

УДК 343.26:343.8

## **PRISON REHABILITATION IN UKRAINE: A CASE OF KHARKIV REGION**

**Marianna Klochko** – PhD Associate Professor of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Marion Campus

*This article addresses the issue of "time discounting" and its relationship with deviant behavior, whereas higher levels of delinquency are affected by a desire for immediate gratification, or high level of discounting of behavioral consequences. Ideally rehabilitation process should help prisoners to extend their time horizons and start valuing the future, which will help to prevent future deviant behavior. Data analysis showed that in Ukraine the ability to defer gratification is more likely to be exhibited by females, older people, those who receive letters by mail, and those who are single. Contradictory to the initial expectations time discounting is actually increased with factors such as spending time in mandatory rehabilitation programs, spending time in prison, and being in prison repeatedly, which allows us to start questioning the effectiveness of prison rehabilitation.*

**Keywords:** prison rehabilitation, time discounting, gender differences, prisonization.

*Подана стаття присвячена питанню дисконтування часу та його зв'язку з проявами девіантної поведінки особистості, де орієнтація на миттєве задоволення потреб призводить до підвищення рівня девіантності. Ідеальний процес перевиховання повинен допомогти ув'язненим змінити їх сприйняття часу та оцінку ними майбутнього, що, в свою чергу, може запобігти проявам девіантності в поведінці. Дослідження, проведене в Харківській області, продемонструвало, що здатність до очікування отримання задоволення найбільш яскраво виявляється у жінок, людей, старших за віком, неодружених, а також тих, які отримують листи від значущих для них людей. Всупереч припущенням, рівень дисконтування майбутнього збільшився не тільки у тих, хто брав участь в обов'язкових реабілітаційних програмах, але й у тих, хто знаходився в ув'язненні протягом більш довгострокового терміну, а також у рецидивістів. Виявлена тенденція дозволяє нам припустити наступне: система реабілітації ув'язнених не є ефективною для процесу перевиховання.*

**Ключові слова:** реабілітація ув'язнених, дисконтування часу, гендерні розбіжності.

*В данной статье рассматривается проблема дисконтирования времени и её связь с девиантным поведением, где ориентация на немедленное удовлетворение потребностей приводит к повышению уровня девиантности. Идеальный процесс перевоспитания должен помочь заключённым изменить их восприятие времени и оценку ими будущего, что, в свою очередь, может предотвратить проявления девиантности в поведении. Анализ исследования, проведённого в Харьковской области, показывает, что способность к ожиданию получения удовольствия наиболее ярко выражена у женщин, людей старшего возраста, неженатых (незамужних), и тех, кто получает письма от значимых для них людей. Вопреки изначальным предположениям уровень дисконтирования будущего увеличился не только у тех, кто участвовал в обязательных реабилитационных программах, но и у тех, кто находился в заключении в течение более длительного периода, а также у рецидивистов. Обнаруженная закономерность позволяет нам предположить следующее: система тюремной реабилитации неэффективна для перевоспитания заключённых.*

**Ключевые слова:** тюремная реабилитация, дисконтирование будущего, гендерные отличия

This paper introduces the idea of time discounting into prison population analysis -that is, how prisoners view and value the future. The literature on deviant behavior emphasizes that the source of behavior such as drug abuse, crime and gang membership is the demand for immediate gratification. In other words, those engaged in such behavior take into account the immediate benefits of their actions (e.g. stealing or selling drugs) but fail to account for long-term consequences of their choices, such as being caught, serving time in prison, and the subsequent diminution of their opportunities once released from prison with a criminal record (Gottfredson and Hirshi, 1990; Piquero and Tibbetts, 1996). It is, then, a common notion in public policy that incarcerated individuals, while serving their time in prison, are hopefully subject to a change of some sort: specifically, that of being rehabilitated and ready to re-join society. Thus, we can hypothesize that one of the traits which is presumably altered by a successful rehabilitation program is a person's time discount. From a policy standpoint, then, it is reasonable to expect that incarcerated individuals, in order to be successfully prepared for re-entry will have had their individual time discounting rate minimized by participation in educational, religious, vocational and other on-site programs.

Here we ask whether such programs are effective or even meaningfully implemented in Ukraine in the light of deterioration of public and governmental institutions in the aftermath of dissolution of Soviet Union? Specifically, we want to see if incarceration in the contemporary Ukrainian prison system contributes in any way to a rehabilitation that helps prisoners become productive members of society. We also ask whether rehabilitation as measured by time preferences is more likely for women versus men? Do the incarceration experiences of males and females differ?

