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According to the classical school of criminology, which emerged around the middle of the eighteenth century, crime was the result of rational considerations on the part of the offender, who was considered to possess a free will. Thus the classical school supported penal sanctions oriented to the extent of the individual’s culpability as a response to criminality. Opposed to this view were the positivist criminologists at the end of the nineteenth century, who regarded crime causation as determined by the offender’s physical, mental and social characteristics. They held that the offender possessed no free will and required treatment to prevent him from recidivism. The ideas of both the classical and the positivist schools have left their impressions on our Criminal Code and our Code of Corrections. Rather than stressing personality disorders, the modern school of criminology, which emerged following the Second World War, emphasizes the role of interpersonal conflicts in crime causation. Crime originates in social processes involving the offender, the victim and society. It must be controlled in processes of social and interpersonal learning and interaction in which social groups such as the family, the school, the neighbourhood, and occupational and recreational groups are involved to the same extent as the criminal justice system is.

The crisis of criminal policy

Modern explanations of crime causation, based pre-
Every society has its own limits to socially acceptable behaviour, which have developed historically and which continue to evolve in social processes and in processes of penal legislation and its enforcement (Erickson 1966). All forms of crime are related to a societal context (Newman 1976). As economic and social conditions change, so do extent and form of crime (Brantingham 1984). Industrialisation, urbanisation, and motorisation bring about — among other things — changes in a population’s lifestyle and its value and behaviour systems. Industrialisation, urbanisation, and motorisation can lead to anomie, to the disintegration of values, social disorganisation, the deterioration of the community and to the emergence of youth subcultures. The presence of both traditional and progressive value norms and behaviour patterns in a changing society can produce conflicts which must not be suppressed or resolved violently. Rather, the conflicting values must be socially integrated and coordinated. Such a peaceful process leading to renewed social cohesion, to value consensus and to the sharing of common societal norms (synnomie) requires a creative energy within a society which can be summoned with the aid of legally implemented conciliatory proceedings. In contrast to this the failure of a society to cope with conflicts results in value disintegration and a considerable increase in juvenile delinquency and adult crime. Unresolved value conflicts are apt to be transmitted to social groups, e.g. the family, leading to the dissolution of personal relationships. During the socialisation process the child internalises this value disintegration. This inadequate internalisation cannot produce an intact, normatively conforming conscience in the personality of the child or adolescent.

The basis for the emergence of criminal acts in interpersonal learning and interaction processes are social learning processes, which, in turn, are a function of historically generated social structures and cultural value systems and can be influenced by penal legislation, its enforcement, and by the mass media. A felon learns not only criminal skills and attitudes, criminal justifications and values in criminal subcultures, but also his role as a perpetrator of crime; equally, the victim learns his role as a victim. Criminality is not inborn; it is essentially the result of defective socialisation and upbringing. Juvenile delinquency emerges and rigidifies into adult criminality when children are not supervised and constrained sufficiently. Juvenile delinquents are unable to identify with their parents or teachers. Delinquent and criminal behaviour can be learned as such, but it can just as easily result from a failure to learn socially accepted behaviour. Most cases of juvenile delinquency are caused by inadequate supervision and poor child-rearing ability of parents and teachers, flaws which tend to recur in each generation. Juvenile delinquency and adult criminality are caused by the
deterioration and dissolution of relationships which bind a person to the normative society and its particular socio-cultural groups. When such relationships decay there is an increase in delinquent and criminal subcultures in which criminal and delinquent behaviour patterns and value notions are learned, and in which the delinquent and criminal behaviour of individuals is indicated and supported.

Juvenile delinquency and adult criminality also result from processes of symbolic interaction, from criminal careers. Individuals influence each other not only by reacting to each other's actions but also by interpreting and defining the actions and personal characteristics of their partners in interaction. Everybody commits petty delinquent or criminal acts at least once in his life. The criminal, however, is a person whose life and identity are determined by the reality of crime. The orientation of his behaviour around crime is largely dependent on his experience of being arrested and of being labelled a criminal in criminal court proceedings. This experience is one of the most crucial steps in the process of developing a fixed pattern of criminal behaviour. It leads to the emergence of an autodynamic process, a self-fulfilling prophecy. Having been branded as a criminal, a person experiences steadily increasing social pressure pushing him towards increasing and more severe crime. Finally he develops a criminal self-image and a criminal self-esteem. Juveniles who have often been convicted for delinquency at an early age show a high rate of recidivism. Each arrest and conviction increases the likelihood of rearrest and reconviction (Farrington 1979:289–348; Farrington, Osborn & West 1978: 277–284).

