involvement of the various institutions as well as the community.

Keywords: social factors, restrictive environment, social reintegration.

Résumé

Le présent article est un résumé de quelques études menées dans l'espace roumain sur l'influence des facteurs sociaux sur les individus vivant dans un environnement restrictif, tels que les pénitenciers ou divers centres de rééducation. La structure du document comprend trois sections, à savoir: les caractéristiques sociales de la délinquance juvénile, les facteurs sociaux dans l'environnement pénitencier et la troisième se réfère aux facteurs sociaux impliqués dans la rechute. Les trois sections définissent le mieux le titre de cet article: “You! Hier, aujourd'hui et demain.” L'objectif est de mettre en évidence les principaux facteurs sociaux présents dans les trois périodes afin de mieux comprendre les stratégies de réinsertion sociale et de prendre conscience de la nécessité d'une implication active des différentes institutions ainsi que de la communauté.

Mots-clés: facteurs sociaux, environnement restrictif, réintégration sociale.

Rezumat

Lucrarea de față reprezintă o sumarizare a unor studii din spațiul românesc privind influența factorilor sociali asupra individului care se află într-un mediu restrictiv, precum penitenciarul sau în diverse centre de reeducare. Structura lucrării este

¹ Student within master's degree “Applied Psychology in the Field National Security”, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, University of Bucharest. email: okros_norberth@yahoo.com

formată din trei secțiuni, și anume: caracteristicile sociale ale delicvenței juvenile, factorii sociali în mediul penitenciar, iar cea de-a treia se referă la factorii sociali implicați în recidivă. Cele trei secțiuni definesc cel mai bine titlul acestui articol: „Tu! Cel de ieri, de azi și de mâine”. Scopul este acela de a evidenția principalii factori sociali care se regăsesc în cele trei perioade de timp pentru a oferi o mai bună viziune asupra strategiilor de reintegrare socială și conștientizarea nevoii de implicare activă a diverselor instituții, dar și a comunității.

Cuvinte-cheie: factori sociali, mediu restrictiv, reintegrare socială.

"You, yesterday", the social characteristics of juvenile and young offenders

Juvenile delinquency includes a number of violations of various social and legal norms, ranging from minor offenses to crimes committed by minors. In our country, according to the Public Ministry's report, the number of juvenile offenders sent to trial has been increasing since 2014, with 3,704 juvenile offenders registering in 2018. Of these, 2 053 are convicted of offenses against property and 741 convicted of offenses against the person. One thing that draws attention is that minors tend to commit more and more crimes against the person, and the number of offenses against patrimony is declining. Also, the counties with the most juvenile offenders are Bucharest, Iasi, Bacau, Constanta and Neamt (Raport de activitate 2018).

Starting from this, the question arises as to the importance of social factors for minors; Popa *et al.* (2018) conducted a comparative study between minors in penitentiaries and re-education services. More specifically, the study evaluates the relationships between individual and family characteristics among these minors in terms of risk factors. The paradigm behind this article is that of Shader (2004). It defines the risk factors linked to juvenile delinquency "as characteristics that, if present in a young person's life, increase his chances of engaging in delinquent behavior." Thus, he identified three categories of risk factors: individual (psychological and behavioral characteristics), social factors (influences of families and colleagues) and community factors (school and community characteristics).

The study was conducted in Romania between 2007 and 2008 and involved 565 juvenile offenders, of whom 285 were imprisoned in prison and 280 were in re-education centers. The sample was divided into two: under 16 and between 17 and 19 years of age. Among the variables used are: type of crime, level of education, occupational status, drug or alcohol consumption, presence of health problems, socio-demographic data, etc.

The results of the study are as follows: in the case of individual characteristics: 16% of minors in prison were illiterate, 62% abandoned school, 14% had health problems, 16% were drug users. Also, 78% of minors who received the detention measure committed the offense in the group and 48% were recidivists. In the case of family characteristics: 54% of minors in prisons had at least three siblings, the average number of brothers being lower for minors in re-

education centers. Also, about 50% of minors detained did not live with their parents at the time of the crime, and only one fifth of their parents were alcoholics. The study presented identified five individual risk factors (age, type of offense committed, drug use, school abandonment and relapse) and three family risk factors (family alcoholism, parenting relationship and number of brothers) as those who grow up the probability of juvenile delinquency in Romania.