The time discounting studies (Davids and Falkof 1975) show that females tend to value the future more highly than males (have a higher propensity to save than males). If we make this assumption than the rehabilitation experiences should also be different depending on the gender. The Criminology literature, especially Feminist approach, points out that the patterns and trends of lawbreaking are different for females. Feminists especially stress the necessity of studying women because they are different from men and one cannot make the same assumptions about their behavior (for more detailed account of this argument see Daly 1998, Chesney-Lind 1989, Smith and Paternoster 1987). To address these issues in the next section we describe a questionnaire that was administered among Ukrainian prisons' population in the course of Summer 2006. It has to be noted here that the sample of inmates is limited to the Eastern Ukraine and might not be a representative of the Ukrainian prison population overall. Many respondents did not answer some questions; therefore some logit analysis had decreased number of data points to analyze to 97, 93 and 55 respondents. The significant reduction of the sample therefore can lessen our ability to generalize and draw conclusions. Also, the females represent about 23% of the sample which means that we only have 47 data points to analyze.

**Data:**

Our data, consisting of 206 completed questionnaires, were collected in the summer of 2006 in all male (medium level of security) and all female (minimal level of security) institutions by the Kharkiv Institute of Social Research<sup>1</sup>. The questions included in the survey are as follows:

**Gender:**

Out of 206 respondents 159 are males and 47 females (77.2% and 22.8% respectively).

**Family Status:**

'Family status' indicates the married -unmarried status of the prisoner, with coding of a low number corresponding to being married and a high number to being single. The other two categories included in this question were 'divorced' and 'widowed'. As opposite to what one would have expected based on studies of time discounting (Rubin and Paul 1979) it seems that single people in this sample have a higher probability of postponing immediate gratification. However, this relationship can be skewed by the fact that 54% of respondents are single (20.4% are married).

Another question which addresses the family situation measures the number of children the respondents have, where this variable ranges from 0 (no children) to 8, with the mean of .79 children. The number of women who have one child is significantly higher than number of men (44.7% vs. 28.3%). Also, the number of women having three or more children (21.1%) exceeds the number of men (4.3%). It is difficult to hypothesize what accounts for such relatively high proportions of mothers with children in prisons, or why females seem not to be deterred from committing the types of crimes that would result in incarceration by the need to provide for the family? We can hypothesize [but cannot test] that women feel more responsible than males to provide for the family and therefore engage in theft or other similar activity to gain resources in the troubled economy that a post-Soviet transition engenders. Women, on average, tend to engage in violent behavior less than men. In fact, the data shows that burglary and theft is indeed the largest offense category for females (36.4%) comparing to assault for males (36%). One of the more difficult issues to explain is why there are more women (19.1%) than men (6.9%) in our sample who committed murder, given that murder is a violent offense? It could be the specificity of the sample (e.g. small size, regional characteristics) or the fact that if a woman commits murder it is usually in self -defense or as a result of domestic abuse. Ukraine is a more patriarchal society than the USA, in which case the effects of the culture on domestic abuse rates are accentuated. Indeed domestic violence is a sizable problem in Ukrainian society, with a great number of women suffering from abuse and in some cases reacting to violence with an attack on the perpetrator (Banwell et al. 2000). The existence of 'domestic violence' as a legal category has only been recently recognized: "the law does not construct domestic violence as a crime, mitigating or absolving domestic violence by claiming that alcohol or drugs and women's provocation can cause domestic violence" (Johnson, 2007: 389). This can leave woman facing the perpetrator with no sizable help from the state thus forcing her to resort to violence as a method of defense.

**Family contact:**

The initial hypothesis suggests that the contact with one's family will increase the identification with life outside of prison and minimize the associations with fellow inmates thus potentially decreasing the degree of

---

<sup>1</sup> The author wishes to thank Alexey Serdyuk of Kharkiv Institute of Social Research for his assistance in the administration of the questionnaire used in this study.

prisonization. There were few questions targeting this issue in the questionnaire. The inmates were asked how many letters they got from their family and how many letters they wrote to the family in a past month. Also, we asked about the visitation frequency in a past 2 months. Our males subsample tends to have smaller proportion of people who receive no letters from the family (2.03 versus 7.25 for females). There are two alternative explanations that might be applicable here. One possible explanation suggests that if the inmate is male, his most likely visitor is his mother or wife/girlfriend. Females tend to be more communicative/ devoted/ oriented to visitation than males, therefore they are more likely to visit their partner in prison. Another explanation rests on the fact that being in prison is relatively rare for females so they are more likely to be shunned/ostracized by their families (e.g. families stop all the contact: both written and visitations).

Of course, we can also think of the effects of imprisonment on marital status and, as a result, on the support the prisoner is likely to receive. It seems that the intimate relationships tend to dissipate after the incarceration and it indeed affects more women than men. Judith Pallot, analyzing life in Russian prisons, notes that “according to the 1999 Census, among men prisoners who were married at the time of sentencing, 31.5% divorced while in prison, and the figure for women was 47.7%. Against this, some 3.9% of male prisoners and 1.8% of female prisoners had married while in prison” (Pallot, 2007:583). Clearly, there is a significant discrepancy between sexes especially concerning keeping and establishing new relationships after the prison term starts.

