

## *Effects of Imprisonment on Romanian Offenders' Lives*

### *1. Scientific motivation*

#### *The importance of the problem from the scientific and socio-economic point of view*

Imprisonment is often seen by the general public, but also by some practitioners and policymakers as an efficient penal strategy of crime prevention. Three main arguments have been advanced in support of this view: a) prison deters or at least it reduces criminal behavior of the individuals who have experienced detention; b) prison keeps the offenders isolated from the society; it has an incapacitation effect, by putting lawbreakers in the inability of committing other felonies in the community; c) prison rehabilitates and reforms the offenders into law abiding citizens. Although these claims have led to the increased use of prison as main penalty imposed to criminal offenders in Europe and worldwide, in the international academic literature they shown to be largely overstated, if not incorrect. Four lines of research can be distinguished, but they all go in the same direction: prison is not such an effective tool in reducing crime as the practitioners and policymakers have argued.

A) Early studies of American criminologists, which have examined prison life, prison adaptation, inmate socialization and subculture (Clemmer, 1940; Sykes and Messinger, 1960), have shown that prisons have criminogenic effects, being nothing more than "*schools of crimes*";

B) Scholars interested to assess *the specific deterrent* effect of the detention have found out that modern prisons are not so unpleasant or disagreeable as one can imagine and for this reason, they cannot act like a discouraging factor of criminal behavior (Gendreau, Goggin and Cullen, 1999);

C) Analyses focused on the evaluation of the efficiency of treatment programs and psychosocial intervention (the *literature on "what works"* in the rehabilitation of prisoners) have revealed that programs based on punishment and control are not efficient in reducing recidivism (MacKenzie, 2005);

D) More recently, the advocates of the *developmental and life-course theories* have drawn attention on the adverse, longer-term consequences of confinement not only on reoffending, but also on others major life-domains of the inmates (employment, family, social integration etc.). They have argued that prison is stigmatizing, both socially and economically, and diminishes people chances for employment, family formation, civic participation and social

integration (Sampson and Laub, 2005; Uggen, Manza and Behrens, 2004; Uggen, Wakefield and Western, 2005; Pager, 2003).

Internationally, researchers' concern about these negative and *unintended* effects of confinement has been materialized in a large body of books, articles and research reports about consequences of incarceration to: former prisoners' employment opportunities, wages and job stability (Western, 2002); family roles and relationships (Arditti, 2005); well-being of children (Murray, 2007); communities (Clear, 2008).

These studies have brought and continue to bring important scientific contribution in research areas related to: a) correctional policies and practice: offenders treatment, rehabilitation, prisoners social reintegration; b) theories of criminology and sociology of crime: life-course theory, social control theory, socialization theory, deterrence theory etc; c) other sociological research fields: child care, family life and dynamic, social inclusion, human and social capital, employment and labor force market etc.

To investigate the (collateral) effects of incarceration in more detail, the European Society of Criminology has established in 2010 a working group on *Prison Life and the Effects of Imprisonment* whose main objective is the promotion of international collaboration on prison research.

The social and policy relevance of the topic stems from the fact that understanding the (unintended) consequences of the custodial sentences is a key element in developing efficient correctional policies and social re-entry strategies. Identifying those prison variables that have negative impact on the future of the offenders' lives, hampering their successful reintegration in the community after release from detention can provides valuable information about where to focus the criminal justice system resources in order to overcome these prison negative effects and prevent reoffending. Also, because the studies on collateral effects of imprisonment focus on the impact of incarceration on the inmates' children and families, they could bring further useful insights into the child protection and families in need social assistance policy issues. Moreover, by analyzing how prison affects former inmates' chances for employment are brought into discussion important implications for social policies regarding the inclusion of marginalized people on labor force market.

**In Romania**, the topic of crime prevention impact of imprisonment and its collateral consequences gains special scientific and societal relevance. First, in our country there are no

studies that examine the impact of incarceration on inmates' major life domains (including criminal behavior); therefore, my study, which will precisely approach this research topic, will have significant academic relevance in Romania. *Nationally*, the study will contribute to the development of knowledge in some important theoretical and empirical areas, well developed at European and international level, but very poor covered in the Romanian sociological and criminological literature: recidivism, desistance, offenders' rehabilitation, inmates' re-entry, prisoners' families etc. *Internationally*, because most of the researches conducted on the effects of imprisonment come from North American and Western European countries, my study will complete the image of these studies, by bringing additional information about the realities from a South-Eastern European (post-communist) country.

