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Abstract

The ever-increasing rate of drug addicts in our country is reflecting itself in the rise of the prison population. While some of the prisoners might take this with a pinch of salt and indulge themselves in a life of crime, others long for rehabilitation. The rest of the community is bound to trust the prisons system as an institution to reform and rehabilitate its inmates. However, are the people put behind the Corradino Correctional Facility’s bars rehabilitating themselves, or are they returning back to society in an even worse manner than they had left it? Experience is what forms and alters perceptions regarding this. Hence, the differing perceptions of people who have experienced prison and others who never did will be outlined.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.01 Preamble

Drugs have had victims for quite a long time. However, the seriousness of such a problem was only recognised a few centuries ago, which resulted in the set up of organisations aimed to help drug addicts, who apart from dealing with their addiction, are also more prone to get involved in crimes in order to keep up with the expenses that this habit involves.

The number of imprisonments for drug-related offences is always on the rise. This could be partly because a considerable number of prisoners do not step inside the Corradino Correctional Facility just once, but one imprisonment sentence could open the possibility of a series of similar awards. This study seeks to examine the experiences of such people.
Although the main prison building is situated in Paola, other buildings within the Maltese prisons system are dispersed around our island. However, in setting parameters, the researcher decided to focus on the people who have only spent time at the Paola building. Hence, this study will not incorporate within it the situational experiences of those confined in other parts of this institution and the findings cannot be generalisable for all the inmates spread within the whole prison body.

While a drug rehabilitation programme definitely helps a person to get back on track and try to get rid of such a horrendous addiction, a stay in prison is still expected to have reformative effects on the individual. However, is this being the case in our country? What is being done to deter, reform, and rehabilitate an offender? What goes on behind the tall walls and little windows of the prison building? Are inmates being released as better or worse persons?

This study seeks to answer such questions, but not only. It is mainly based on information collected from a group of persons, referred to summarily as ‘deviants’ in the remaining chapters. Unfortunately, it was not possible to enter the prison building and thus interviewing inmates was out of the question. Therefore, the informants were interviewed after they left the Corradino Correctional Facility to start a drug rehabilitation programme.

In order to do so, the person found guilty is allowed to apply for prison leave as soon as the verdict is delivered. The application is then reviewed by a selected Board which decides whether a person should be permitted to leave the main prison building at an earlier stage or not. If approved, the delinquent is granted the opportunity to leave prison
and engage in a drug rehabilitation programme. The latter can be pursued either at the Substance Abuse Therapeutic Unit (S.A.T.U.), which is situated in Mtaħleb (limits of Rabat) and forms part of the Maltese correctional services, or at one of the two leading organisations in Malta offering such treatment, namely Sedqa and Caritas.

The experience of these people and their evaluation of the prison life will be analysed and contrasted to the data gathered from a control group made up of final year students reading for a degree in the social sciences on how the Maltese prisons are perceived. Thus, although not representative of Maltese youth, they provide a different perspective for comparison.

1.02 Overview

Although it is interesting to gain full knowledge about any subject, no research can ever include everything. Consequently, the researcher will be dealing with the selected issue following a set of hypotheses by interviewing 26 people in total; 13 deviants and 13 students.

The next chapter will primarily deal with some of the literature present with regards to this research subject. It will illustrate the importance of social maintenance, the need of
prison build-ups and the changes that occurred to the functions prisons serve, with particular focus on the Corradino Correctional Facility. This chapter will consequently deal with the problems that drugs cause, together with the nature and future of imprisonment and the theories concerned.

The third chapter will outline the scope of this study and discuss the methodology used to access the information needed. Ethical considerations and more limitations that the researcher faced while carrying out this study are also included.

The fourth chapter will analyse and expose the findings that emerged out of the collected data. Divided into themes in sync with the hypotheses, direct quotations are used to provide better understanding. Apart from linking such findings to those established in the second chapter, this chapter will also incorporate the testing of hypotheses.

Finally, the fifth chapter will summarise the whole content and show how the scope of the study has been reached. After outlining the most significant conclusions, recommendations are given by the researcher.
2.01 Introduction:
Social Order and Maintenance

It is no news that we are all subject to error; everyone makes mistakes only to regret them later. A wrong-doing can be classified in various ways, usually depending on the different people. However, while morally wrong actions are up to the individual to do or not to do, legally wrong actions, if caught, are punished by the law. Social scientists make use of different terms in this regard; while a ‘deviant’ is seen in a more social context and dependent upon a particular culture, a ‘criminal’ carries with him/her legal connotations (Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:148).

Order-maintenance is a priority in every civil society. Since the formation of human societies, the need was felt to regulate people’s actions (Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:147). Numerous were the people who in turn, spoke of the social contract.
As cited in Tannenbaum & Schultz (2004:179), Locke mentions that the natural law governing individuals follows the dictum “an eye for an eye”, hence, a state of war. On the same note, Hobbes (Tannenbaum & Schultz, 2004:162) stated that ‘the completely free reign of appetitive individuals ... produces a state of violent anarchy’, leading to a war of all against all. After describing the life of man in the natural state as ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short’, he spoke of their engagement in a social contract. Azzopardi & Scicluna (2009:147) explain this by putting it as people surrendered part of their liberty to guarantee the rest of it by giving right to the sovereign to legislate in exchange of their protection.

Beccaria showed that this was not done arbitrarily, however. In fact, he argued that ‘no man ever freely sacrificed a portion of his personal liberty merely in behalf of the common good. ... It was, thus, necessity that forced men to give up part of their personal liberty’ (Einstadter & Henry, 2006:54).

If there is no maintenance of order, nations will only be based on ‘incomplete and insecure foundations’ (Brewer et al. as cited in Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:147). This can be seen as one of the main reasons that gave rise to the build up of prisons, and also the reason underlying the justification of the criminal justice system which encompasses the police, the law courts and the correctional services. All these fall under the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs and hold a duty to prevent, detect, and investigate offences, bring the offenders before the judicial authorities who judge and punish accordingly, see that the punishment awarded is executed, and nonetheless, to preserve public peace (Criminal Code, 1954, S. 346.1). However, due to various reasons, ‘it is estimated that reported
crimes amount to less than 50 percent of the actual crimes committed’ (Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:149).

As cited in Crow (2001:105), Woolf and Tumim claimed that prisons form part of the criminal justice system, and should sequentially discourage crime.

Following Spencer’s social Darwinism in employing the organic analogy, Durkheim saw the criminal as a dysfunction, and consequently in need of treatment to be cured and function once again in a healthy society constituting interdependent parts (Crow, 2001:5).

This therefore implies that to achieve maximum safety and security within a society, an offender must not only be punished but also rehabilitated; ensuring that the previously committed criminal act would not be repeated.

2.02 History of Prisons

Numerous might have been the reasons which led to the build up of prisons. Attard (2000:9) defines prison as a public place where those condemned or awaiting trial under arrest are kept. After referring to prison as the “get tough” approach to crime control, Useem and Morrison Piehl (2008:3) give a deeper insight in picturing it as:
The ultimate intrusion by the state into the lives of citizens. Prisons impost on their residents near-complete deprivation of personal liberties, barren living conditions, control centres that regulate movement within the prison, exterior fences draped with concertina wire, lines painted on hallway floors that limit where inmates walk, little and ill-paid work, and endless tedium.

With the felt need to punish, deter, and distinguish people with the aim to produce a better society, several structures such as dungeons were used in ancient years. The eldest buildings which served as prisons are found in England. The York Castle Prison and the Oxford Castle Prison were both built as castles, yet included a prison. While other prisons were progressively built along the timeline, an increase in prison build ups can be noted in the 15th and 16th centuries which continued to reach peak during the 18th and 19th centuries. Nowadays, every country and state holds a prison.

The manners in which these are built not only reflect the era, but also represent the social exigencies of that particular time. Nevertheless, a feature which is present in all totalitarian institutions is undoubtedly that of security. Together with control and justice, prisons must be adjusted at the right level. According to Woolf and Tumim (cited in Crow, 2001:105), this is what the stability of prisons depend upon. Security varies according to the different prisons and the inmates incarcerated there. With the world’s most secure prison ever being that of Alcatraz, others ensure maximum security (known as supermax) while some offer minimal security.
The United States, for example, operates its institutions at five different security levels so as to place the offenders in the most appropriate manner. These include minimum, low, medium, high, and administrative. The main differences between one another include the presence of external patrols, towers, and security barriers or detention devices, the type of housing with its internal security features, and the staff-to-inmate ratio.

Nonetheless, prisons differ not only in their layout and security, but also in their utility. Some are built for military purposes, others political, and also psychiatric. However, most national prisons systems operate through the supplement by state counterparts. Certain prisons are dedicated to a particular segment of the criminal population, such as juvenile prisons. Thus, prisoners usually find themselves distributed within a variety of institutions.