Females can also be much more desperate for family contacts: females tend to write more letters to the family than males (on average 3.6 vs. 2.9), also only 4.4% of females wrote no letters to the family, yet a significantly bigger number (31.9%) got no letters from the family. For males, the proportions are less drastic: 14.6% and 29.7%. The lack of letters from the family can possibly be connected to the lack of packages which are very important part of inmate's life, because, according to Liudmila Alpern's research on Russian correctional institutions, female prisons have a hierarchy where one's position is determined by how many packages one receives. In contrast, the hierarchy in a male prison is determined by one's criminal past. (Alpern 2001[2]: 34). Given that Ukraine was part of the Soviet Union with Russia we can assume similar gender differences for Ukrainian prisons.

#### **Time Preference**

One of the crucial questions which serve as a main measure of the demand for immediate gratification vs. extended time horizon was where we ask respondents whether they prefer 100 HRN today or 500 HRN in the future (6 months from today). (HRN stands for Hryvnia – the national Ukrainian currency, where 1\$ approximates~ 5 HRN). This question is used extensively in other studies of time preference (with currency variations, of course) and, since we want to develop a research agenda consistent with and comparable to earlier research, is an appropriate measurement tool in the analysis of time preferences here (for more discussion see Klochko 2006). In our combined sample this preference is distributed rather equally: 49.7% prefers 100 HRN today and 50.3% prefer 500 HRN in the future. The questionnaire provides us with more than one measure of time discounting, which include questions about prison lottery (with a reward being a dinner) and the length of time one chooses to wait for the monetary reward. Even though those measures are less traditional than the above mentioned one we still use them to provide a more complex measure of time discounting. We will discuss the less traditional measures later in this paper.

Comparing male and female respondents one can easily see the significant difference between them: 52.7% of men and 39% of women choose immediate reward, whereas 47.3% of men and 61% of women choose to wait. Indeed, as we show later, being a female positively correlates with choosing the higher reward in the future.

#### **Analysis:**

To begin to understand this difference is to introduce the issue of certainty. One can hypothesize that if prisoner was more certain about life after the prison and its potential for success, he/she might be more likely to develop a longer time horizon. Also, expressed certainty about things like finding a job upon release and knowing someone who could help when first reentering society indicate that a person has spent some time thinking about the future, which should have the effect of extending their time horizon. In trying to address the issue of certainty we ask few questions about the future, such as ‘Do you know someone who could help you with finding a job once you finish your sentence?’ The first thing to notice about our data insofar as explaining differences in time preferences of males and females is to note that females are more certain that they can find a job upon release, which suggests that they have wider social networks (e.g. they know someone who could help to find a job) -- (83%-females and 68.4%-males). However, when we take into account the effects of gender and other parameters (see Table1: models 3 and 4) the positive answer to this question paradoxically indicates a lesser probability to choose the future reward. Why a negative correlation? Does this mean that the perceived existence of social support in the future does not necessarily affect time horizons?

It is important to note that the job market in Ukraine had experienced dramatic changes after the structural changes which started to be implemented after so-called ‘perestroika’ in 1986. The research on wage changes between 1986 and 2003 shows the “large exodus of low wage female workers” as well as “large decline in employment over this period, especially for females” (Ganguli et al. 2006:223). The analysis of unemployment in

Ukraine points out that “by western standards, Ukrainian displaced workers have low return rates” and “female workers have substantially lower return rates” (Lehmann et al, 2006: 257, 261) after they have experienced unemployment. This means that many unemployed workers spend an excessive length of time not being able to find a job. Moreover, unemployment creates a large income loss which “would be exaggerated if individuals work in the informal sector, which is estimated to be substantial in Ukraine” (Lehman et al. 2006: 258). These findings might be in effect interpreted as an indicator of higher difficulty of finding a job for females in an unstable job market. We are looking at an economy wherein a large percentage of employment is located in the informal sector, which increases both the degree of uncertainty and higher losses in case of unemployment given that there are no unemployment benefits here. Females might have wider social networks and they might believe that their chances of finding job can be better. However, the harsh reality of a transitional economy combined with high level of unemployment, especially for females, might ultimately prevent them from getting or/and keeping a job.

Admittedly, of course, the number of women in our sample may be too small for definitive conclusions. Nevertheless, let us now address the results of the logit regressions in greater detail (Table 1: models 1 through 4). Clearly, looking at models 3 and 4, one of the more significant parameters is gender: being a female corresponds to having a lower level of individual time discounting (i.e., a greater propensity to receiving 500 H in six months as against 100 H today). The literature on time discounting supports this finding, noting that women tend to discount future less than men because they bear children and are responsible for the most of children’s socialization process (Davids and Falkof 1975). It is interesting, nevertheless, that this relationship does not always hold true. In a study of Ukrainian students the relationship of gender has an opposite effect (see Klochko 2006).

It is interesting that being single has more positive bearing on time discount rates than being married (see models 2 through 4). Traditionally it is assumed that being married extends one’s time horizons because of child rearing concerns. Our counterintuitive finding might indicate that being married creates immediate concern for the family, having to support it in times of economic transition (or perhaps, owing to incarceration, deprivation).