Second, *the societal relevance* of the project is also important in Romania, especially nowadays, in the context of European Union political debates regarding our country accession to the Schengen area. With a rate of incarceration of 125.7 inmates per 100.000 inhabitants, Romania places in the middle of the European countries in terms of prison population, after United Kingdom, Spain, Czech Republic or Hungary, but before Netherlands, Italy, France or Germany (European Council, 2011). What strongly differentiates our country from others and what makes the topic of prison effects so important to be explored is the length of custodial sentences. The national data (INS, 2009) show that of all persons held in prisons in 2009, only 3% were incarcerated less than one year and 6.7% were serving sentences between 1 and 2 years of detention. Almost 90% were imprisoned more than two years (including for life). In comparison, in Netherlands, 80% of prison sentences are no longer than 6 months (Nieuwebeerta and Dirkzwager, forthcoming). The legitimate questions to which my study will try to find answers are: In what way has changed the lives of people after staying two, five or even more years behind bars? And how these changes affect their further involvement in crime? The responses could constitute as a scientific basis for the future Romanian penal policies regarding imprisonment.

#### *The difficulty elements of the problem*

The difficulties elements of the problem, which my project tries to tackle, rise, first, from the necessity *to clearly and rigorous disentangled the impact of prison* from the impact of other possible sources of influences. In other words, it is important to attribute the changes in different life-domains of the offenders – family and children, employment, human capital, social

networks, offending patterns to the detention experience and not to other experiences, events and circumstances that could also affect these life-domains. Second, earlier studies have methodological difficulties especially associated with the *time framing of the investigation*. The question that rises is: What time period is sufficient enough to capture the influences that custodial sentences exert on former prisoners' lives? Some of the incarceration effects can be identified in a short period of time, but others are more subtle and visible only after long periods of time. Some of the prison influences may not last very long, while others persist for important periods of time. The third difficulty is associated with *the research design used in studying prison effects*. Researchers have usually used a longitudinal, prospective approach, following the evolution of the prisoners from the period when they are in pretrial detention to one or two years after they are released from custody. This type of approach requires a lot of time, and also human and financial resources. Other scholars have used a retrospective design. This also raises some difficulties, for example, some of the respondents could have difficulties in recalling events or in chronological ordering them (Farrall, 2006). However, such difficulties can be partially overcome by using complementarily other sources of data (prison files or interviews with family members).

#### *The limits of the current approaches in the context of the state of the art in the field*

In the international literature, there are certain aspects related to the effects of incarceration that were not yet explored or that only now have begun to capture the interest of the researchers' communities from abroad. One of these aspects regards the lack of evidence about the theoretical mechanisms by which imprisonment has effects on offenders' lives (Nieuwbeerta and Dirkzwager, forthcoming). In the proposed project I will try to overcome this limit, by focusing on that.

#### *2. Objectives*

The aim of the proposed study is to compensate the lack of research in the field of (intended and unintended) consequences of imprisonment in Romania and to link the Romanian criminological research to the international one. The main objective of my project is to examine the effects of incarceration on offenders' main life domains – family and children, employment, human capital, social networks and criminal activity, and to develop a theoretical and empirical model of analysis this topic, adapted to the Romanian realities, model that can be integrate it further into the larger body of international researches and theoretical explanations offered to this

topic. More specifically, I will try to identify to what extent and what is the nature of the prison impact on the inmates' lives, what life-domains are more affected by incarceration and what mechanisms put in motion the prison influences.

The scientific objectives of the project are:

O1: to identify the consequences of incarceration on inmates' criminal activity. If the influences are negative, to what extent and in what way their offending behaviors have suffered qualitative changes under the influences of prison? The answers to these questions will allow me to test some of the hypotheses of the specific deterrence and "schools of crime" theories, but also, to advance and test different hypotheses customized to the Romanian context (such to what extent the Romanian prisoners have acquired and developed an "Western countries-style" of criminality);

O2: to identify the consequences of incarceration on the main aspects of inmates' life – family and children, employment, social networks, human capital. Does imprisonment has no effect on these aspects? It improves them or on contrary, deteriorates them? And if it is the case, how the negative changes induced by prison in these life-domains are related to criminal behavior?

O3: to describe the mechanisms through which prison leaves its stamp on offenders' lives;

O4: to identify what factors can overcome the negative impact of prison on offenders' further criminal behavior and other life domains;

O5: to develop a set of recommendations for penal and social policies.