The modern prisons system as we know it today, that having a panoptical dimension in which prisoners stand under constant surveillance without knowing when their silhouette figure is actually being looked at, saw its birth in Britain during the nineteenth century with the views of Jeremy Bentham. In spite of this, though, the functions they are expected to perform changed and will probably keep on doing so through time.

As cited in Siegel (2009a:92), Beccaria argued that in order to prevent people from committing even more serious offences, ‘crime and punishment must be proportional’. Bentham, who saw punishment as harmful in itself, not only agreed with this, but went on

---

1 See Appendix 1.
to say that punishment is only justified in so far that it ‘promises to prevent greater evil than it creates’.

2.03 Changes in Prison Functions

Lying beneath the prison institution has always been the protection of citizens. To ensure social control even more so, the rule of law found its way into every constitution, allowing no-one to stand above the law and making everyone subject to it.

Whenever mentioning a totalitarian institution, one thing which definitely comes to mind is the prevention of liberty. Prisoners find themselves inevitably confined in detention. While this might be perceived as a harsh punishment awarded to someone who has been socialised in a free country, much harsher were the punishments awarded in previous times. The odds were that abuse took place in that quite a large number of the condemned were innocent (Rhys, 1929:ix).

Foucault (1977:3-10) describes in-depth the horrible tortures that the condemned had to face, consequently leading to their death. The penalties were directed towards the human body, resulting in a high proportion of physical punishment. Clearly noticeable, no rehabilitation was in question. Not only that, but during the times of the eighteenth century
and before, this also served as a form of public entertainment, where people used to gather in the agora and witness the execution.

The end of the eighteenth century witnessed a shift from the punishing of the body to the punishing of the soul. Foucault (cited in Crow, 2001:103) described this progress as moving from ‘corporal’ to ‘carceral’ forms of punishment, referring to prison as ‘the gentle way in punishment’ by producing ‘docile bodies’.

Following these same lines, prisons have moved from being purely punitive to correctional facilities. Attard (2000:9) explains how before, the punitive doctrine was the one adhered to, yet he indicates the alternatives to imprisonment which were introduced in Malta but declared that these were usually to no avail. Thus, imprisonment sentences soon found their way back to being popular. This implies some of the changes that prisons undergone throughout the years. While some changes take a relatively long time to be implemented, others occur rapidly. In fact, until the nineteenth century, reform was still crude, with all prisoners, irrelevant of the offence, being ‘subject to the same regime’ (Hudson, 2003:28). However, the last century was one in which many changes took place.

In 1952 (p. ix), Glueck was speaking of the transformation in the management of society. He implied the idea of a character-therapeutic system instead of punishing the “guilty mind” since none of the legislative or administrative medicines will cure crime.
The twentieth century saw the evolvement of the ‘old’ treatment model or ‘rehabilitative ideal’ which, characterised by a curative nature and tendency to regard the offender as a ‘passive recipient of intervention’, offered a way to deal with delinquents (Crow, 2001:x). This caved in by the 1970s, allowing for the ‘nothing works’ doctrine to emerge. By the end of the same century, however, a ‘new’ treatment model backed by the ‘what works’ movement surfaced, aiming to reduce offending while being acquainted with the rights of the offender, the victim, and the whole of society. This also induced the idea of a ‘voluntaristic process of reform’ (Garland, as cited in Crow, 2001:x), meaning that a person must not only be responsible for the actions committed, but must also acknowledge the responsibility to control such unacceptable behaviour. Implied here lays the recognition that rehabilitation is not a one way process involving only the offender, but society must do its part as well and replace social exclusion with social integration (Crow, ibid).

This is advised in Davies (1974:136), who claimed that ‘the most common emotion in the [prisoners’] literature is not anger but resignation’ and that the most frequent critique of prisons is ‘concerned with the hypocrisy of a system which claims to be reforming its inmates’ as opposed to what the majority would expect to be its disciplinary element. Davies (1974:168) goes on to say that prisons could be made more humane. Meanwhile, he argued that ‘prison never corrects’, but concluded that ‘that is not what it is there for’. This can be taken to be the case in Malta, as how statistics perfectly illustrate, recidivity is very high, thus, the number of people who enter prison more than once is somewhat alarming (Mid-Dlam għad-Dawl, n.d.).
Speaking of drug cases in relation to his work as a magistrate, Mr. Justice Lawrence Quintano maintained that instead of condemning people, we should understand them and help them get back on track. According to him, rehabilitation does ‘not consist of giving drug users methadone to overcome the problem but a reason to live’ (Johnston, 2010).

With the help of the instances mentioned above, the development of human thought together with the improvement in the way punishment is being executed could be illustrated. Big steps have been made in this regard, even if there is still a long way to go when it comes to rehabilitative matters.

2.04 Theories of Punishment and Rehabilitation

Social theories are generated with respect to every sector of the human life. This is nonetheless also the case with punishment and rehabilitation.

Davies (1974:168) claimed that the courts’ decisions are primarily influenced ‘by their self-perceived role of exercising control in a complex modern society’ rather than feeling a need to reform people. Making their best to ensure the protection of citizens, they challenge retribution and deter others.
According to the philosopher Hegel (Mitias, 1984:173), punishment is not there ‘to reform or purify the criminal, i.e., to make him repent of his sin, but ... to realise justice’. This, however, might be rehabilitative in its nature, as it might deter the convict to commit another act.

Leading to the development of rehabilitation as we know it today, Ferri (cited in Hudson, 2003:28) made a distinction between three kinds of criminals, namely: the born criminal, the insane criminal, and the person who if faced by different circumstances would not have been criminal at all. Therefore, the offender’s background must be taken into consideration when being penalised as impersonal punishment may have more negative repercussions rather than positive ones.

Woolf and Tumim (cited in Crow, 2001:105) suggested that while people should not be awarded imprisonment to be reformed, the prisons system must ensure that they are provided with training to help them become law-abiding citizens, thus, appropriately prepare them for their return to society.

Although the word ‘treatment’ usually carries with it medical connotations, it might not always be the case. In the criminal scenario, this has been commonly linked to terms such as ‘reform’, ‘rehabilitation’ and ‘resettlement’ while contrasted with punishment and retribution. However, this paradigm suggests the medical or quasi-medical interventions and therapies. Yet, other types of interventions may still be helpful, including psychiatric treatment, group work, development of skills, and those directed towards the social re-integration of offenders, to mention but a few (Crow, 2001:8). Having said that, Clinard
(1974:423) maintained that ‘results of treatment indicate that drug addiction ... is one of the most difficult forms of deviant behaviour to treat effectively’.

While retribution and deterrence might be the result of punishment awarded due to crime, rehabilitation acknowledges ‘the possibility of additional problems developing during the offender’s sentence or treatment’. The rehabilitationist theory holds that crime is ‘a symptom of social disease’ which can be cured by treatment (Bean, as cited in Banks, 2004:116). Utilitarianists contend that ‘punishment should have reformatory or rehabilitative effects on the offender (Ten, as cited in Banks, 2004:116) in that it changes their values.

As cited in Caruana (1993:21-23), rehabilitation programmes are to be offered on a voluntary basis as they should be facilitative and not coercive. She goes on to say that while the physical environment affects the rehabilitation process, programmes must not be intervened with other facts such as the length of a sentence. They must be aimed at ‘keeping the prisoner alive at a physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, and social level’. Quality relationships between the prison officers and the inmates ensure not only a sense of caring, but also more stability.

For rehabilitation to be effective, Caruana (1993:23-30) distinguished a number of measurements to be taken, including the separation of prisoners, discipline, and specialised staff.
Although the road to reach the ideal is not always plain sailing and usually bumpy, things can be quite improved should the adequate measures and means be applied.

2.05 The Corradino Correctional Facility

Although the main prisons on the island are now found in Paola, before, prisoners held in Malta were detained in Fort St. Elmo, Fort St. Angelo, and Fort Ricasoli, together with the Palace of the Inquisitor and the residence of the Head of Justice during different eras.

The build up of the former Civil Prisons was initiated in 1842 and received its first inmates eight years later. It included the previously mentioned panoptical dimension as created by Bentham, originally hosting two hundred prisoners within four divisions. However, with the changing exigencies along time, other divisions were added to cater for the ever-increasing prison population.

With the prison population rapidly increasing due to the fact that 80% of people accused before the criminal courts were awarded imprisonment sentences (The Times, 2010), leaving the government to dedicate nothing less than €21 million on an expansion
project of the CCF, prison still had the need to introduce cell sharing in 2010 so as to keep up with the large number of prisoners held in custody (Vella, n.d.).