Another statistically significant parameter is age (which, when we contrast the various models in Table 1 (models 1, 3 and 4), seems to gain significance as we add more variables in the equation). Briefly, older respondents tend to have lower discounting rates, which is a relationship that tends to be supported by other research in the field: older people seem to have learned better than younger population to defer–immediate gratification (see Davids and Falkof 1975, Rubin and Paul 1979, Rogers 1994). This relationship between time preference and age might also explain the propensity for drugs and gang behavior in younger crowd.

It is interesting to note that family visits (Model 4) tend to negatively affect the degree of time discounting. We can only speculate that perhaps having family members visit often tend to remind the inmate of family needs and the problems the family faces without them, especially if one has children. This could potentially suggest a need for more detailed analysis and the introduction of multiplicative model. Initially it was hypothesized that having family visits would improve the rates of time discounting by having the inmate look forward to spending time with the family and being outside of the prison walls. Nevertheless, frequent visitations as well as number of family members visiting seem to have the opposite effect. A similar line of reasoning might emphasize the difficulty of arranging the visits for the family, so when family members meet there may be a tendency to discuss all of the obstacles, psychological as well as financial, the family is experiencing. Anton Oleinik notes that while comparing the frequency of visits in Canadian, French and Ukrainian institutions one can see significant differences: “If in France and Canada about two thirds of inmates have had visits of their close relatives during last month, only 43.8% of Ukrainian inmates have family visits” (Oleinik 2006: 166). This finding highlights the relative deprivation of Ukrainian inmates and it might support our earlier argument.

Table 1.

**Dependent variable: \$100 HRN today vs. 500 HRN in 6 months**

	<b>Model 1 (n=99)</b>	<b>Model 2 (n=98)</b>	<b>Model 3 (n=95)</b>	<b>Model 4 (n=70)</b>
<i>Intercept</i>	-1.812 (2.216)	-2.188 (1.286)*	-3.178(2.369)*	4.037 (5.087)
<i>Age</i>	.043 (.026)*	.034 (.028)	.069 (.035)**	.102 (047)**
<i>Education</i>	.004 (.203)	.003 (.213)	-.015 (.241)	.037 (.357)
<i>Family status</i>	.263 (.181)	.357 (.206)*	.363 (.236)*	.508 (.394)*
<i>Hours Rehab</i>	-.025 (.018)	-.025 (.019)	-.015 (.022)	-.010 (.030)
<i>Children</i>	---	.191 (.231)	-.029 (.250)	.384 (.419)
<i>Months spent</i>	---	-.003 (.007)	---	
<i>Months left</i>	---	.011 (.009)	---	
<i>Time spent vs. left</i>	---	---	-.297 (1.165)	-.363 (1.657)

<i>Sex</i>	---	---	1.410 (.621)**	1.691 (.867)**
<i>Second time</i>	---	---	-.674 (.870)	-.918 (1.260)
<i>Living arrangement</i>	---	---	.284 (.504)	-.288 (.884)
<i>Meet at the release</i>	---	---	.127 (.602)	-.228 (1.108)
<i>Help Finding job</i>	---	---	-1.251 (.545)**	-1.568 (.721)**
<i>Borrow money</i>	---	---	.290 (.424)	.554 (.582)
<i>Enough money</i>	---	---	.249 (.221)	.347 (.306)
<i>Family visits</i>	---	---	---	-1.130 (.565)**
<i>All visits</i>	---	---	---	.410 (.462)
<i>Recvd. family letters</i>	---	---	---	.416 (.445)
<i>Letters sent</i>	---	---	---	-.696 (.457)*
<i>Visit frequency (fam)</i>	---	---	---	-1.060 (.759)*
<i>Seriousness of crime</i>	---	---	---	-.443 (.307)*
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	.068	.097	.26	.448

It is also surprising to see that the number of letters sent to one's family is negatively related to one's rate of time discounting (Model 4). Receiving letters though has the opposite effect. The data shows that the sent letters are not always reciprocated (especially in the case of women), so a sent letters might add to the frustration and difficulty in identifying with life on the 'outside', whereas received letters (albeit not a significant parameter) might help the incarcerated to identify with their family and the free life that awaits them in the future.

The more serious the crime the individual committed the less likely one is to orient oneself to the future (Model 4). Possible explanations for this relationship might involve the length of the sentence (people usually receive longer sentences for more serious crimes) as well as the fact that people who commit more serious crime might be much more present oriented than those who commit less serious crime to begin with. Thus, it might take longer for serious offenders to change or it might be less possible for them to change.