Addeo *et al.* (2015) conducted another study on protection factors and risk factors, but this time among the younger recidivists. The study includes variables such as: socio-demographic characteristics, criminal history, type of offense, family characteristics, social relationships, entourage, and educational context. The sample consisted of 364 detainees from Spain (163 inmates), Romania (156 detainees), the rest being from Cyprus.

As significant results, it is noted that most of the young detainees committed offenses against the patrimony (57%). Other offenses committed are: blows causing death, (14%) and harassment and other violence (12.3%). There is a significant gender difference: boys tend to commit more often crimes against property (59.5%) and blows causing death (15.9%), while girls engage in crimes such as blows and other violence (26.1%) and disturbing public order and safety (11.6%).

A percentage of 74.2% of detainees were at first conviction, while 16% were second convicted and 9.8% were more than three convictions. In Romania, most of the young people were at the first conviction, at a rate of 88.3%. Of the total number of detainees, less than half (42.4%) said that one of the family members was convicted, and this percentage is even lower among girls (33.8%).

From the point of view of education, 30.7% of young people went to school regularly, 40.3% gave up at a time, and 30% of them never went. Also, 55.2% of those attending school had disciplinary reports and 57.6% were involved in physical assaults in schools.

Work, being considered a protection factor, was included as a variable and found that 48.2% of the young men worked before the punishment, and 51.8% of them never worked.

In the case of leisure, 31.3% of detainees said they regularly consume light drugs. In the case of young people in Romania, 72.4% said they did not use this type of drug.

Finally, the purpose of the study was to identify risk and protection factors. Therefore, it was found that the presence of a family member in the penitentiary and the negative characteristics of leisure time (alcohol, drugs, etc.) are risk factors for relapse. Regular school attendance and work experience are protective factors for relapse.

Vasile, Ciucurel and Ciucă (2010) identifies some variables that address adaptation to the reeducation environment. The concept of adaptation has been operationalized by two indicators, namely: behavioral (disciplinary misconduct, violent acts, days spent in isolation, participation in programs), but also emotional (depression, anxiety, anger).

Three main models have been proposed to find those variables associated with adjustment, adaptation to the correctional environment (Dhami, Ayton and Loewenstein 2007). The import model that supports the relevance of pre-existing incarceration factors: demographic characteristics, personality, criminal history, deprivation pattern highlights the relevance of the detention environment (overcrowding, security level, penalty length, etc.), and the latest model, the situational, which supports the interaction of the person with the context.

As a result, the participants had an average age of 16.6 years. A percentage of 77.1% of them had Romanian citizenship and the others belonged to ethnic minorities. The educational level of the subjects was below the average values reported for their age, with an average of 4.17 years spent in school. Likewise, 31.4% of minors worked occasionally.

Concerning the family, 68.6% of adolescents came from disorganized families (divorce, abandonment, the death of a parent), the average age of children at the time of disorganization of the family was 5.48 years. Most of the participants' families were characterized by conflicts, violence and alcohol abuse. Of the total of participants, 40% were in placement centers. Living conditions were poor or very poor in 87.5% of cases. Parents had a low level of education, and most did not have a stable job. Family crime is present in 60% of cases.

Also, 60% of adolescents were convicted for theft, 25.7% for robbery, and the rest for sexual offenses or attempted murder. It should be noted that 60% of the crimes were committed in the group.

The results highlighted a correlation between, institutional inadequacy with the low level of education, the existence of criminal history, early age at the time of disorganization of the family and the history of family crimes.

“You, today”, the social factors in the penitentiary environment

This second part aims to provide a vision of the social factors that are directly related to the way in which the person deprived of liberty behaves in the penitentiary environment and how it is affected by the presence or absence of social factors.

Dâmboeanu and Nieuwbeerta (2016) conducted a study on a sample of 280 detainees from the Prisons of Craiova, Giurgiu, Tulcea and Timișoara. The authors wanted to see if there is a link between the characteristics of detainees, the deprivation of liberty and their deviations.

They divided the deviations into four categories: total deviations, violations involving violence, smuggling and defamation, defiance offenses. The information was taken from the detainees' electronic files. Violent misconduct measures if the detainee was involved in attacks on other detainees / personnel, in self-mutilation and/or in possession of knives or other weapons. Smuggling offenses indicate whether the prisoner had mobile phones, drugs / alcohol and / or other prohibited articles in his / her possession. The defiance refers to violation of internal regulations and whether they behaved without respect for

the staff. Each variable was measured twice, i.e. for two distinct periods of time: the previous year and the last two years.