#### *The elements of originality and innovation of the project*

In Romania, the state of knowledge about the impact of imprisonment on reoffending, and especially about the collateral consequences of incarceration on the lives of the prisoners is, if not lacking, very limited. The only research carried out on prison effects was conducted by P. Dobrica (2009-2012) and focused solely on deculturation as a consequence of incarceration. The project that I propose is a continuation of my PhD thesis which aimed to reveal the main factors that determine and favor recidivism. Although in my dissertation I have identified some influences that the imprisonment exert on reoffending (see also B1), I consider that the topic needs further and extended analyses not only to capture in more detail the effects of prison on criminal activity, but also to identify the collateral consequences of incarceration, which manifest

on the offenders' family and children, employment, human capital, social networks. In the same time, this further analysis is needed in order to identify the mechanisms through which prison exerts its influences.

#### *The potential impact of the project in the broader scientific field*

The impact project on the broader scientific field could be seen on two levels.

A) Nationally, my study will contribute to: a) the development of fundamental research in an area currently not examined in the Romanian scientific literature: the intended and unintended consequences of imprisonment of offenders' lives; b) the efficiency of the imprisonment policies in Romania. The dissemination of the research findings of the project, through: a) publications (2 articles published in prestigious (ISI) journals from abroad and a book in English (print and electronic version) that will be delivered to 25 international and 10 national university libraries); b) research reports provided to different governmental institution (Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Administration and Interior; Ministry of Work and Family, child protection services); c) participation at 2 international conferences; d) organization of a workshop with participants from the academic community, but also from the governmental institutions and e) the webpage of the project, will allow me: a) to promote the results of the project at national level; b) to increase the visibility of Romanian research at the international level.

B) Internationally, as mentioned before, the project aims to link the Romanian criminological research to the international field, by complementing the researches conducted in United States and other Western European countries with the research conducted in a country from South Eastern Europe. It will allow me: a) to overcome some of the limits of the international researches: b) to connect to the international research networks already existing interested in studying prison effects.

### **3. Methodology**

Preferably to study the effects of incarceration one would like do a prospective longitudinal study, i.e. following people before, during and post prison, and with an experimental group (people with (long) prison sentence) and a control group (people with (short) prison sentence). However, in the current situation in Romania, that is impossible. First and most important, because as I mentioned before, the prison sentences are on very long-term and it will take a long time to complete the study. For example, if to an average length of confinement of 3-

5 years, it adds 1-2 years of follow-up, results a period of data collection between 4 and 7 years. Especially for this reason, my study will use *a cross-sectional research design*. In order to have experimental groups and a control group, I will divide the samples according to the length of time they are already imprisoned: already long-term imprisoned (more than 5 years), already middle-term imprisoned (2-5 years) and short-term imprisoned (less than 2 years). By doing this, we can test whether the longer the inmates have been in prison, the more (negative) effects of imprisonment are shown (they have become unemployed, divorced, get a smaller social network, etc.)

The study will use an original and complex methodology that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches. It will be carried out for two samples:

A) *The first sample that we will study in a qualitative analysis, based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews is compound of 30 men incarcerated in two prisons for adults from the country* (one of maximum security and closed regime and one of open and half-open regime). These 30 respondents will be selected from the total number of recidivists held in these two prisons according to their ages and length of custodial sentences: long-term, middle-term and short-term prison sentences. There will be selected those who have between one and three months before entering to the conditional release commission in prison. In addition, I will interview 6 Romanian inmates held in Dutch prisons. The research subjects will be asked to answer to in-depth questions about how their previous incarceration(s), but also the current one has affected their major life domains.

B) *The second sample we will study in a quantitative analysis based on a questionnaire. It is compounded of 300 inmates held in the two prisons mentioned above, proportionally selected from the total number of the prisoners confined in those penal institutions (recidivists and first-time offenders) according to the criteria of inmates' age (young aged 18-21, adults aged 22-50 and older prisoners over 50 years old) and length of incarceration (long-term, middle-term and short-term sentences).* The quantitative data collected through questionnaires will be analyzed using the SPSS statistical program. They will allow me to test different hypotheses (e.g. how prison impact varies according to certain variables: inmate's age, social background, length of imprisonment) and to develop statistical models of prison influence.