Punishment as a deterrent and as an educational measure

The general population's attitude to crime influences penal legislation and its enforcement and vice versa. Penal legislation and enforcement constitute the formal cultural definition of what is forbidden in a society, a definition which must be accepted by the people and which must be transmitted to the younger generation by means of the socialisation process. Here, the immediate deterrent effect of penal legislation and its enforcement is less important than the indirect influence exerted on the population by a lifelong socialisation process, a process likewise oriented to penal law standards. Empirical criminological research has shown that the immediate deterrent effect of penal legislation and its enforcement cannot be rated as high as was originally assumed (cf Andenaes 1974; Blumstein, Cohen & Nagin 1978). As a general rule successful citizens can easily be deterred because they have too much to lose and tend to be bound by their success to the social system in which they live. On the other hand, offenders are usually unsuccessful in their socially conform careers and therefore difficult to deter, since they have lost all hope and believe that by committing criminal offences they can only gain.

An individual's personality is the result of a process of social learning—a mental process of active, cognitive integration of past experiences. How parents and other important identification figures react to norm violations is crucial for the development of a sense of justice in the psyche of children and adolescents. Child-rearing that is characterised primarily by the use of punishment and power, and that employs harsh and frequent corporal punishment, produces at best a superficial, outward willingness to conform to the norms; it can also lead to aggressive modes of behaviour towards weaker persons. 'Laissez-faire' methods of child rearing do not generate any sense of justice at all. For the development of an independent, internally controlled sense of justice the presence of an actively law-abiding model is important since it does not develop according to professed abstract norms and rules. Parents or teachers who have established a relationship with their children or pupils on the basis of emotional warmth and acceptance should not fall back on their superiority and authority if a conflict arises. Instead of providing prefabricated conflict solutions, they ought to discuss seriously and sincerely with their children or pupils on an intellectual and emotional level. This requires teachers and parents to observe the following three points:

- Firstly, they must make clear to their children or pupils why it is necessary to observe the norm that has been violated.
- Furthermore, they must point out to their children or pupils the extent of suffering and anguish experienced by the injured party, i.e. by the victim, as a result of the norm violation.
- Finally, parents and teachers must themselves observe those generally binding norms, and show their children or pupils that they can conduct and resolve their own conflicts among themselves openly and peacefully.

Individuals also learn open and peaceful conflict resolution by observing the behaviour of others. The social climate of those involved must be characterized by a mutual respect for each other. Undoubtedly, parents can also learn from their children's behaviour.

Formal and informal crime control

A criminal offence does not come out of the blue, even if this sometimes appears to be the case. It is the product of centuries of cultural, as well as decades of interpersonal learning and interaction processes in which it is embedded. Therefore, whoever wishes to prevent juvenile delinquency and adult crime in future societies has to start in the family and at school. The
family setting in which the socio-cultural birth of the individual takes place initiates the development of a socially conform or of a criminal career. As the modern family is marked by an increasing degree of loss of function, and many children do not receive adequate supervision and an appropriate upbringing within the family, schools must assume a greater role in teaching children peaceful modes of conflict resolution. In this case the only appropriate educational approach is one which provides the reasons for the existence of norms and sheds light on the victims; suffering. Such an educational approach requires intellectual and emotional discussions with the pupils, supervised by teachers with strong personalities and conducted in much smaller classes than presently exist. Due to the increasing degree of family dysfunction, the school is forced to assume the task of teaching familial psycho- and sociodynamics, and, above all, familial child-rearing practices.

Comparative criminological studies (Clinard 1978; Adler 1978) have made clear the great importance of the informal social control exercised by families, schools, neighbours, professional and recreational groups in the prevention and control of crime. The ten nations with the lowest crime rate in the world, although including countries with distinctly different economic and social structures such as Japan, Switzerland, or Saudi Arabia, show three common characteristics:

- Community consciousness and the citizens’ willingness to accept responsibility facilitate the peaceful regulation of conflicts in the community. Mutually accepted regulation of conflicts in turn produces value agreement and social cohesion.
- The decay of communities and the deterioration of social relationships are minimal. Youth subcultures and socially disorganised areas, for example in industrialised urban areas, have not developed. Social relationships within social groups and between social groups are more or less undamaged.
- The criminal justice system is well integrated into the community. The community is involved in defining and solving crime, and in charging, sentencing and punishing offenders. The community supports its criminal justice system; the criminal justice system seeks to be integrated into its community.