Few over half (53%) of the 179 prisoners imprisoned for at least two years were involved in a misdemeanor. In total, 296 offenses were reported for this group, 37% for smuggling offenses, 22% for violence and 22% for defiance. The results are similar in the case of previous year deviations: 35% of the 240 detainees had at least one offense, 21% smuggling, 13% violent behavior and 11% defiant behavior.

In the case of deprivation of liberty, more than a third of the detainees had already executed 5 years in prison. Almost three-quarters of them were sentenced to 5 or more years of imprisonment. Most of them (60%) executed part of the penalty in the closed and maximum security regime, and just over half worked for at least 20 days. Detainees were also asked about the conditions in the penitentiary.

Regarding the characteristics of detainees, almost half of them were 35 or more at the time of the interview, more than half were married or lived in concubinage, and 47% had children. Also, 57% were convicted of a violent crime.

The results of the study indicate that some socio-demographic characteristics of prisoners such as age, marital status, or parental status correlate inversely proportionally with prisoners' deviations. Those at least 35 years of age are significantly less involved in misconduct and married or those living in concubinage are less likely to deviate from the rules, as is the case with detainees who have children. Detainees with a history of violent crime are more likely to engage in inappropriate behavior.

From the point of view of deprivation of liberty, detainees who are incarcerated in closed regimes or maximum security are likely to commit more deviations than those from less strict regimes. On the other hand, detainees involved in work activities have much less chance to engage in inappropriate behavior than those who do not work. A surprising finding of the study was that recidivist detainees did not have more deviations than those who are at the first conviction.

Another very interesting study was conducted by Lindsey *et al.* (2017) who wanted to see if there is a relationship between the penitentiary distance to the home and deviants' deviations, whether the effect is greater on young detainees and whether this relationship is mediated by social ties. The sample consisted of 33 853 detainees incarcerated in Florida penitentiaries during 2000-2002.

The results indicate that a greater distance from the penitentiary to the home is associated with more disciplinary misconduct. However, after about 480 km, this effect is reversed. This effect is also more pronounced for young prisoners and less pronounced for the elderly. Last but not least, this distance - deviation relationship is mediated by social ties.

“You tomorrow”, the social factors involved in the relapse

Recurrence or relapse raises great questions and often harsh reactions from society. Researchers in social sciences bring scientific support to this problem by

establishing causes that push people to relapse. Below I will present some studies that wanted to see what social factors are involved in the relapse.

Antonescu and Damboeanu (2012) conducted a study in 2010 in the Giurgiu Penitentiary. They want to discover the barriers that prisoners encounter in their attempt to successfully reintegrate into the community. The sample is made up of both penitentiary staff, representatives of community institutions and recidivists.

As a result, the recidivists responded to the question, "What are the main obstacles they have had after release from prison?" That the main barriers are the impossibility of finding and keeping a stable job to guarantee them the necessary revenue. In their view, this is due to the reluctance of companies to hire people who have a criminal record. Also, interviews revealed that former detainees did not persevere enough to look for a job, especially if they were rejected once or twice. Another problem is drug addiction, and most of those interviewed with a history of drug use admit that their "recovery" chances are much lower. Another difficulty for most detainees is meeting with friends involved in criminal activities. Although they want to give up such backgrounds, they think that because they were in prison, it would be difficult to enter in a new group without members who were not in the penitentiary.

Prison staff believes that prisoners' training for release is through the multitude of psychosocial and educational programs: therapy groups, social assistance programs, the possibility of made a school or a job qualification, etc.

Therefore, it should be understood that the reintegration of detainees does not stop at the prison gate, the essential role is played by local authority and the entire community.

Another study was carried out by Goga (2015) at the Maximum Security Penitentiary in Craiova on a sample of 101 detainees, and the study aimed to capture the views of detainees on the social reintegration experience. One of the objectives of the study was to identify the perception of people deprived of their liberty about the level of influence of social reintegration programs.

Persons deprived of their liberty have been asked to mention the social reintegration programs they have followed. 89.4% of the respondents mentioned the educational activities, of which 70.2% mentioned cultural activities, 47.1% of them included psychological counseling and social assistance activities, 64.4% mentioned the moral activities and 11.5% of school activities and only 9.6% said they had participated in vocational training activities.