The surprising and wholly unanticipated result here, however, is that the more time one spends in a Ukrainian prison compared to how much time is left in one's sentence the less likely is one to exhibit a longer time horizon. Even though this parameter is not significant in the equation it consistently has a negative sign in both models 3 and 4. This makes us contemplate the efficiency of prison in whatever constitutes a rehabilitation process in Ukraine. Numerous studies address the negative effect of 'prison culture' on rehabilitation; perhaps what we observe in this analysis points us in the same direction. In fact, Donald Clemmer in his study of a prison community notes that "every man who enters the penitentiary undergoes prisonization to some extent" (Clemmer 1940: 299). He sees the process of prisonization as acquiring by the individual of "folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (Clemmer 1940: 299). He notes, however, that the process of incarceration does not affect everyone in the same way. Some prisoners acquire certain way of dressing and talking, but they might not necessarily "breed or deepen criminality and antisociality and make the inmate characteristic of the criminalistic ideology in the prison community" (Clemmer 1940: 300). This deeper level of what we might call 'prisonization' depends on a variety of factors, primarily the personality of the individual, his or her ability to resist joining prison's primary groups and being able to associate with prison workers, and therefore with an outside world; but also on the depth of the relationships with the people outside the prison, vs. inside, plus, of course, the likelihood of placement in a close proximity with some of the antisocial and more criminal inmates in terms of work assignments or allocation of sleeping quarters. Interestingly enough Clemmer (1940: 301) asserts that the least degree of prisonization can be achieved (among other things) if an inmate has a short term punishment and is not going to spend much time in prison, which goes along with the results of this survey which suggests that the longer you stay in prison the less likely you are to discount future less (see models 3 and 4).

Being imprisoned can also has negative effect on rehabilitation if we look on the process of learning, as the new inmates might learn from those who are already in prison, and this learning would include the learning of a criminal trade. This assertion is supported by the study of several prisons conducted by Arnulf Kolstad. He notes that "nine out of ten respondents agreed partly or completely that prisons were universities where they learned how to offend as well as learned deviant behavior and ways of thinking. Two-thirds of the first timers definitely agreed and none of the recidivists disagreed" (Kolstad 1996: 329).

With this as background along with our findings in models 1-5, it is important to note that Ukrainian prisons were criticized by European observation commission for Council of Europe (2002) for their poor conditions. Human Rights report also acknowledges the devastating conditions of Ukrainian prisons (2005): "Torture and ill-treatment continues to be a significant problem in police detention and prisons in Ukraine. Ukraine's human rights ombudsman receives numerous complaints of torture from criminal suspects and estimates that 30 percent of all detainees may become victims of torture or ill-treatment by law enforcement

agents. ... Prison conditions in Ukraine continue to be poor. Prisons are overcrowded, and prisoners have insufficient access to food and health care. As in many other former-Soviet nations, tuberculosis is widespread in prisons". (Human Rights Watch Report, 2005: <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2005/01/13/ukrain9884.htm>). US Government in its report on Human Rights practices notes (2006) that "problems with the police and the penal system remained some of the most serious human rights concerns. Problems included torture in pretrial detention facilities; wrongful confinement in psychiatric hospitals; harsh conditions in prisons and pretrial detention facilities; and arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention" (Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (2006) Released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor March 6, 2007: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2006/78846.htm>). In a release on the Kharkiv Human Rights Group website, "the editor of TV-Vhoru newspaper reported on the experiences of a man in Kherson who was sentenced to 15 days for "minor hooliganism" and who was forced to pay \$30 (150 hryvnia) for his stay in "special prison facilities." According to the prisoner, there were four people in his cell, a bucket for the only toilet, the lights were dim, filthy mattresses were not replaced for new prisoners, all print materials were banned, and he did not receive food in the first 24 hours in his cell".

The poor prison conditions and human rights violations in Ukraine could also be illustrated by the "five group suicide attempts in prisons and detention centers. Human rights NGOs explained that these incidents resulted from harsh treatment of prisoners by facility administrators: prisoners were searched, beaten, and their food destroyed. In two instances, prisoners ended up in solitary confinement or received longer sentences for the suicide attempts". There were also criminal cases initiated against the administrators of two pretrial detention cases in Lviv region for abuse of power. One of the cases was brought to the attention of authorities after "27 prisoners cut themselves in protest against harsh prison conditions that included administrators demanding bribes from prisoners, refusing to feed them, and using excessive force".

As far as health conditions are concerned, tuberculosis in prisons continues to be a problem despite officials' statements that this health issue is under control. It has been reported "that tuberculosis remains widespread in the prison population. ... The Dnipropetrovsk Human Rights Society reported that in 10 prison and detention facilities they had monitored TB patients were put in overcrowded prison hospital wards with 54-104 beds per 60 square meters, limited daylight, damp air, poor bathroom facilities, improper and often expired food, and insufficient medicine." "It would appear that the antiquated prison system, and within it the chronically underfunded prison health system, has fallen out of the public expenses register; thus there is no form of accountability to the public and the public purse, and therefore to the public conscience" observes Brykczynska (2002: 366) in her comments on quality of prison health system in Ukraine.