The prison regulations which were primarily released in 1820, followed by other sets of regulations in 1926 and 1931 which were revised in 1993 and further replaced in 1995 helped for the trends inside prison to change: the prisoners’ compulsory hygiene, their lock-up times, the number of gadgets and games allowed, and forced work among others were adapted and started including prison leave for inmates, conjugal visits, community work outside prison and the allowance of daily telephone calls. Along time, these regulations moved towards the discipline and rehabilitation of offenders (Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:154). Now adding up to sixteen departments, this institution’s name was changed to Correctional Facility between 1993 and 1994. The current staff amounts to 205; with 187 correctional officers and 18 police officers distributed among the different divisions.

The Maltese prison’s motto is ‘Suavis ex Aspero’ which translates to ‘Firm but Gentle’. While this is the main prison, other places of custody acknowledged by the law courts in Malta are the Substance Abuse Therapeutic Unit (S.A.T.U.) in Mtaħleb, the Valletta Lock-Up, and the Forensic Unit in Mount Carmel Hospital, Attard. Falling under the same correctional services is also the Probation Services in Valletta.

As exposed in CCF’s website, its principal goals are to:
i. Keep prisoners in custody

ii. Maintain order, control, discipline and a safe environment

iii. Provide decent conditions for prisoners and meet their needs, including health ones

iv. Provide positive regimes which help prisoners address their offending behaviour and allow them as full and as responsible a life as possible

v. Help prisoners prepare for their return to the community

While recognising the prisoners’ need to rehabilitate in the goals mentioned, the only current rehabilitative services offered at the Corradino Correctional Facility are regular visits by social workers and fortnight visits by a psychiatrist (Caruana, 1993:11). Thus, more human resources are needed for rehabilitative to be more the case in our prisons.

The director of Sedqa, one of the leading organisations in drug rehabilitation, urged a new drug policy. While ‘prisoners have nothing to do for most of the time’, there are cases who have been waiting for more than a year to speak to the psychologist (Grech, n.d.). He challenged the law courts not to see prison as the first resort when penalising drug addicts and people who have committed minor offences as the system is still miserably failing to reform or rehabilitate them. Grech also spoke of the prisoners’ rights in that those sentenced to more than a year imprisonment are no longer granted the right to vote. He was seconded by George Busuttil from Mid-Dlam għad-Dawl who added that legal injustices and thefts are happening, giving the example of when a person loses the right to a pension if jailed after being aged 61 (The Times, 2010).
2.06 The Problem of Drug Misuse

Our generation is witnessing the ever-intensifying problem of drug misuse and addiction. While possibly unknowingly, people associate the word ‘drugs’ with something illegal. However this is widespread and takes on many forms. Drugs can be both legal and illegal. While the latter are sanctioned and punished by the law, others such as the smoking of tobacco, consumption of alcohol, and misuse of the drugs which can be freely bought over the pharmacist’s counter can still be addictive and cause severe problems.

Crow (2001:165) defines the specific features of an addiction. According to him, it is the case when:

i. There is an onset of withdrawal symptoms once the drug ceases to be taken

ii. There is the need to increase the dose of the drug to achieve the same effect

iii. The person becomes dependent and craves for the drug.

A link between drug misuse and crime was also established: either organised crime to supply drugs, or that committed by drug victims to support their habit due to its expensive nature.
Analysing the British drug scene, he found that users were ‘increasingly likely to be working-class young people’ coming from areas ‘characterised by high levels of poverty and social stress, poor social provision and high levels of alienation’ rather than belonging to the middle-class. This is also the case in our country as Sedqa’s director Mr. Grech pictured the recovering drug addicts from Valletta all coming from the same six streets (Grech, op.cit.).

With the number of drug addicts always on the rise, the problem has spread so wide that ‘the number of drug addicts trying to get clean at Sedqa’s detox centre include three generation families – grandfathers, fathers and sons’ (Grech, ibid). Clinard (1974:404) also showed this by saying that the nature of drug addiction changes from time to time. Along with this, though, Mr. Grech’s concerns include the increase in number of women a and child b drug users, the high rate of prisoners jailed for drug related cases, the average of a minimum ten annual deaths from overdose, the high rate of people turning to drugs while being treated in Mount Carmel Hospital, and the alarming number of cases at the stated detox centre.

a These are more likely to be engaged in unique problems such as prostitution, sexual abuse, and domestic violence. A shocking fact is that the ones seeking help are the parents of some 900 children, who cannot be given the appropriate care from organisations due to the lack of human resources (The Times, 2010).

b Caritas director Victor Grech revealed that children of age as tender as eight are using drugs and become addicted by the time they seek help. He was worried in feeling that
'Malta is losing its fight against drug addiction and trafficking. Drugs are dispersed among Malta and Gozo, and those who have money and friends can buy as much as they want’ (The Times, 2006).

The seriousness of such child drug cases was even more clearly illustrated in a study carried out by Sedqa between the years of 1995 and 1999 which found that 9.46% of boys and 7.63% of girls have at least for once experimented with illicit drugs by the time they reach 16 years of age.

Furthermore, a study carried out among students attending the University of Malta in 2009 consequently found that 17.3% of students had used drugs within a year, with the most common substance being cocaine. While 12.2% of the students smoke regularly, another 9.2% smoke occasionally, and the rest do not smoke at all. 11% then consume alcohol daily, 79% occasionally, and only 10% never drink alcohol.

2.07 Drug-Related Crime

The justice system operates like a giant sorting machine,’ distributing offenders in the different institutions of correctional supervision (Useem & Morrison Piehl, 2008:9). For an act to be considered criminal, it has to be listed in the country’s Criminal Code.
However, what constitutes a crime ‘suffers from an extreme cultural relativism’ (Muncie & McLaughlin, as cited in Azzopardi & Scicluna, 2009:147) but it incorporates within it a socially harmful and legally forbidden act.

Siegel (2009b:41) exposes three views of crime: the consensus view, the conflict view, and the interactionist view. He defines crime as:

A violation of social rules of conduct, interpreted and expressed by a written criminal code, created by people holding social and political power. Its content may be influenced by prevailing public sentiments, historically developed moral beliefs, and the need to protect public safety. Individuals who violate these rules may be subject to sanctions administered by state authority, which include social stigma and loss of status, freedom, and on occasion, their lives.

As earlier stated, there seems to be quite a strong connection between drugs and crime (Bennett, 1998), and this is supported by various reasons. Clinard (1974:422) stated that ‘the use of narcotics is so expensive that an addict must often engage in various illegal activities to maintain his supply’. Crow (2001:172) goes on to point out its complex nature: while illegal possession of drugs is an offence in itself, it usually leads to other criminal involvements such as supplying drugs to others and stealing so as to fund this expensive habit. He also mentions that treatment programmes should not only focus on health issues, but also try to ‘unravel a difficult set of social and criminal relationships’.

According to national statistics, drug offences within the Maltese population add up to 341 per 100,000 people (NationMaster, 2011). The number recorded between 2001 and
2006 (Mid-Dlam għad-Dawl, n.d.) showed a decrease in cases. However, *rumours* are that even if a person is imprisoned on a different case, chances are that one will turn to drugs while in prison, causing a chaos in the long run.

### 2.08 The Nature of Imprisonment

An imprisonment sentence may have attached with it a number of different emotions varying according to the person; the convicted, the relatives, and the victims. However, as Davies (1974) explains, prison is still held to be an inevitable part of the penal system by many people, even if ‘there is a growing awareness that its effects on offenders are rarely beneficial and may be positively harmful’.

He (p. 21) emphasises how ex-prisoners stress the ‘harshness, the depersonalisation and the overbearing aimlessness of life in jail’ together with the ‘crisis of coming out’ since the imprisonment sentences aggravate the problems which they have to face after their release. Davies (1974:105) goes on to say that the repercussions might not always be temporary (i.e., while in prison) but can also permanently damage one’s ability of economic survival.
The prison environment suggests the deprivation of freedom, especially emphasised by the high walls surrounding it, and only a little window in each cell. According to Crow (2001:103), while prison is primarily thought of as a punishment, it has several other functions to fulfil, namely, retribution, deterrence, containment, and rehabilitation.

The Drug Intervention Programme in Britain proposed among other areas, the concept of ‘through care’ in which the help provided is not simply offered while a person is serving the sentence, but starts beforehand, goes on inside prison, and continues after release for as long as needed (Community Engagement Project, 2006).

As cited in Crow (2001:194), Hough identified two important considerations in relation to drug misuse and the criminal justice. According to him, treatment should be given as soon as its need is recognised, and it should last for a minimum of three months. After reporting ‘little difference in success between methadone maintenance, therapeutic communities and community-based, drug-free programmes’, he stressed that:

Treatment should be thought of as less as a technology and more as a human process, where a diversity of strategies can all achieve the same effect: shaping and sustaining motivation to change.