To obtain information on their situation in detention and the possible consequences we use various types of instruments:

a) Face-to-face in-depth interviews with 30 prisoners held in Romanian prisons and 6 held in Dutch prisons on topics related to the relationships with parents, brothers and sisters; relationships with wives and children; the economical situation of the family; the children wellbeing; educational and employment experiences; relationships with the peer group; experiences of confinement; criminal careers;

b) In-depth interviews with the relatives of 30 inmates held in Romanian prisons, before or after they visit their relative in prison, on how the incarceration of their family member has affected the children's life and quality of care; family's life (role, relationships, and emotional state); the household financial wellbeing;

c) Questionnaires – prisoners. The sample of 300 prisoners will be asked to fill in questionnaires on topics that follow closely the interview guide;

d) Questionnaires – relatives of prisoners. We will give questionnaires to all the families of the 300 inmate's in our large sample (if they maintain contact with prisoners and come to visit them). Also, the topics included in the questionnaire will follow closely the interview guide for families.

Complementarily to the interviews with these detainees and their families, I will also collect information using official data (mainly, criminal records); they will include variables that describe the subjects' criminal careers until the moment of their admission in prison. Also, through interviews with prison staff and inmates files, I will collect detailed information about: types of programs at which the detainees have participated, their visits and contacts with their families, rewards and disciplinary sanctions etc. This unique design and data collection will provide information that will allow me to identify the possible sources of prison influences on inmates' criminal activity and other major life domains: family and children, employment, human capital, social networks.

*The work plan is detailed in the following table:*

<b>Specific objectives/ Time framing</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables/Research products (results)</b>
Scientific documentation <a href="#"><i>May 2013 – Oct. 2013</i></a>	Review of international literature on intended and unintended effects of prison.	a) Webpage of the project; b) Report of documentary analysis; c) Participation to an international conference.
	Documentation analysis about the use of imprisonment in Romania.	
	Official data analysis on the imprisonment trends in Romania (2000-2012); comparison with other European countries.	
	Documentary stages: Leiden University, Cambridge University.	
Development of the analytic framework of research of prison effects <a href="#"><i>Nov. 2013 – Mar. 2014</i></a>	Elaboration of project methodology.	a) Archive of interviews; b) Statistical database; c) Methodological report.
	Data collection in country and Netherlands.	
	Interviews transcription; SPSS database for data collected through questionnaires.	
Assessing prison impact. O1: Identifying prison effects on criminal activity; O2: Identifying the collateral effects of prison <a href="#"><i>Apr. 2014 – Jul. 2014</i></a>	Interpretation of the interviews. Advancing hypotheses regarding prison effects.	a) Submitting an article for publication in an ISI journal.
	Analysis of quantitative data. Testing hypotheses. Developing statistical models of prison influence.	
	Summer school participation.	
Explaining prison impact. O3: Describing mechanism of prison impact; O4: Identifying the factors that can overcome the negative impact of prison <a href="#"><i>Aug. 2014 – Dec. 2014</i></a>	Developing explanations for prison effects. Qualitative and quantitative data analyses.	a) Submitting an article for publication in an ISI journal; b) Participation to an international conference.
	Elaboration of a theoretical and empirical model of researching prison effects in Romania.	
	Research stage at Leiden University: evaluation, consultations etc.	
Policy recommendations. O5: Development of a set of recommendations for penal and social policies <a href="#"><i>Jan. 2014 – Apr. 2015</i></a>	Advancing a set of penal and social measures that can impede the negative effects of incarceration.	a) Research reports for governmental bodies; b) Book; c) Organization of a workshop; d) Final research report.
	Preparing the book for publishing	
	Organizing an international workshop	