The system apparently lacks transparency and does not welcome international observers. "The government allowed prison visits by human rights observers but observers reported difficulties in getting full access to prisons and pretrial detention facilities in some cases. The Ukrainian Red Cross Society said that it had no problems in all of its prison and pretrial detention center access requests. However, domestic human rights organizations, such as the Ukrainian-American Human Rights Bureau, reported that the penal system had become more closed since the Orange Revolution, lacked effective oversight, and access to prisons by journalists and human rights activists was more limited. Prisoners and detainees were permitted to file complaints with the ombudsman for human rights about the conditions of detention, but human rights groups reported that prisoners were sometimes punished for doing so." (Country Reports on Human Rights Practices). Here is an excerpt from a letter received by the newspaper «Pravda Ukrainy», (No.26, 19 February 2002): «I am a convict of Alchevsk colony No. 13. We beg you to help us. ... all what happens in the colony may not be described. In the working zone they switched off heating. The frost was hard, we had to build fires in the buildings. All this time they extracted money from us for electric energy. As to the nourishment, it is uneatable.

*We, certainly, may not pretend to order food in a restaurant, but the administration even does not permit to get food from relatives. Our colony is for TB cases.*

*I do not dare to sign the letter – I want to survive». (As taken from the report of Kharkiv Human Rights website: [http://www.khpg.org/data/2004/1095798001\\_torture.pdf](http://www.khpg.org/data/2004/1095798001_torture.pdf)).*

Clearly, the poor conditions cited by the preceding reports cannot be relied upon as a motivator for rehabilitation. The dire incarceration conditions might prompt prisoners to form their own survival code which would stress the immediate concern for food and physical comfort, as opposite to cultivating the positive outlook and teaching inmates to think about their future. The contemporary analysis of punishment systems by Whitman (2003) tries to interpret the degree of harshness of those systems while comparing United States, France and Germany. While the analysis does not directly pertain to Ukraine it points out that both Durkheim and Tocqueville predicted the decrease in harshness of punishment with the increase of equality and 'contractualization' (Whitman, 2003:7). If we follow the rhetoric it is not surprising to see that Ukrainian punishment can be interpreted as cruel. In the process of post-Soviet transformation the system has accentuated inequality not only on

the level of status (e.g. via party privilege and unequal distribution of perks typical of Soviet times) but more so on a level of income (due to the emergence of private enterprise and shadow economy). With rising levels of inequality and virtually non-existent 'contractualization' of a market-based economy we cannot expect a trend toward more humane punishment. Indeed while the majority of Ukrainians are trying to survive in a turbulent economy the concern for imprisoned population conditions could not have been any less pronounced.

Our initial hypotheses predicted the positive effect of spending time in rehabilitation programs (e.g. drug cessation, spiritual development, physical development, etc.). However, the data suggests that the more hours an individual spends in what is labeled a rehabilitation program in Ukrainian prison the more likely one is to prefer immediate gratification (see models 1 through 4: even though this parameter is not quite significant the correlation is negative). This might indicate the poor quality of rehabilitation programs or the fact that these programs are mandatory in Ukrainian prisons and intended merely to occupy a prisoner's time. When someone makes a conscious decision to participate in something it always has stronger effect than when someone is forced to participate in an activity that might be beneficial. In other words, a mandatory parameter might cancel out all the positive effects. (One might think of students who take elective as opposite to required classes. Generally, elective classes enjoy higher level of participation and better grades than required classes). We can also speak of a prison's personnel who are supposedly placed there to facilitate the rehabilitation process. Indeed Alpern, while analyzing Russian prisons, notes that psychologist in prison can affect how the inmate thinks; for example, placing the importance on one's future. However, she finds that psychologists more often than not end up working for prisons, not for prisoners. They do not try to determine the initial trauma which leads to crime but rather draw on the current psychological profile acquired after the inmate spends a significant amount of time in prison. (Alpern 2001[1]: 61). Oleinik notes that the psychologists only started to appear in Russian and Ukrainian prisons only by the end of 1990s. "The surveys conducted in 2003 show that the level of both anticipated and received help from psychologists and social workers is significantly lower in Russia and Ukraine than in Canada" (Oleinik 2006: 166). In fact inmates in post-Soviet prisons do not expect much help from the staff and mostly rely on God (35.1%) (Oleinik 2006: 166-167). As far as other staff members go, Alpern notes that prison work is considered to be prestigious, especially in the areas where there is a deficit of 'good' jobs. As a result people are hired because of their friendship and relative's networks, not because of superior qualifications or any evident commitment to rehabilitation (Alpern 2001[1]: 81). The bottom line here is that the rehabilitation process ends up compromised. To echo these findings let us also offer an insight from Oleinik's work who notes that "moral considerations play a visibly more important role in the two Western countries than in the three post-Soviet ones. It could mean that French and Canadian prisons are more oriented to the task of rehabilitation than their post-Soviet counterparts" (Oleinik 2006: 177).