The last decade saw the introduction of the Mandatory Drug Testing, which tests the inmates’ urine and determines whether they had been using drugs. While this seems like a step forward in reducing drugs inside prison, many are sceptical. MacDonald (1997:13) found that while some of the respondents believed that such testing would reduce drug
use, twice as much thought that it would make no difference at all. The latter view was also expressed by the prison officers he interviewed. Thus, this suggests that while MDT might serve as a deterrent to some prisoners, drug use inside prison still remains likely to be the case.

Morgan (cited in Crow, 2001:104) who saw strong parallels between prisons and lunatic asylums, suggested three uses of prisons, namely:

i. Custodial – remanding prisoners in custody ‘to ensure that the course of justice proceeds to its conclusion’

ii. Coercive – fining defaulters because of their ‘failure to comply with a court order’

iii. Punitive – ‘Men come to prison as a punishment, not for punishment’ (Paterson, 1951).

When asked about the situation of prisoners inside the Corradino Correctional Facility, Mark Montebello, an activist for prisoner rights, was quoted saying that:

The most unfortunate thing that could happen to society and to the actual and future potential victims, is that a person leaves prison worse than when he entered it and that is what is happening. Prison should be at the service of society. People should pay their dues, but it should not only be a place of punishment but also a place of therapy, where people are healed from the causes of crime. Actually people who say that there should be no help are illogical because they say they want to benefit society, but simple incarceration is not beneficial to society; it is making things worse. So when we defend the
possibility of a prisoner to live happily and uphold the laws of the land, we are actually contributing to the benefit of society. (Schembri Wismayer, 2002)

### 2.09 The Situation Behind the Bars

While laymen may perceive the situation of prisoners as getting what they deserve in return for their unacceptable behaviour, a study conducted amongst inmates at the Corradino Correctional Facility revealed how 80% of them still felt integrated in society after release and pleaded employers to get a job. They shared their wish to be given a second chance by ‘access to free training, flexible working hours and support from an employment centre’ (Attard, n.d.).

Davies (1974:2) is cynical on whether prisons serve as a lesson to delinquents while making the society they must return to seem as a ‘foreign land’. Being held in custody in order not to influence their surroundings, ‘prisonisation’ makes the inmates accept an inferior role in such an institutional culture. This can be also shown in the uniformity they must conform to such as ‘cell accommodation, their food, their leisure-time activities, their work opportunities, their companions, their mode of dress, hair-style’, etc.

However, other issues arise when focusing on the drug situation behind the bars. According to Crow (2001:188), while estimating the extent of drug use inside prisons is not
clear cut, studies suggest that its use is ‘substantial, if not widespread’. He claims that ‘in
the past, treatment in prison for people with drug dependency problems has been limited
and inadequate’. Yet again, the following proposes that this might still be the case in our
times, at least in our prison.

After describing his act as “morally wrong but legally correct”, Marsden, now a free
man, spoke on the drug situation inside the Corradino Correctional Facility soon after his
release. His shocking statements made the situation appear in the limelight, together with
several measures to be taken by the concerned authorities.

He described the Corradino Correctional Facility as a ‘drug den’, stating that he have
seen more drugs being traded and taken in that prison than he had seen in the rest of his
life (Maltastar, 2009). Further speaking about the situation, Marsden went on to say that it
is:

In a word horrific. People would not believe what goes inside that prison. Corradino Correctional Facility, there is no rehabilitation. It is a joke basically. It needs a complete overhaul as well as the judicial system. It needs to come to the 21st century. People [are] going in as petty criminals and coming out as drug addicts. There is no correctional facility. There is no exercise. There is nothing, it is a joke.

This gave way to a number of inmates to express their views regarding the same
situation, confessing that somehow drugs came through, and adding that “whoever does
not say he is taking drugs is lying” on an aired local television program (Maltastar, 2009).
2.10 Public’s Notions

The public’s impression of prisoners may be characterised by ambiguity, yet governed by several things; the comic pictures, the scruffy look on police identity photos, video-clips on the daily news showing them covering their face, you name it. As explained in Becker’s labelling theory, once a person has entered prison, one will lose all the merits and good labels possessed to adopt a negative one – that of a criminal. People tend to rank and portray prisoners as all alike (Davies, 1974:16). This is then linked to the self-fulfilling prophecy, making matters only worse.

Usually even after one’s release, once the sentence has been served and the punishment paid, society will still look at the ex-prisoner with a negative eye. However, Coyle (as cited in Crow, 2001:107) holds that the probability of re-offending rests more on the issues the offender faces on release such as accommodation, family support and employment, rather than the imprisonment experience itself.

A national survey conducted in Malta in 2001 uncovered how 83% of the Maltese population perceived drug abuse to be a serious problem. This stands in contrast to the 43% who thought of it as such in 1984. The same survey also showed that the same people considered drug users as patients, rather than criminals (Crime and Society, n.d.).
A study conducted by Buhagiar (2007:60-65) revealed how the majority of those interviewed held neutral attitudes towards the characteristics of the prisoner, rehabilitation and punishment for prisoners, and having a relationship with an ex-prisoner, with the last statement being the least favoured. The majority, however, held positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and negative attitudes towards punishment. Moreover, they believe that prisoners do not rehabilitate at all inside prison, and thus, they still feel threatened when a prisoner is released. Having said that, respondents believed that effort should be made to include prisoners back in society.

Buhagiar (2007:64) concluded that rehabilitation is not occurring inside the Corradino Correctional Facility, implying that if the strategy is not being rehabilitative, the end result will be the same irrespective of the length of one’s sentence. This led her to further conclude that prison is ‘only serving as a building to discriminate us from them’.

2.11 The Future of Imprisonment

While for some, prisons should be part of the past, for others, they offer some comfort and security. As have been happening with the function they perform, Tonry (2004:4) predicted that people’s expectations of prisons will keep on changing as well. However, signs indicate that the harshest and most stereotyped attitudes towards crime and criminals are softening, meaning the worst is supposedly over.
He goes on to say that there are valid reasons why prisons should keep on operating, especially since its alternatives are ‘scarily worse’. Based on two foundations, namely scope and values, Tonry (2004:6-23) proposes a number of impositions on future prisons, including:

i. Punishment of offenders and prevention of crime should be in the prison’s aims.

ii. Prisons should facilitate prisoner's self-development.

iii. Prisons should not damage prisoners.

iv. Management of prisons should be the responsibility of a unified corrections agency with responsibility for delivery of all community and institutional punishments.

v. Corrections systems should develop capacity for continuing, integrated oversight of services and programs for individual offenders.

vi. Nearly all corrections personnel should be career civil servants.

vii. All sentencing decisions should be guided by presumptive sentencing guidelines.

viii. No sentence may be imposed that is more severe or intrusive than can be justified by reference to the seriousness of the offender’s crime or crimes.

ix. No sentence should be more intrusive or severe than the least restrictive that will serve applicable purposes at sentencing.

x. No prison sentence should be imposed unless the judge has received and reviewed a pre-sentence report prepared by a professional corrections officer.

xi. Implementation of all sentences, of whatever type, should be continuously overseen by a designated oversight team.

xii. Prisons should be places of security and safety for prisoners, staff, and visitors.
xiii. No prison should house more than 300 prisoners.
xiv. Prisoners should enjoy all rights and privileges of free citizens except those inherently infringed by movement controls and security needs associated with imprisonment.
xv. Life within the prison should closely approximate that in the community.
xvi. Prisons should provide opportunities for constructive, self-change for those prisoners who want it.
xvii. Prison walls should be permeable.
xviii. Supervision and provision of services to released prisoners should continue seamlessly.
xix. Released prisoners should enjoy all rights and privileges of other free citizens, except those inherently limited by the terms of any post-release supervision and for requirements that they participate in mandated treatment programs.

As cited in Caruana (1993:1), at the moment the behaviour of delinquents is being neither understood nor corrected since the criminal justice system is neither being effective in deterring nor in correcting the criminals. Instead, in the supposedly correctional institution, people ‘may well be preparing for an adult life of crime’.

Davies (1974:153) said that arguments against prison are identified threefold:

i. Humanitarian case - no society should require anyone to live in indecent conditions.
ii. Effectiveness argument - prison is of no positive value in reducing crime due to its inhumane conditions and the shortcoming of training programmes, instead, it can considerably aggravate the situation and make it worse to settle after release.

iii. Economic argument - it would be cheaper to keep a person in the community rather than in prison.