## References

- (1) Arditti, Joyce A., Lambert-Shute, K. Joest (2003). Saturday Morning at the Jail: Implications of Incarceration for Families and Children. *Family Relations*, 52(3): 195-204.
- (2) Arditti, Joyce A. (2005). Families and Incarceration: An Ecological Approach. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 86(2): 251-260.
- (3) Apel, Robert, A.A.J. Blokland, P. Nieuwbeerta and M. van Schellen (2010). The Impact of Imprisonment on Marriage and Divorce: A Risk Set Matching Approach. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 26(2): 269-300.
- (4) Apel, Robert, G. Sweeten (2010). The Impact of Incarceration on Employment during the Transition to Adulthood. *Social Problems*, 57(3): 448-479.
- (5) Bernburg, Jon Gunnar, Marvin D. Krohn (2003). Labeling, Life Chances, and Adult Crime: the Direct and Indirect Effects of Official Intervention in Adolescence on Crime in Early Adulthood. *Criminology*, 41(4): 1287-1318.
- (6) Bersani, Bianca E, J.H. Laub, P. Nieuwbeerta (2009). Marriage and Desistance from Crime in the Netherlands: Do Gender and Socio-Historical Context Matter? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 25(1): 3-24.
- (7) Blokland, Arjan A.J., D. Nagin, P. Nieuwbeerta (2005). Life Span Offending Trajectories of a Dutch Conviction Cohort. *Criminology*, 43 (4): 919-954
- (8) Blokland, Arjan A.J., P. Nieuwbeerta (2005). The Effects of Life Circumstances on Longitudinal Trajectories of Offending. *Criminology*, 43(4): 1203-1240.
- (9) Bushway, Shawn D., P. Nieuwbeerta, A.A.J. Blokland (2011). The Predictive Value of Criminal Background Checks: Do Age and Criminal History Affect Time to Redemption? *Criminology*, 49(1): 27-60.
- (10) Clear, Todd R. (2008). The Effects of High Imprisonment Rates on Communities. *Crime and Justice*, 37(1): 97-132.
- (11) Clemmer, Donald (1940). *The Prison Community*. Rinehart: New York.
- (12) Damboeanu, Cristina (2011). The Recidivism Phenomenon in Romania. *Quality of Life*, 3: 295-312 (in Romanian).
- (13) Damboeanu, Cristina (2010). Factors that Encourage Recidivism. A Typology of the Career Offenders. *Romanian Sociology*, 3: 82-97 (in Romanian).
- (14) Ezell, Michael E., Lawrence E. Cohen (2005). *Desistance from Crime. Continuities and Change in Long-Term Patterns of Serious Chronic Offender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (15) European Council, *Annual Penal Statistics SPACE I*, Strasbourg, March 2011.

- (16) Farrall Stephen (2006). *What is Qualitative Longitudinal Research?*. LSE Methodology Institute, Papers in Social Research Methods, Qualitative Series, Paper 11, available at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/methodologyInstitute>.
- (17) Gendreau, Paul, Claire Goggin, Francis T. Cullen (1999). *The Effects of Prison Sentences on Recidivism*, Ontario: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- (18) Godfrey, S. Barry, David J. Cox, Stephan D. Farrall (2007). *Criminal Lives. Family Life, Employment and Offending*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (19) Graffam, Joseph, Alison J. Shinkfield, Lesley Hardcastle (2008). The Perceived Employability of Ex-Prisoners and Offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52(6): 673-685.
- (20) Harris, Patricia M., Kimberly S. Keller (2005). Ex-Offenders Need Not Apply. The Criminal Background Check in Hiring Decisions. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21(1): 6-30.
- (21) Henry, Jessica S., James B. Jacobs (2007). Ban the Box to Promote Ex-offender Employment. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 6(4):755-762.
- (22) Huebner ,B.M. (2005). The Effects of Incarceration on Marriage and Work over the Life Course. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3): 281-303.
- (23) INS (2009). Statistics Annual 2010. Chapter 22: Justice (available at: [www.insse.ro](http://www.insse.ro)).
- (24) Laub, John H., Robert J. Sampson (2003). *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives. Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.
- (25) Laub, John H., Robert J. Sampson (2001). *Understanding Desistance from Crime*. In Tonry Michael (ed.), "Crime and Justice: A Review of Research", 28: 1-69.
- (26) Leverentz, Andrea M. (2006). The Love of a Good Man? Romantic Relationships as a Source of Support or Hindrance for Female Ex-Offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43(4): 459-488.
- (27) Lynch, James, William J. Sabol, (2004). Assessing the Impacts of Mass Incarceration on Informal Social Control in Communities. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 3(2): 267-269.
- (28) MacKenzie, Doris Layton (2006). *What Works in Corrections. Reducing the Criminal Activities of Offenders and Delinquents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (29) Maguire, Mike, Peter Raynor (2006). *How the Resettlement of Prisoners Promotes Desistance from Crime: Or Does It?* *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1):19-38.
- (30) Maruna, Shadd, Hans Toch (2005). The Impact of Imprisonment on the Desistance Process. In Jeremy Travis, Christy Visser (ed.), "Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 139-178.
- (31) Morgan, Rod, Alison Lieblich (2007). Imprisonment: An Expanding Scene. In Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan, Robert Reiner (ed.), "The Oxford Handbook of Criminology", 4th edition, p. 1100-1138.