#### ***Prison lottery***

As a partial check now on the conclusions we have reached on the basis of the monetary choice posed by our first measure of time preference, let us turn to the additional indicators of time preference that we included in the survey, and which provide respondents with non-monetary indicators that might be more salient within prison confines, such as having a nice dinner or an extra visitation. One question we asked was "Imagine that you won the prison lottery, which prize would you choose: one dinner this week, two dinners next week or three dinners next month?" Given that this question has three options to choose from we have run an ordinal regression the results of which are depicted in Table 2. Because only 9.3% chose second option (e.g. 2 dinners next week) this option was grouped together with third option (e.g. 3 dinners next month). Table 3 then shows the modified version of the question about dinner lottery and the three logit regressions which we were able to run. It is interesting to observe that for this question females almost uniformly choose the most immediate reward (as opposite to their answer to the monetary question (80%). Table 2 shows that gender, while an insignificant factor, changes its sign comparing to Table 1. Gender has the same sign in Table 3 as in Table 2 but it becomes one of the most significant parameters in the equation. Age also changes its sign in this equation, where now being older corresponds to a higher probability of choosing the immediate reward. Note that while age remains an insignificant parameter in Table 2 and first two models of Table 3 it becomes significant in Model 3. Also, the more serious the crime the more likely is one to choose waiting to receive a larger lottery option, which is a diametrically opposite result to choosing between monetary rewards.

Why such differences here? First, with respect to gender, we can only speculate that women perceive the poor quality or/and lack of food more acutely than males, which makes their levels of relative deprivation higher. Likewise, when asked a similar question about winning extra visitation rights, females also tend to prefer immediate gratification. We can again speculate that females feel prison isolation more acutely, especially in the light of the higher numbers of those who receive no letters or visits from the family. Previous research in American prisons (Giallombardo 1966) indicates that females tend to form/ create same gender families in order to replicate the family structure outside of prison. "Homosexual dyads cast into marriage alliances, family groups,

and other kinship ties formed by the inmates integrate the inmates into a meaningful social system and represent an attempt to create a substitute universe within the prison” (Giallombardo 1966: 270). This longing for family contact and a nurturing role in the relationship might also have prompted females to choose the most immediate visit they could get. These findings are confirmed by Alpern, who in her study of Russian prisons finds that the women inmates get together in groups, called ‘families’. Then members of these families can help each other and protect each other’s interests (Alpern 1991[2]: 29). More generally with respect to the differences that Tables 1 and 3 report, we might speculate that we are potentially tapping two different preferences (monetary and non-monetary), where the most acutely felt deprivation (e.g. food, visits) skews the preference away from future rewards. We also have to note that as we include more variables in Table 3 the sample size shrinks to 55 people which could also affect our results.

Table 2.

**Dependent variable:** “Dinner this week or 2 dinners next week vs. 3 dinners a month later”

	<b>Model 5</b> (ordinal regression)
<i>Age</i>	-.027 (.031)
<i>Education</i>	.384 (.262)*
<i>Family status</i>	.185 (.238)
<i>Hours Rehab</i>	.011 (.018)
<i>Children</i>	.131 (.264)
<i>Time spent vs. left</i>	-.326 (1.153)
<i>Sex</i>	-.936 (.666)
<i>Second time</i>	.577 (.844)
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	.133

Table 3.

**Dependent variable:** Dinner this week vs. 3 dinners one month later

	<b>Model 6 (n=73)</b>	<b>Model 7 (n=58)</b>	<b>Model 8 (n=55)</b>
<i>Intercept</i>	-.863 (1.488)	19.354 (9.792)**	24.259 (11.735)**
<i>Age</i>	-.042 (.033)	-.149 (.097)*	-.175 (.113)*
<i>Education</i>	.373 (.261)*	.691 (.514)*	-.1.167 (.643)*
<i>Family status</i>	.119 (.231)	-.209 (.504)	.097 (.641)
<i>Hours Rehab</i>	.019 (.019)	-.036 (.037)	-.041 (.041)
<i>Seriousness of crime</i>	.106 (.204)	.917 (.463)**	1.239 (.532)**
<i>Children</i>	---	-.656 (.792)	-.439 (.839)
<i>Time spent vs. left</i>	---	.246 (2.192)	.669 (2.509)
<i>Sex</i>	---	-2.561 (1.344)**	-3.883 (1.639)***
<i>Second time</i>	---	.137 (1.462)	-.349 (1.523)
<i>Living arrangement</i>	---	-.466 (1.449)	-.955(1.939)
<i>Meet at the release</i>	---	-25.734 (9999.326)	-27.467 (9331.815)
<i>Help Finding job</i>	---	22.790 (9999.326)	24.061 (9331.815)
<i>Borrow money</i>	---	.050 (.694)	.061 (.865)
<i>Enough money</i>	---	.551 (.502)	.971 (.609)*
<i>Family visits</i>	---	-.651 (.619)	.290 (.424)
<i>All visits</i>	---	-.508 (.617)	-.999 (.732) *
<i>Received family letters</i>	---		-.915 (.739)
<i>Letters sent</i>	---	.044 (.495)	.570 (.661)
<i>Visit frequency (fam)</i>	---	.165 (.521)	-.312 (.669)
<i>500 vs. 100 HRN</i>	---	-2.444 (1.498)	-3.330 (1.768)*
<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	.113	.558	.639

**Conclusions:**

Ideally a rehabilitation process should help prisoners to extend their time horizons and start valuing the future, which will help to prevent future deviant behavior. Briefly, our analysis reveals that in Ukraine at least deferring gratification is more likely to be exhibited by females, older inmates, those who receive letters by mail, and those who are single. Contrary to initial expectations time discounting actually increased with factors such as spending time in mandatory rehabilitation programs, spending time in prison, writing letters home and not



receiving responses, and being in prison repeatedly. This study adds new arguments not only in the discussion of individual time discounting, but also to the debate on social policy regarding the levels of prisonization as well as the efforts of rehabilitation in at least one post-Soviet penal system. Of course, the conclusions we offer are preliminary rather than definitive and they need testing on a more representative sample (national as well as international/comparative levels). Nevertheless, they serve as a warning that the Ukrainian penal system may be failing and accomplishing little more than temporarily removing criminals from society.