He also held that ‘it is more humane in most cases not to shut a man away in an artificially imposed community ... [yet] it would be more sadistic to potential victims to give a man his freedom than it would be to lock him up’. He also suggested that the inhumanity implied could be reduced if prison conditions were improved and more scope of inmate decision-making was allowed within the institution.

2.12 Conclusion

With the various diverging perspectives about prison being put into light in this section, Morris (1974.ix) denoted that ‘insofar as prisons purport to cure crime, their record has not been encouraging’. He also said that the several other purposes of prison including that to banish is what assures their continued survival.
This chapter must be concluded, however, with the words of Sir Alexander Paterson (as cited in Crow, 2001:103), a former Commissioner of Prisons for England and Malta, who in 1951 argued that:

In order to afford anything in the nature of permanent protection, either the prison must keep the offender within its walls for the term of his natural life, or it must bring such influence to bear upon him while in custody that he will, on the day of his discharge, be an honest, hard-working, and self-controlled man, fit for freedom, and no longer an enemy of society.
Chapter 3

Methodology

3.01 Introduction

To successfully carry out an empirical research, one must cautiously choose the methodology to be used and applied throughout the study beforehand. This chapter will illustrate and describe the methods which were deemed best fit for this research, and which will thus be applied.

3.02 Purpose of Study

With particular interest in social order, the researcher decided to focus this study on prison as an institution, and then narrowed her attention to the drug rehabilitation that takes place inside the Maltese prison.
The main purpose of this research study is to analyse whether prisons in Malta, in particular the Corradino Correctional Facility is serving as a place of rehabilitation to people hooked up on drugs while serving their sentence. The second underlying aim then is to point out the difference in perceptions about the same topic between people who have experienced prison first hand and others who have not.

In addition, this study will be briefly analysing more facts, including which factors may increase the incidence of turning to drugs, opinions regarding the prison sentences awarded with relation to drug intake and trafficking, the main objectives of a prison, and what happens after the person serves the sentence and returns back to society.

As working hypotheses, this study is based on the following:

i. Drug addiction emanates from peer pressure.
ii. Prison serves as a deterrent to crime.
iii. CCF prisoners rehabilitate themselves.
iv. Drugs are widely available inside the Maltese prison.
v. Prisoners are well prepared to re-integrate themselves.
3.03 Research Design

Producing a research design ... implies that all the various aspects will be integrated. It provides the template for how you will manage your project. (Kelly, 2004:141)

While for Bhatt (2004:416), ‘there is no ‘correct’ method’ to investigate something, the researcher believes to have chosen the right techniques that fit best for such research and which will be discussed below.

There has been an ongoing debate on which method is best to be used in the social sciences. As cited in Neuman (2006:13), this is shown by Levine who argued that quantitative, which he called “real” social science has faced opposition but still won the battle. On the other hand, Denzin and Lincoln claimed that qualitative research has been widely used and displaced what they called “outdated” quantitative research.

However, since as indicated before, this research project deals with two groups of participants, it was decided to opt for a combination of both the qualitative and quantitative research methods which were attached to each group of respondents respectively in order to collect the data.
Due to the fact that the first group of participants, that is the prisoners, have more to say and will possibly give deeper insights on the research topic chosen, qualitative interviewing was found to be more suitable for this group.

Various reasons support this decision. As outlined in Neuman (2006:13), the qualitative approach is more likely to construct social reality and focuses on interactive processes. It is situationally constrained and usually the subjects (i.e. participants) are few. Also, replication can never be exactly the case, and generalisation is not possible.

Another characteristic of this approach is that the researcher is involved. Although this might be a positive feature so as to undermine any misunderstandings and get a better hold of the information transmitted, the negative aspect of it can be that the researcher might influence the respondents in a number of ways, including the way in which questions are posited, together with the tone of voice and body language. Having said that, the researcher will do her utmost to stay as neutral as positive and hold no bias.

As further identified by Byrne (2004:182), qualitative interviewing has more pros and cons. Although unpredictable, it is yet very flexible, which helps to extract different forms of information from the interviewees. It provides the researcher to better grasp the interpretations, experiences, and opinions of those being questioned. When chosen as a research tool, various factors affect the outcome. Some of these variables include who the interviewer and the interviewee are, the form of questioning and the location where the interviews take place.
Finally, Bryman (2008:366) distinguishes and pinpoints three features of qualitative research, namely that it is inductive in its approach, and hence theory is formed after the data has been gathered\(^2\); that it possesses an epistemological position, which is described as interpretivist and stresses the understanding of the social world through the interpretation of that world by the participants; and that it holds an ontological position, which is described as constructivist, implying that social properties are outcomes of interactions between individuals.

Moving on to the second group of participants, the quantitative method was found to be more adequate to apply mainly because the answers collected from them will primarily be needed to be compared to those of the first group, and thus draw the differences in the perceptions.

The quantitative approach focuses on variables (Neuman, 2006:13), which in this case have been set and identified beforehand by means of the literature reviewed at an earlier stage in the study. Another characteristic is that the researcher is detached (Neuman, *ibid*). Thus, in contrast to the first case, she will not be encountering face-to-face interviews with the respondents. Although it takes time to formulate the questionnaire, it is still much less time-consuming to gather the data when compared to the qualitative approach. Having mentioned this, which can be listed as an advantage together with the easier process to analyse the data with statistics (Neuman, 2006:153) due to the closed-

\(^2\) Being an inductive method, a qualitative approach to research denotes the development of theory during the data collection process and is thus grounded in that data (Neuman, 2006:157).
ended questions mainly set, some seemingly disadvantages are that the respondents may not get down to give their full opinion on the subject. This is however neutralised by the earlier mentioned fact that no in-depth answers from this group are really needed, and therefore, a quantitative approach deemed more suitable just the same.

The methodological procedures of this approach are standardised and rely on objectivity (Neuman, *ibid*). Replication can easily be the case and data analysis is also made easier with the help of statistics, charts and tables to expose the findings (Neuman, 2006:157).

A quantitative questionnaire is composed of different variables, which can either be independent, dependent, or intervening (Neuman, 2006:161). Apart from generalisation and replication, causality is a preoccupation within quantitative research as the researcher is particularly interested in examining the causes rather than the phenomenon itself (Bryman, 2008:156-157).

Although a very practical and sought-after method, the quantitative approach faces some criticisms in that it fails to distinguish people and social institutions from the ‘world of nature’ (Schutz, as cited in Bryman, 2008:159), its measurement process possesses an artificial and spurious sense of precision and accuracy, the reliance on instruments and procedures hinders the connection between research and everyday life, and that the analysis of relationships between variables creates a static view of social life that is independent of people’s lives (Blumer, as cited in Bryman, 2008:160).
In spite of this, it is still supposed that all the processes involved in this research study are enough and ideal to make it useful.

Finally, since the products (answers/data) of the both approaches will be compared, this implies the use of the comparative method.

**3.04 Sampling & Choice of Participants**

Sampling is a major problem for any type of research. We can’t study every case of whatever we’re interested in, nor should we want to. Every scientific enterprise tries to find out something that will apply to everything of a certain kind by studying a few examples (Becker, as cited in Neuman, 2006:219).

In view of the very difficult nature of this study, the researcher opted for non-probability sampling, which can be described in simpler words as not selecting people randomly. This also means that the exact number of interviewees could not be determined beforehand. As Flick (cited in Neuman, 2006:220) puts it, qualitative researchers determine their participants more on the basis of their relevance to the topic rather than their representativeness.
As for the first group of participants, in order to be relevant for such a study, people who served time at the Corradino Correctional Facility and made use of drugs during their stay there were needed to be interviewed so as to get the necessary information. Thus, the researcher contacted a particular Maltese home forming part of a leading organisation which aims to help people (including ex/prisoners) dealing with drug problems. It was willing to help and gave permission to interview all the residents, which added up to 13, on one condition: that both the home itself and the people residing within it remain anonymous.

This type would be considered as deviant case or extreme case sampling, as the interviewed will be people who experienced imprisonment while being addicted to drugs, thus, being somewhat different from the rest of society and fall under the term ‘deviants’. Since the respondents would be undergoing a drug rehabilitation programme, they are not be representative of the whole prison population dealing with drug issues, since while these have chosen to try and rehabilitate themselves, there might be others who are not willing to do so. Yet, their answers will somewhat be representative of the people who are willing to rehabilitate themselves and especially those undergoing treatment.

In addition, this carries with it a number of advantages. As opposed to other kinds, especially probability or random sampling, it was not necessary to go through a series of processes to get to the participants. While a population had been targeted, the sampling frame rests within this home. Unfortunately, no sampling ratio is provided since there are no data or statistics which show how many people abuse of drugs while serving a sentence.
in prison, which might be partly due to the sensitive nature of such cases. Another advantage is that there can be no sampling error.