Many people assist the criminal justice system in an honorary capacity, for example as voluntary probation officers or as visitors in correctional institutions. Police officers live in the neighbourhood where they work, and try to be in touch with the citizens. By setting up police information and counselling bureaux in schools attempts are made to develop a trust relationship between the pupils and police officers.

Restitution as a creative social and individual achievement

Offender-oriented treatment in correctional institutions is increasingly losing the support of the general public. There can be no return to the ineffective and inhumane dungeons, no matter how hard ‘moral entrepreneurs’ (Howard S Baker) try to persuade people of their value. Such a regression would be a step backwards in social development and untenable in the long term. Rather, the entire criminal justice system must be adapted to the concept of restitution, which extends the offender-oriented treatment approach to encompass victims and society. Restitution must be seen as an interactional process between offender, victim and society which resolves criminal conflicts and creates harmony and peace between the parties involved. This does not simply involve a monetary payment and a few perfunctory apologetic remarks. Restitution is a creative process, a personal and social achievement, requiring a considerable psychical and social effort on the part of the offender towards confession and remorse and towards assuming responsibility for his offence to society and his victim. From this process – if it reaches a successful conclusion – the offender, the victim and society will emerge changed and matured as a result. The offender repents his action by facing up to its harmful consequences and by being forgiven by his victim; he is absolved without personal humiliation. He loses his criminal stigma and can take again his place in society as a member enjoying equal status. The victim receives – as far as possible – restitution. Having successfully made the personal effort of forgiveness he is able to overcome the psychical and social damages suffered as a result of the offence. His willingness to forgive the offender needs to be aroused. As a rule, the victim does not insist on revenge. It is, however, of vital importance to him that the court acknowledges his injury and the damage incurred and that the offender assumes responsibility for his deed instead of resorting to rationalisations and excuses. The use of restitution, the solution of the criminal conflict and the reconciliation process involving the offender, the victim, and society create a sense of justice in society, something far more important for crime control than deterring the population in general with penal legislation and enforcement. Restitution calls for an alteration in the aims of the criminal justice system in its entirety. The police, district attorneys and courts no longer solely concentrate their activities around the offender. Probation officers and correctional staff no longer just help and give guidance to offenders in their charge but also have to assume the role of mediator between offender, victim, and society. The concept of restitution thus demands not only an increased effort on the part of the offender, but also of the victim and of
society, especially with regard to their social control function.

The victimological concept was just the first step in the right direction. It has led to the establishment of the fact that victims of crime are traumatised by the offence itself as well as by the reaction to their victimisation; also, that they are therefore in need of help and support during the process of reaction to their victimisation, and that their mental, social and physical injuries have to be treated. This concept is beginning to gain public recognition. The offender/victim reconciliation involving formal social control institutions is another important step towards an effective model of crime control. A crime victim does, by no means, wish to hinder the social rehabilitation of an offender. In fact, he can play a considerable part in the offender’s rehabilitation and wants to do so. By being assigned a more active and positive role in the reaction to crime the victim can avoid, to some extent, becoming the object of further harm or being victimised again during and by this process. The principle of restitution is one to which offenders, victims and society can give their approval as it benefits all parties involved. In our German judicial system, however, legislation is unsatisfactory with regard to the possible use of restitution as a condition attached to the granting of probation and as a potential method of victim compensation within the criminal procedure. With the enactment of the first Victim Protection Act (Opferschutzgesetz in 1986 (Bundesgesetzblatt I:2 496-2.500)) the federal legislator made an effort to activate and promote victim compensation in criminal procedure, an effort, though, which was inadequate and will not achieve the desired effect.

Rather, restitution must be promoted to constitute an independent penal sanction, as was acknowledged by the US legislation in the 1982 Victim and Witness Protection Act. If a federal court in the United States does not make use of the opportunity of utilising a reparatory sanction, the reason for its decision not to do so must be stated in the written judgement. Both the General Assembly of the United Nations (1985: Document A Res 40/34) and the Council of Ministers of the Council of Europe (1985) have fundamentally acknowledged the importance of restitution as a concern of criminal justice. Nevertheless, the crucial importance of restitution still remains to be fully appreciated by political institutions, society and also by the criminal justice system. First experiments employing restitution as a sanction in its own right in juvenile court proceedings in the United States have, as a result, led to a decline of recidivism rates (Schneider 1986:533-552).