**References:**

1. Alpern, Liudmila. 2001[1]. Vsego lish desiataia chast: zhenshchiny i deti v rossiiskoi tiurme: zametki posetitelia tiurem. [Only one-tenth... Women and children in Russian prison. Observations of prison visitor]. Moskva: Tsentr sodeistviia reforme ugovornogo pravosudiia.
2. Alpern, Liudmila. 2001[2]. Zhenshchiny v rossiiskoi tiurme: problemy, svidetelstva, vzgliad iznutri; sbornik materialov [Women in Russian prison: problems, testaments, the look from within; Collected materials]. Moskva: Tsentr sodeistviia reforme ugovornogo pravosudiia.
3. Alpern, Liudmila. 2001[3]. K voprosu o sotsialnoi reabilitatsii naibolee uiazvimykh grupp tiuremnogo naseleniia (podrostki, zhenshchiny): materialy issledovaniia, mneniia, lichnye dokumenty. [Towards the question of social rehabilitation of the most disadvantaged groups of prison population (teenagers, women): research, opinions, and personal documents]. Moskva: Tsentr sodeistviia reforme ugovornogo pravosudiia.
4. Banwell, Suzanna, Erin Barclay, Elizabeth Duban, and Robin Philips. 2000. Domestic Violence in Ukraine. Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis. www.mnadvocates.org
5. Brykczynska, Gosia. 2002. "Prisons and Prisoners: Some Observations, Comments and Ethical Reflections Based on a Visit to a Prison Hospital in the Ukrainian Republic". *Nursing Ethics* 9(4): 361-372
6. Chesney-Lind, Meda. 1989. "Girls' Crime and Woman's Place: Toward a feminist Model of female delinquency." *Crime and Delinquency* 35: 5-29.
7. Clemmer, Donald. 1940. The Prison Community. Christopher Publishing house.
8. Daly, Kathleen. 1998. "Gender, Crime and Criminology." The Handbook of Crime and Punishment. Michael Tonry (ed.), New York: Oxford University Press: 85-108.
9. Davids, Anthony and Bradley B. Falkof. 1975. "Juvenile Delinquents Then and Now: Comparison of Findings from 1959 and 1974." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 84(2): 161-164.
10. Ganguli, Ina and Katherine Terrell. 2006. "Institutions, markets and men's and women's wage inequality: Evidence from Ukraine", *Journal of Comparative Economics* 34: 200-227.
11. Giallombardo, Rose. 1966. "Social Roles in a prison for women", *Social Problems* 13(3): 268-288.
12. Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirshi. 1990. A General Theory of Crime. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
13. Johnson, Janet E. 2007. "Domestic Violence Politics in Post-Soviet States". *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 14(3): 380-405.
14. Klochko, Marianna. 2006. "Time Preference and Self-Selection vs. Socialization: A Case Study of Ukrainian Students." *Rationality and Society* 18(3): 305-331.
15. Kolstad, Arnulf. 1996. "Imprisonment as rehabilitation: Offenders' assessment of why it does not work." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 24(4): 323-335.
16. Lehman, Hartmut, Norberto Pignatti and Jonathan Wadsworth. 2006. "The incidence and cost of job loss in the Ukrainian labor market". *Journal of Comparative Economics* 34: 248-271
17. Oleinik, Anton. 2006. "A plurality of total institutions: towards a comparative penology." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 46:161-180.
18. Pallot, Judith 2007. "Gde muzh, tam zhena' (where the husband is, so is the wife): space and gender in post-Soviet patterns of penalty." *Environment and Planning* 39: 570-589.
19. Piquero, Alex and Stephen Tibbetts. 1996. "Specifying the direct and indirect effects of low self-control and situational factors in offender's decision making: toward a more complete model of rational offending", *Justice Quarterly* 13: 481-508.
20. Rogers, Alan R. 1994. "Evolution of Time Preference by Natural selection." *The American Economic Review* 84(3): 460-481.
21. Rubin, Paul H. and Paul, Cris W. 1979. "An evolutionary model of tastes for risk." *Economic Inquiry* 17(4): 585-596.
22. Smith, Douglas A., and Raymond Paternoster. 1987. "The Gender Gap in Theories of Deviance: Issues and Evidence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 24:140-172
23. Whitman, James Q. 2003. Harsh Justice. Criminal Punishment and the Widening Divide between America and Europe. Oxford University Press.