Although non-probability is generally used in qualitative research, the researcher opted for the same kind of sampling in the quantitative part of the research as well. This of course excludes the possibility of any type of generalisation, but was deemed acceptable as a student project. As interviewees, all final year students in the researcher’s course were used as the universe for this study.

3.05 Measurement Instruments

As human beings, we tend to measure everything in our everyday lives; some which are easy measureable by means of technological equipment such as temperature and weight, and others which might seem non-measureable such as intelligence and poverty. The latter, however, usually produce answers which make sense only in a relative context. Although they might not show the true or full picture, such measurements still help a great deal.

Nonetheless, as social scientists, we try to measure social facts, and this partially explains all the statistics we are exposed to and affected by. Various organisations and
institutions were set up for this purpose, like the National Statistics Office on a national level, and others such as the EuroBarometer and EuroStat on a European level. Measurements can give a deep insight to a population. This can be shown in the national census which takes place every ten years, and from which no citizen can refrain.

Part of the process in carrying out a research study entails measuring the concepts and variables which are linked by data (Neuman, 2006:181). As the title of this dissertation proposes, the researcher will be measuring the respondents’ perceptions with regards to the drug rehabilitation, or the lack of it, that occurs inside the Maltese prison, that is, the Corradino Correctional Facility.

While the questions have been formulated beforehand by means of the literature reviewed, the first group, who will be interviewed in a qualitative manner, will possibly come out with concepts which might not have been foreseen. On the other hand, the second group of participants who were exposed to a quantitative questionnaire, did not have the possibility to give their full perspective on the subject, and thus their answers will be relative only to the questions asked.

‘Measurement links data to concepts’ (Neuman, *ibid*). With the first group of participants, measurement will initially take place during the data collection, hence the interviews themselves. Thus, the concepts that arise will be noted instantly. In contrast to this, the answers provided by the second group of participants will be produced in the form of numbers, as required to be processed by the PASW and which will further explained in the ‘Data Analysis’ section.
Of crucial importance when measuring are issues of validity and reliability. By validity, it is meant that the picture portrayed is true and reflects reality. Reliability, then, suggests consistency. Apart from consistency in carrying out the research, it proposes very similar outcomes should the study be replicated under similar conditions (Neuman, 2006:188).

Even if the processes involved in both the qualitative and the quantitative approaches are different and vary according to their respective nature, in both instances, validity and reliability are to be reached. Consequently, representativeness might be crucial too but it is still presumed to be the case in this study.

3.06 Description of Questions

This section will briefly describe the content and nature of the questions used with the two different groups of respondents.
Qualitative Interviews with Prisoners

Although the interviewees remained anonymous throughout due to ethical issues, the respondents’ gender, and other personal details such as their age, their level of education, and their last employment were enquired and jotted down. This was mainly done for comparative reasons during the data analysis.

During the conversational interviews, a semi-structured questionnaire consisting of seven sections was used.

Section 1: Personal Opinions. The respondents were asked whether the four instances mentioned could increase the risk of a person to turn to drugs. They also had the opportunity to mention other personal experiences or opinions regarding the matter. Another question was whether their perception of prison had shifted after they had experienced it themselves.

Section 2: Background. In this section, the respondents were asked to portray their primary experience of drug intake, including whether it was a voluntary or involuntary act, and whether they were aware that this was a vice and could lead them to commit criminal offences. Finally, they were asked whether they had ever engaged in a drug rehabilitation
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programme before. Indirectly, the researcher also grasped what their case involved in a nutshell.

Section 3: Prison Sentences. Here the respondents were asked to give their account with regards to the prison sentences awarded to drug addicts and drug dealers. They were also asked to specify whether the time spent in prison affects the rehabilitation process or not together with whether their experience was better or worse than they had expected.

Section 4: Prison as an Institution. In this section the respondents were asked questions with regards to how they view the Corradino Correctional Facility and what are its objectives. They were also asked whether they see prison as a rehabilitative institution which helps prisoners even on an academic level.

Section 5: Prison vis-à-vis Drug Addiction and Rehabilitation. Now the respondents were asked more in-depth questions regarding the drug situation inside our main prison. In addition, questions regarding whether they were subjected to drugs-test together with how accessible is help while being behind the bars were put forward.

Section 6: After Prison. This section dealt with the impact that prison leaves on them, what do they feel sorry for, and whether they are looking forward or dreading the day they return back to society. Last but not least, they were asked which helped the greatest deal; prison or the home they were serving time in.
Section 7: Conclusion. To conclude the interviews, the respondents were invited to suggest what can be done to improve the situation inside the Corradino Correctional Facility together with their opportunity to add whatever they feel might be relative to the subject and was not mentioned throughout the conversations.

Quantitative Questionnaires for Students

Keeping in sync with the interview questions described above, an online questionnaire on the same lines in order to be able to compare the views of the different groups of participants was formulated. Divided into seven pages, this consisted of ten questions.

While the first page was an introduction, asking the respondents to kindly fill in all the questions, in the second page they were enquired them to provide their gender and age, together with whether any close or family member of theirs has ever been to prison.

Page 3: Experiencing the first drug intake. Consisting of three questions, this page dealt with which, if any, of the four instances mentioned (family background, education, peer group, bullying) could increase the risk of a person to turn to drugs. They also had to possibility to include other instances. Following this, the respondents were asked to fill in at what age do they think that the first drug intake occurs, together with whether it is a voluntary or involuntary act.
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Page 4: Objectives of Prison. This page was characterised by two questions: the first one asking them to choose from a given number of possible answers regarding the objectives of a prison and whether the Corradino Correctional Facility is achieving such objectives, and the second one consisting of a Likert scale with five options to tick one at a time and express their views with regards to the statements provided.

Page 5: Drugs and Rehabilitation inside Prison. This page consisted of one Likert scaled question with six statements regarding the drug rehabilitation that goes on inside prison including the drugs-test and the prison environment. The respondents had to choose from five options to express their degree of agreement with each statement provided.

Page 6: Imprisonment Sentences. Consisting of two other Likert scale questions dealing with the imprisonment sentences awarded in relation to drugs and what happens after the imprisonment sentence has been served, the respondents were asked to tick their degree of agreement with each statement.

The last page was then a conclusion to thank the participants for their time and concern. No questions were asked in it.
3.07 Location of Interviews

Starting with the first group of participants, it was agreed from the beginning that the interviews were to take place at the home where these prisoners are kept in custody since they are not allowed to leave it unless for other reasons included in their deal. Thus, the researcher travelled there to carry out the interviews.

In a serene environment, with his permission using the director’s office, the interviews were carried out as expected. For ethical and even comfort reasons, only the interviewees (one at a time) and the researcher were in the room. This made it also easier for the recordings to come out clear.

The second group of participants gave their input by filling an online questionnaire which could be accessed by clicking on the particular link attached with the e-mail personally sent to them. Thus, there was no particular location as they could access it wherever they wanted to, at whichever time and whenever they felt like it. To mention a couple of other advantages, this mode of collecting data is very much less time consuming, and more efficient.
3.08  Data Collection

Every researcher aims at collecting high-quality data, which is an empirical representation of concepts (Neuman, 2006:181). While with the first group of participants, the data was collected at the time of the interviews, hence grasping full knowledge and understanding of the matters they express and also establishing the main concepts at first account, with the second group of participants it was a different story. To get hold of how they perceive the drug issue inside prison and be able to collect all the data they provided, all the respondents had to previously fill in the web-based questionnaire.

3.09  Data Analysis

After all the data had been collected, the next step would be analysing it. This is probably the most time-consuming process of all.

In order to analyse the data collected through the qualitative interviews, the use of grounded theory and its iterative approach were applied. In simple words, these assume the derivation of theory from data, which is ‘systematically gathered and analysed through
the research process’ (Bryman, 2008:541). It also means that the data collection and its analyses possess a ‘close relationship’ (Strauss and Corbin, as cited in Bryman, *ibid*).

A particular tool in grounded theory is that of coding, in which the researcher breaks down the data into component parts which will be later analysed so as to generate theory. While making use of a constant comparison, the researcher identifies categories within the data previously collected, exploring the relationship between them, and testing the hypothesis. This leads to the generation of theory.

The process to analyse the data collected through the quantitative questionnaire, which in this case was web-based, might require less effort but still demands full attention. In this instance, each question and statement takes up the name of a variable and each answer is coded into numbers. These are then inserted into the PASW (Predictive Analytics Software, former SPSS) and analysed by means of a number of processes provided, which in turn allow the researcher to come out with charts in order to illustrate the findings.