**The social reintegration model**

Penal law constitutes only one aspect of social control. Criminal proceedings create a distance between those involved; a trial can have stigmatising side effects for an offender if it is utilised too early. All the same, the criminal procedure retains its importance for constitutional reasons. It must, however, be closely connected with the informal social control exercised by social groups. That is why the social reintegration model is receiving such worldwide attention in criminal policy debates. This model attributes great importance to the ‘treatment of the offender at liberty’, to his treatment in, by, and with the community, and to improving the quality of community interaction: The offender is encouraged to develop bonds with his family, with his neighbourhood and with his occupational and recreational groups. This is meant to involve community in the treatment process on a large scale. The people in the offender’s immediate social sphere are to be kept aware of the problems concerning delinquency and crime. The social reintegration model supports ‘diversion’ (circumvention of the criminal justice system), because, the more delinquents and criminals are entangled in the net of the criminal justice system, the more their delinquency and criminality will strengthen. ‘Diversion’ involves the following responses of formal social control agencies (e.g. the police, the courts and correctional institutions):

- Delinquents and criminals are referred to informal social control, e.g. youth services run by honorary assistants working outside the criminal justice system.
- Delinquents and criminals are subjected to less harsh official or semi-official sanctions within the criminal justice system, e.g. to correctional forms based upon the community.

**Mediation and arbitration procedures**

These procedures, first proposed by the Canadian Law Reform Commission (1975) as a pre-trial diversionary measure preceding the formal proceedings, involve the offender and the victim meeting face to face and attempting to resolve their conflict between themselves in an informal procedure under the supervision and mediation of a judge and with the assistance of the public prosecutor, the defence lawyer and, in certain cases, an expert. This procedure can only be made use of if there is no doubt as to the guilt of the offender and if all parties involved have given their consent to it. This mediation and arbitration procedure, which concludes with a judgement which is binding for all parties, has been recommended as it strengthens the informal control by allowing the parties concerned to practise resolving conflicts between themselves with the help of the criminal justice system. The aim of such a procedure is, on the one hand, to settle the terms of restitution between the offender and the victim and to reach a binding agreement for all con-
cerned; this, for example, has been proposed to resolve criminal conflicts between persons in close social proximity such as cases of abuse of wives and children. On the other hand, such a procedure also attempts to control the criminal conflict in the future by organizing social workers to monitor and look after the family, so that a formal conviction of the offender to a term of imprisonment can be avoided – a sanction that is hardly of any use to either the family or the victim, and which can even lead to further damage. The mediation and arbitration procedure can also be recommended for resolving criminal conflicts within the scope of petty, environmental and economic crime. When the mediation and arbitration procedure is successful the formal proceedings can be suspended.

**Restitution in the community**

Occasionally, an offender is released on probation under the condition that he will make reparation. However, this option is not used sufficiently in either the juvenile or the adult criminal procedure. Furthermore, the reparation of material damages usually is the only matter of any concern. Where immaterial damages are concerned, a simple apology is usually considered as sufficient. This criminal law practice is inadequate. Victim surveys have shown that even in case of property offences, such as burglary of fraud, the crime victim suffers substantial immaterial damages, manifested in a fear of crime and a mistrust of the criminal justice system. For that reason treatment experiments, e g in Canada (Yantsi 1985:329–343) with offender-victim reconciliation projects are successfully carried out: Juvenile burglars on probation meet their victims under the supervision of probation officers acting as mediators with a great deal of sensitivity and psychological skill. By bringing the offender and the victim together, not just once but for a series of meetings, the offender comes to realize the full extent of the social, material and psychical damage caused by him. His victim is no longer an abstract person fading from his memory. He cannot rationalise his act any longer nor repress it. By getting to know his offender the victim ‘humanises’ his image of him. The juvenile offender is no longer an abstract ‘monster’ for the victim, but a young individual with problems shared by many other young people. Rather than being excused, the offender must be prepared to take full responsibility for his offence and to compensate the material damages he inflicted.