Interviewees provided grades between 1 and 10 for the activities carried out in the penitentiary. An average of 7.8 for cultural activities, 9 for school activities, 8.2 for educational activities, 7.8 for moral and religious activities, 8.7 for vocational training activities and 7.8 for counseling activities psychological and social assistance activities.

Asked if they consider that social reintegration programs in the penitentiary are useful, 35.6% of the detainees estimated they were "very useful", 15.4% "useful", 28.8% said they were in the "average" useful, 3.9% said they were "less useful" and 11.5% "very little useful".

Rogojan (2013) conducts a research on the social reintegration of prisoners in two penitentiaries, one in Oradea and the other in Arad. The survey was conducted in 2012 and the sample consisted of 38 men from the Oradea Penitentiary and 30 women from the Arad Penitentiary who were to be released during the year.

Survey finds that recidivist men are far more optimistic about reintegration than women who tend to be more pessimistic about this issue. Both women and men, when considering their chances of reintegration, rely on family support, that they can find a job, and thus contribute to family income, some also relying on the professional qualifications they have acquired. Overall, both Oradea detainees and detainees from Arad, do not have a high level of schooling but have some qualifications such as in construction, carpenter, tailor, bartender, waiter, etc.

From the point of view of criminal history, 24 of the men think that people will be influenced by this, and in the case of women, 23 of them believe that people will be influenced by the fact that they have a criminal record.

When it comes to plans after release, most interviewees say they want to find a job, to remake their lives and spend more time with their families.

Conclusions

The social factors, as shown by the studies mentioned above, play an extremely important role in every person's life, moreover, whether we are talking about children, young people or adults. We note that these factors do not differ greatly from one stage of life to another, including: age, criminal history, type of crime, social and family support, the distance of penitentiary and home, education level, criminal history family row, alcohol or drug use, and so on.

Of course, besides these social factors, we must not ignore the other components that define the human structure. Every person can be seen from the perspective of the biopsychosocial model, a model that brings together the three major areas: biological, psychological and social, interconnecting and stimulating each other. So, between the three domains there is a bridge, a binder, a link that completes the human being. I dare to mention that besides the three great domains, the spiritual and emotional domain that governs the human being could also be included. In fact, it is unfair not to recognize the need for multidisciplinary teams when it is necessary to reintegrate and reposition a person who for various reasons deviates from the natural way and shared by most people.

References

- Antonescu, F., Damboeanu, C. (2012). Community reintegration of Romanian ex-offenders: myth or reality? *Scientific Research & Education in the Air Force-AFASES*, 1.
- Conference: SICAP 23-Psychology and Ongoing Development-Timisoara, Romania, 20-21 November 2015At: Timisoara (Romania) Volume: *Theoretical and Applied in Psychology SICAP 23*.

- Dâmboeanu, C., & Nieuwebeerta, P. (2016). Importation and deprivation correlates of misconduct among Romanian inmates. *European Journal of Criminology*, **13** (3), 332-351.
- Dhami, M.K., Ayton, P., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). Adaptation to Imprisonment: Indigenous or Imported? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, **34** (8), 1085-1100.
- Goga, C. I. (2015). Toward a social and judicial analysis on the social reintegration of persons deprived of liberty: evidence from the Romanian detention system. *Revista de Stiinte Politice*, **47**, 165-177.
- Lindsey, A. M., Mears, D. P., Cochran, J. C., Bales, W. D., & Stults, B. J. (2017). In prison and far from home: Spatial distance effects on inmate misconduct. *Crime & Delinquency*, **63** (9), 1043-1065.
- Popa, I., Borrelli, P., Breda-Popa, R., & Montomoli, C. (2018). Juvenile delinquency in Romania: a comparison between minors in prisons and re-education services. *European Journal of Social Work*, **21** (5), 764-777.
- Rogojan, D. D. (2013). The social reintegration of persons deprived of liberty. Research conducted in Oradea and Arad prisons. *Annals of University of Oradea, Fascicle Sociology-Philosophy & Social Work*, **12**.
- Ministerul Public (2019). *Raport de activitate pe anul 2018 al Ministerului Public*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 18, from http://www.mpublic.ro/sites/default/files/PDF/raport_activitate_2018.pdf.
- Vasile, A. S., Ciucurel, M. M., & Ciucă, S. (2010). Study of the variables associated with correctional adjustment in adolescents. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, **5**, 1409-1413.