### 3.10 Ethical Considerations

This section will deal with and discuss the ethical issues that arose during this study, with regards to the Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association.
To start off, all the questions asked to both groups of respondents were previously reviewed and approved by the supervisor. In the case of the deviant group, the set of questions asked were also previously reviewed and accepted by the director of the home. He was also requested to read and consequently sign a consent form\textsuperscript{5}.

In order to safeguard the participants’ interests, it was made sure that all of them were self-conscious adults. Throughout the whole research, the researcher honoured their anonymity, privacy, and guaranteed confidentiality to all participants.

With regards to the first group of participants, the research objectives together with their rights were written black on white in the consent form\textsuperscript{6} handed to and signed by them before the interviews took place. Due to their fragile nature which was kept in mind throughout, no source of superiority was expressed from the interviewer’s side. Consequently, none of the participants were negatively affected by this research.

While all participants have been made aware of the nature of this study before any encounters from the researcher’s side, no identification of any of the participants has been recorded whatsoever.

With regards to professional integrity, the researcher:

\textsuperscript{5} Appendix 4
\textsuperscript{6} Appendix 5
i. Declares that all the information published here is accurate and true;

ii. Is willingly publishing this study and its results to be further used by other researchers, also contributing to the well-being of society.

3.11 Limitations of the Study

During the several processes of this study, quite a number of limitations which seemed to put restrictions on it were encountered. Firstly, a lot of time was wasted until the right, approving gatekeeper and people for this study were found and contacted. Also, the difficulty and restriction of access to enter prison and interview its inmates should be mentioned.

Secondly, due to the nature of the setting the respondents reside in, time was very restricted in that interviewees could have been moved from one day to another, so all qualitative interviews took place within the span of a week. Only in this manner could the researcher take a full picture of the people who were addicted to drugs while serving their prison sentence yet while undergoing a drug-rehabilitation programme during a particular time and at a particular place.
Third, while quite a lot of literature was reviewed, the researcher was only exposed to theory, written experiences, and words-of-mouth. This means that she was not used to their culture and the change in backgrounds was reflected such that at certain moments, what the respondents meant by some of the terms used could not be fully understood.

### 3.12 Conclusion

After dealing with all the means and processes involved in carrying out a research study, we will move on to the following chapter which will analyse what have been found.


Chapter 4

Discussing the Findings

4.01 Introduction

This chapter will present the results of the two empirical studies. The facts will be presented and the different responses obtained will be highlighted. This chapter will also incorporate a discussion in respect of the theories dealt with in the second chapter.
4.02 Profile of Respondents

As indicated both in the title of this dissertation and in the previous chapter, two groups of participants, who are briefly referred to as ‘deviants’ and ‘students’ were asked to voice their opinions about the subject. The tables that follow will outline their profile, namely the respondents’ age, gender, and level of education in relation to (i) the case they were awarded imprisonment for, and (ii) whether a family or close member of theirs has ever been to prison respectively. While Table 1 displays the deviants’ profile, Table 2 displays the students’ profile.
### Table 1: Deviants' Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (drug related)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not drug related)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Students' Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Post-Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.03  Faces of Prison

It is most likely that there are as many opinions as there are people. Consequently, prison may be perceived differently by different people, who in addition attach to it a number of faces. While before experiencing imprisonment everyone is only exposed the others’ word-of-mouth, one’s perception might change drastically when having a first-hand experience.

When the deviants were asked whether they had a picture of what prison looks and feels like in mind and whether such perception had altered since when they experienced it, the respective majority, seven in all, said that they did have some sort of picture in mind. The responses were not identical, however.

Out of these seven, three put on a blank expression while saying that they did have a picture in mind. One of these said such perception had altered, and explained that:

“Hemm ġew dejjem hemm ġew; ghandek kemm ghandek saḥha, mejjet ħaj.”

“Being in prison is being in prison whatsoever; irrespective of your powers, you’re a living dead.”

From the picture drawn at this point, thus after this person experienced prison, it can be safely assumed that the thought before his imprisonment rested upon informal power.
making one’s stay better. The other two respondents claimed that their perception it did not change.

On first encounter, this already shows that opposite to what Caruana (1993:21-23) suggested when saying that the aims must be pointed at ‘keeping the prisoner alive at a physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, and social level’.

Furthermore, two other respondents had a negative image in mind, one being afraid that prisoners were sexually abused, and the other due to having been exposed to close family members sent to prison before him. While the first respondent admitted that it did change for the better, since such abuses never occurred, the other claimed his negative image did not change. Moreover, he went on to say that:

“Il-habs skola tal-kriminalita”

“Prison is a crime school”

The remaining two of the seven had a positive picture in mind, such as prisoners lived a luxurious life, being provided with everything they want including gadgets. They both claimed that it changed. Interestingly enough, according to one of them, the positive image included access to drugs, hence implying the model such people are given, putting their mind at rest that prison would not mean the end of their habit. At this point, it must be kept in mind that this respondent was put in the juvenile section, in which no drugs are ever accessible.
The minority, adding up to five, had no previous idea regarding what prison offers to its inmates. However, all of them said that they do have a clear picture which differs from what they had previously expected.

The last respondent, who experienced prison for the first time at a very tender age, had something unordinary to say. He confessed being happy to have entered prison for the first time, perceiving it as a holiday to see what it looks like.

From this preliminary analysis, if one were to classify these respondents as Ferri (cited in Hudson, 2003:28) proposed, they would all fit to the section in which if faced by different circumstances, they would not have been criminals at all. Apart from one (whose sentence was not drug related and shows in the deviants’ profile), they were all sentenced in-part, if not fully, to supply their habit.

This question was not asked to be compared to the student respondents, since none of them had ever experienced imprisonment.
4.04 **Origin of Drug Addiction**

There can be various factors which might lead a person to turn to drugs. A series of questions were put to the respondents in order to get a better understanding of what (i) they think, and (ii) their experience was.

In the first question, both groups were provided with four instances, namely family background, education, peer group and bullying, together with an option to add whatever they feel affects such emanation. The findings are listed in the tables below, with a table for each instance showing the responses obtained from the students. These are shown in relation to the respondents’ age, gender, and whether a close or family member has ever been to prison. Assisting them is a Chi-square test showing the relation between two of the variables.

Table 3 shows how seven of the respondents think that the family background increases the risk of a person to turn to drugs. On the other hand, Table 4 explains how none of the respondents think that education might in some way affect the likelihood to start this habit. In contrast stand the findings displayed in Table 5 which illustrate how all respondents feel that one's peer group affects a person to start using drugs. Five of the respondents shown in Table 6 expressed that bullying also increases such risk. Table 7 then exposes the other incidences identified by the respondents which add to the chance of a person to turn to drugs, namely, exploration, lack of fulfilment, and a way of coping with problems.
### Table 3: Drug emanation from family background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Background</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Background</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

**H₀**: There is no association between Family background and Member

**H₁**: There is an association between Family background and Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the p-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, H₀ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that family background affect the emanation of drug addiction, irrespective of whether a family member of the respondents has been to prison or not.
Table 4: Drug emanation from education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | % of total | 100%  | 100%   | 100%   | 100%  | 100%  | 100%| 100% |%

Due to the consistency of the answers obtained, no other statistics could be computed. However, it is clearly visible that since all respondents hold that education does not affect the emanation of drug addiction, there is no association between their answers and whether a family member of theirs has ever been to prison.

Table 5: Drug emanation from peer group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | % of total | 100%  | 100%   | 100%   | 100%  | 100%  | 100%| 100% |%

Due to the uniformity of the answers gathered, no other statistics could be computed. However, the table above illustrates how all the respondents believe that one’s peer group affects the emanation of drug addiction, therefore, there is no association between the
answers collected and whether a family member of the respondents has ever been to prison or not.

### Table 6: Drug emanation from bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

**H₀**: There is no association between Bullying and Member

**H₁**: There is an association between Bullying and Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the p-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, H₀ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that bullying affects the emanation of drug addiction, irrespective of whether a family member of the respondents has been to prison or not.
These answers can be compared to those obtained from the deviant respondents. Four of the latter confessed that all the factors mentioned by the researcher had an impact on them and affected to start using drugs. However, the absolute majority, nine in all, said that their case was shadowed by the background of the family they come from, two of them said that education affected them as well, seven admitted that they were influenced by peers or even girlfriends in some cases, and three claimed that bullying was also present when they turned to drugs. Additionally, two of the respondents said that worries in life took its toll and hence found comfort in drugs. One of the latter continued to say that other addictions such as cigarette smoking and alcohol consumption eased the start to drug misusing.