**Restitution in correctional institutions**

The German Code of Corrections enacted in 1976 excludes the victim perspective almost completely. The belief was that the prisoner’s socialisation deficits can be remedied by subjecting them to offender oriented treatment. This was obviously done without realising that the development of a sense of justice on the part of the offender and the general population depends on the prisoner coming to terms with his crime intellectually and emotionally. It was even assumed, and it still is, that restitution for damage inflicted on the victim, would subject the offender to excessive stress and interfere with his rehabilitation, if not annul these efforts. Interviews with prisoners both in Germany and abroad have repeatedly shown that prisoners know next to nothing about their victims and that they considered their crimes as expiated after their term of imprisonment. What memory of the crime they had, had faded during that time. They viewed any such recollections as an undesirable mental burden. Material and immaterial restitution was, and still is, considered to be a ‘double punishment’. Those holding this point of view, including some members of the correctional staff, fail to comprehend that, however necessary the offender-oriented treatment may be, it alone is not sufficient to rehabilitate offenders. Acceptance of the fact that it is only offenders who are offered support within the correctional institution system will diminish in the general public. The aims of penal sanctions should therefore be defined anew as follows:

- The prisoner in a correctional institution should in no way be subjected to personal degradation under the guise of ‘culpability compensation’ or ‘penitence’, as he will only internalize such degradations; this in turn will weaken his already poor self-esteem and lead to the reinforcement of the criminal image he holds of himself. This merely results in the prisoner waiting to be released so that he can inflict further damage on society; his main ambition is reduced to only avoiding further arrests and convictions.

- The prisoner must be made to understand that although his criminal behaviour cannot be accepted socially, still he is not regarded as an inferior person and that he is expected in future to be able and prepared to realise normatively correct behaviour. Consequently, he must be encouraged and enabled to engage in socially adequate behaviour. His social status must be improved, his self-esteem strengthened and his role potential and inventory expanded. Not only must he be familiarised with normatively conforming behaviour patterns but also with normatively acceptable attitudes and roles.

- As far as the construction of a self-articulating sense of justice is concerned, such treatment can only be successful if the reasons for the necessity of abiding by the norms are made clear to the prisoner and if he makes an effort to consider his offence and the victimization of his victim honestly and self-critically. Acknowledging that by committing his offence he has inflicted harm on his victim, the
prisoner learns to cognitively process and emotionally digest the offender-victim conflict. His personal responsibility is not 'stolen' from him (Christie 1977:1-15). Rather, he faces up to his social obligations, thus relieving himself of his guilt. The prisoner's sensitization to the damages he has inflicted on the victim must not, however, be misinterpreted as a return to a retaliatory form of penal sanctioning. The former has nothing in common with repetitive, personally degrading accusations of guilt directed at an inmate. Rather, it constitutes a necessary expansion, advancement and supplementation of the concept of treatment.

Adapting the corrections system to a democratic mode of treatment, which is binding on our democratic society as a whole, places exceptional psychological and social demands on all persons concerned, i.e., offenders, victims, society, and, last but not least, the correctional staff. Even though the respective efforts will not always be crowned with success, these aims must be persistently and uncompromisingly pursued none the less. Based on the obligation of corrections to motivate the prisoner, the aim of treatment is to convert the prisoner's attitude from one of reluctance to one of willingness regarding victim restitution. Possible meetings between offenders and victims must be planned as carefully and meticulously as possible. The victim's special situation, namely his emotional stress, must be taken into account. A face-to-face encounter between the victim and the offender is a highly delicate emotional experience for both. Extreme care must be exercised in this situation. The open correctional institution Saxerriet-Salez in Switzerland has been running an offender-victim restitution program for years (Brenzikoler 1982:367-373). Not always necessary, however, for successful offender-victim restitution are face-to-face encounters between both parties. In order for prisoners to be able to affect material reparation, the long-term aim must be to pay them adequate wages for their work, allowing them to organise their debts and make restitution payments in full. Moreover, not always is full material restitution absolutely indispensable. Often the victim's only concern is that the prisoner demonstrates his good will. The immaterial reconciliation between offender and victim is more important and at the same time more difficult. Not every crime victim is perfectly willing to engage in discussions or is capable of talking to the offender. In this case symbolic restitution in form of symbolic reconciliation is acceptable and can be achieved, for example, by having prisoners not meet their own victims, but by letting them become acquainted with crime and its consequences from the angle of victims in prisoner discussion groups attended by crime victims willing to converse. By engaging in victim-oriented role plays within the framework of social training, offenders could also develop a lasting sensitivity for the concerns of crime victims. A victim-oriented correctional system is not just any variant of the penal approach, it is a crucial progress in the treatment concept, which must be tested with care and imagination in correctional institutions. This progress in the treatment concept will be instrumental in promoting the acceptance of the penal system in the general public.