- (32) Murray, Joseph (2005). The Effects of Imprisonment on Families and Children of Prisoners. In Alison Lieblich and Shadd Maruna (ed.), "The Effects of Imprisonment", Willan Publishing, p 442-462.
- (33) Murray, Joseph (2007). The Cycle of Punishment: Social Exclusion of Prisoners and their Children. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7(1): 55-81.
- (34) Naser, Rebecca L., Christy A. Visher (2006). Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry. *Western Criminology Review*, 7(2): 20-31.
- (35) Nieuwbeerta, Paul, Daniel S. Nagin, A. A. J. Blokland (2009). Assessing the Impact of First-Time Imprisonment on Offenders' Subsequent Criminal Career Development: A Matched Samples Comparison. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 25(3): 227-257.
- (36) Nieuwbeerta, Paul., A.J.E. Dirkzwager (2012). Prison Project: A Panel Study on the Intended and Unintended Consequences of Imprisonment. In: Balica C., P. Decarpes, (ed.), "Violence and Crime in Europe". Bucharest. (in print).
- (37) Pager, D. (2003). The Mark of a Criminal Record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5): 937-975.
- (38) Paternoster, Raymond, Robert Brame, David P. Farrington (2001). On the Relationship between Adolescent and Adult Conviction Frequencies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17(3): 201-225.
- (39) Piquero, Alex R. (2004). Explaining Crime over the Life Course ... and All Points in Between. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 95(1): 345-363.
- (40) Rakt, M. van de, J. Murray, P. Nieuwbeerta (2012). The Long Term Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Criminal Trajectories of Children. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49(1): 81-108.
- (41) Sampson, Robert J., John H. Laub (2005). Life Course Desisters? Trajectories of Crime Among Delinquent Boys Followed to Age 70. *Criminology*, 41: 555-592.
- (42) Shinkfield, Alison J., Joseph Graffam (2009). Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners: Type and Degree of Change in Variables Influencing Successful Reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(1): 29-42.
- (43) Snodgrass, G.M., A.A.J. Blokland, A. Haviland, P. Nieuwbeerta, D.S. Nagin (2011). Does the Time Cause the Crime? An Examination of the Relationship between Time Served and Reoffending in the Netherlands. *Criminology*, 49(4): 1149-1194.
- (44) Spohn, Cassia, D. Holleran (2002). The Effects of Imprisonment on Recidivism Rates of Felony Offenders. *Criminology*, 40(2): 329-357.
- (45) Sykes, Gresham, David Matza (1957). Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6): 664-670.
- (46) Sykes, Gresham, S.L. Messinger (1960). The Inmate Social System. In: Cloward R.A. et al (eds.), *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prisons*. Social Science Research Council, p. 5-19.
- (47) Uggen, Christopher, Jeff Manza, Angela Behrens (2004). „Less Than the Average Citizen”: Stigma, Role Transition and the Civic Reintegration of Convicted Felons. In Maruna Shadd, Immarigeon Russ (ed.), "After Crime and Punishment. Pathways to Offender Reintegration", Willan Publishing, p. 261-293.

- (48) Uggen, Christopher, Sara Wakefield, Bruce Western (2005). Work and Family Perspectives on Reentry. In Travis Jeremy, Visher Christy (ed.), "Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America", Cambridge University Press, p. 209-243.
- (49) Visher, Christy A., Jeremy Travis (2003). Transition from Prison to Community: Understanding the Individual Pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 89-113.
- (50) Wakefield, Sara, C. Uggen (2010). Incarceration and Stratification. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 387-406.
- (51) Ward, Tony, Maruna Shadd (2007). *Rehabilitation. Beyond the Risk Paradigm*. London and New York: Routledge.
- (52) Western, Bruce (2002). The Impact of Incarceration on Wage Mobility and Inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4): 526-546.
- (53) Wermink, H., A. Blokland, P. Nieuwebeerta, D. Nagin, N. Tollenaar (2010). Comparing the Effects of Community Service and Short-Term Imprisonment on Recidivism: A Matched Samples Approach. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 6(3): 325-349.
- (54) Wormith, J. Stephen, Richard Althouse, Mark Simpson, Lorraine R. Reitzel, Thomas J. Fagan, Robert D. Morgan (2007). The Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders. The Current Landscape and Some Future Directions for Correctional Psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(7): 879-892.