Community involvement in corrections

The public image of corrections in Western Europe and North America does not correspond to prison reality. In no way does it do justice to the efforts of political authorities towards improving the correctional system, nor does it take into account the positive results achieved in these institutions every day. Prisoners are constantly referred to as the 'slammer', 'joint' or 'can' in a pejorative manner and claims are made that they are too lenient and comfortable on the one hand and too antiquated and conservative on the other. Those few prisoners who use their weekend leave to escape and to commit other spectacular crimes make the headlines, thereby determining to a large extent the public image of the penal system as 'penal hotels'. Western European and North American governments, the correctional systems themselves and even criminologists have, for many years, foregone on the opportunity of providing the public directly with precise information about the real causes of crime and the reality of the correctional system, and of gaining public support for their style of corrections. The only industrialised nation comparable with Germany in terms of its economic and social structure, but with considerably less crime, is Japan, where crime control is not only left in the hands of specialists and experts (the criminal justice system) but is also accepted as a community task. The Japanese are much better informed about their correctional system and they take a more active part in their criminal justice system. This means that within the Japanese correctional system there are honorary prison visitors who have voluntarily assumed an important control function. Rather than seeing prisoners as 'victims of society', and thereby hindering their socialisation they appreciate the fact that during an inmate's term of imprisonment he is unable to create his own circle of socially conforming friends outside the institution. Therefore, they form a network of social contacts on his behalf so that after his release these people will be in a position to support him and help him acquire normatively acceptable behaviour. Honorary assistants fulfil an important task in the correctional system. Accordingly, their work warrants our full support. Publicity must aim at attracting honorary assis-
tants for the correctional system, because they bolster a community’s faith in this system.

Continuing process of development

The education and training of our population in the Federal Republic of Germany is a matter of central importance for our society, as our high standard of living and our high quality of life depend on this high standard of education and training. For this reason, not only the education and training of prisoners, but also that of the correctional staff must be fostered constantly. The prison situation is an educational and training process for the staff as well as for the inmates. Therefore they will have to decide whether or not the training was a waste of time and the correction process will not develop further. The opportunity of prospective smaller prison populations in the Federal Republic must, therefore, be used to constantly improve the training of all correctional staff. The educational style which is obliging for a democratic society, requires the correctional staff to be constantly in physical and intellectual rapport with the prisoners, so that they learn how to resolve conflicts peacefully and develop an internally motivated sense of justice. Such intensive contact requires extreme mental energy, which has to be recharged by having further interpersonal contact. Therefore, prison staff require not only constant and careful training and education but also interpersonal contact, otherwise they will suffer from psychical exhaustion. Especially medium-grade correctional personnel should act as “role models” for prisoners by being actively involved in their adult education. Therefore they have to decide straight after school that they wish to work as adult trainers in prisons. For this sort of work one has to be highly motivated, and many young people have just the commitment needed for this profession. Following thorough training at tertiary level they should be given the chance to engage in educational work.

The correctional institution as a modern service organisation

Only the best suited and most professionally trained persons in our society are capable of assuming the highly demanding task of educating adult felons. Adult education in correctional institutions is a service requiring the highest qualifications and a desire to engage in personal contact. The correctional system must employ the latest research findings from the fields of organisational psychology and sociology. Prison staff and inmates must be able to identify with the goals of the penal system. Only when the staff themselves are motivated and interested they can motivate and interest the prisoners. In order to prevent the formation of a prison subculture with criminal value notions and behaviour patterns, and to prevent prisonisation, i.e. prisoners adopting these norms and patterns, an organisational atmosphere must be created in which creativity, initiative and originality at the place of work can develop. All those involved must be sufficiently informed about events and decisions within the organization. Prison staff and prisoners must see their own tasks and those of the others as being constructive and useful. A good working environment depends on communal decision making and the feeling that problems can be solved, that one can achieve something valuable through one’s work and that one is respected. A satisfied worker is proud of what he has achieved. Prison staff and inmates must not feel helpless and isolated. To reach the aim of correctional institutions must be a challenge for them, and by accepting this challenge they can develop and mature personally. The feeling of being productive and of making progress must be awakened and promoted in the prison staff and inmates, so that they achieve the aims of corrections and can successfully resolve arising conflicts. Rehabilitation can be enhanced considerably by humanising the organisational processes and by encouraging people to develop self-initiative. An organizational environment in which individual talents and, at the same time, a network of social relationships can develop will contribute significantly to dissolving the negative public image of correctional institutions and to making job prospects in penal institutions more attractive.
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