When comparing these responses, some conclusions can be drawn. While the answers gathered in relation to family background and bullying were more or less on the same lines,
the others were not so much. Interestingly enough, while according to the students (who evidently pursued their studies until a tertiary level of education), education does not affect the incidence of people to turn to drugs, it was the case of two of the deviant respondents. Similarly yet on an opposite note, while there was a unanimous agreement among the students in that peer group affects such risk, it was not the case among six of the deviant respondents. Although these outline some discrepancies in answers, the extra responses gathered, i.e., worries, lack of fulfilment and a way of coping with problems were still more or less alike.

When asked to categorise a particular period in life that a person is most prone to start abusing from drugs, the majority of the students, seven in total, said that the first drug intake is most likely to occur during the early teenage years, five said that this happens during the late teenage years, while one said it occurs in a person’s early adulthood. None of the respondents opted for childhood or late adulthood. Their responses are better illustrated in Figure 1.
When compared to the deviants’ experiences, two of whom had started at the tender age of 10, one at age 12, six started between the ages of 13 and 15, two aged 16, one at 20 and another one at 40, this shows some discrepancies yet again. While none of the student respondents assumed drug intake during childhood, it was the case of three deviant respondents. Likewise, while none of the student respondents presumed occurrence of initial drug intake at a person’s late adulthood, it was the case of one of the other respondents. The remainder of the answers obtained were roughly alike.

To some extent, the findings above confirm the study carried out by Sedqa, which found that 9.46% of boys and 7.63% of girls have at least for once experimented with illicit drugs by the time they reach their mid-teenage years. Up to a certain point, they also confirm Caritas’ director Victor Grech’s words when alluding that children as young as eight
are using drugs. Although none of the respondents experimented with drugs at such an age, being only ten years old is not that far apart.

Another question posited in relation to the first drug intake was that asking whether this occurs on a voluntary or involuntary basis. As clearly shown in Table 8 beneath, according to the complete majority of student respondents amounting to eleven, this occurs on a voluntary basis. The other two said that this is involuntary. These were almost in parallel to the responses gained from the deviant respondents, of whom only one said that he felt somewhat forced to intake drugs. The others declared that the decision was up to them.

Table 8: Basis of the first drug intake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deviant respondents were asked further questions regarding their drug experience, such as whether they were aware that this was a vice or thought that they could stop at any time. In relation to this, five said that they did not know it was a vice, six confessed that they knew but did not take it into consideration at that point, one replied that it was perceived as a normal act, and the last respondent did not remember. The following question demanded whether they were aware that taking drugs could lead them into trouble.
or to commit criminal offences. Out of the thirteen respondents, one said he did not remember, two confessed they did know, while ten claimed they did not know at that stage.

These respondents were then requested to state whether they had ever sought help before the programme they were currently undergoing during the time the interviews took place. While for four of them it was the first drug rehabilitation programme, it was not so for the nine others. However, out of the latter, four never completed any of the drug rehabilitation programmes they had started to undergo, while two had completed them and were ‘clean’ for quite some time. One of these explained this time’s reason by saying that:

“Għażilt li nieqaf wara għoxrin sena. Tlif kollox ... irrid nerġa’ nġib l-affarrijiet lura.”

“Għażilt li nieqaf wara għoxrin sena. Tlif kollox ... irrid nerġa’ nġib l-affarrijiet lura.”

“I decided to quit after twenty years. I lost everything ... I want to gain everything back.”

Yet, this stands in contrast with a statement asserted by one who was undergoing a rehabilitation treatment programme for the first time. According to him:

“Trid tinqabad biex tieqaf. Trid tmiss il-qiegh, tmiss il-habs.”

“Trid tinqabad biex tieqaf. Trid tmiss il-qiegh, tmiss il-habs.”

“You must be caught in order to stop. You have to reach rock bottom, experience prison.”

Thus, such opposing statements show that perceptions do not only vary between the different groups of informants, but they might differ quite a lot even within one group.
4.05 Deterrence

As portrayed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, one of the main functions prison exercises towards the men in the streets is that of deterrence. This section analyses the answers obtained in relation to this.

One of the questions asked to both groups of respondents sought to grasp what they believe the objectives of a prison are. Consequently, the participants were asked to say whether they think such objectives are being reached inside the Corradino Correctional Facility. The student respondents were provided with five alternatives, namely reform, rehabilitation, punishment, stigma and meditation. Being a multiple-response question, they were able to choose as many objectives as they pleased. Their results are displayed in Tables 9 to 13, with each one corresponding to a particular respective objective and assisted with a Chi-square test in order to identify whether there is a relation between the variables or not. As shown, while four students think that prison is there to reform its inmates, nine said it is there for rehabilitation and eight for punishment. Four believe that prison is there to create stigma while none of the student respondents think that it is there for meditation. When asked whether the objectives pointed out are being reached at the Corradino Correctional Facility, the results were as follows in Figure 2.
Figure 2: Objectives reached at the CCF

Is the Corradino Correctional Facility reaching such objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph showing objectives" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph showing objectives" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Reform as a prison objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

H₀: There is no association between Reform and Gender

H₁: There is an association between Reform and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the p-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, H₀ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that reform is a prison objective and the respondents’ gender.
Table 10: Rehabilitation as a prison objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

$H_0$: There is no association between Rehabilitation and Member

$H_1$: There is an association between Rehabilitation and Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the $p$-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, $H_0$ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that rehabilitation is a prison objective and whether or not the respondents have had a family member in prison.
Table 11: Punishment as a prison objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

$H_0$: There is no association between Punishment and Gender

$H_1$: There is an association between Punishment and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the p-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, $H_0$ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that punishment is a prison objective and the respondents’ gender.
Table 12: Stigma as a prison objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stigma</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not the case</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null and alternative hypotheses:

$H_0$: There is no association between Stigma and Member

$H_1$: There is an association between Stigma and Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the p-value obtained was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, $H_0$ is accepted. This implies that there is no association between the responses indicating that prison is there to create stigma, irrespective of whether any of the respondents’ family members have ever been to prison or not.
Due to the consistency of the answers collected, no other statistics could be computed. However, since none of the respondents hold that meditation is a prison objective, it is clear that the responses were not affected by their gender.

Interesting conclusions can be drawn here since while those who said that prison is there to hand punishment believe that it is the case at the Corradino Correctional Facility, those who said that it is there for rehabilitation all agreed that such objective is not being reached by the Maltese prison.

Their answers can in turn be compared to those obtained by the deviant respondents. Being asked an open-ended question, thus making them free to mention anything, the results were similar to those analysed above. Four of the deviants said that prison should be there to reform and rehabilitate its inmates, and said that it is not the case at the Corradino Correctional Facility. Three said it is mainly there to serve as punishment for the lawbreakers. A further five said that it should serve more than one function, all explaining that it should firstly serve as a punishment, but reforms the inmates along the way so as to

### Table 13: Meditation as a prison objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the case</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
never end up behind the bars again. One of the prisoners did not have an opinion, instead he just answered that according to him, there should be no prison at all.

This can be further compared to what Crow (2001:103) recommended when saying that some of the functions prison must fulfil are retribution, deterrence, containment, and rehabilitation. As clearly illustrated, not all of these functions are being achieved by the Corradino Correctional Facility. Davies (1974:168) also said that in awarding imprisonment sentences, the courts not only exercise control so as to ensure the protection of citizens, but also challenge retribution and deter others. This will be analysed more in-depth in what follows.

Another question dealt with whether prison serves as a deterrent and thus discourages crime. Six of the student respondents strongly/agreed with this statement, four were not sure about it and three strongly/disagreed. The answers obtained from the deviant respondents differed in nature, though. Five claimed that it does not serve as a deterrent since whoever wants to commit an offence would still do it, especially if under drug-effect when prison would not even cross one’s mind. Standing in contrast are two who said that it serves such a purpose. While another two said that prison serves as a deterrent only if a person has never entered prison, two others said that it serves a deterrent once a person has experienced it. The remaining two said that it depends; on the person’s character and on the sentence they are awarded. A quotation found interesting with regards to this question was:
“The moment the door opens feels like you’ve never been to prison. At first while inside you’d say ‘I won’t talk to friends, won’t approach that person, stay calm, be prudent...’ while you’re inside there though. Once you leave, you’ve never been there. It won’t even cross your mind.”

However, when asked whether the current sentence they were serving will stop them from committing further offences, eleven replied that they will definitely think twice. Hence, irrelevant of the answers previously given, prison is most likely to serve as a deterrent for such people in the future. Yet again, this stands in sharp contrast with the answers gained from the students when asked whether an imprisonment sentence will stop people from committing further crimes, as while only one agreed with this statement, three were not sure about it while nine strongly/disagreed.

Such answers show that as proposed by Hegel (cited in Mitias, 1984:173), an imprisonment sentence might deter the former prisoner, with the nature of imprisonment discouraging him from committing a further act. Up to a certain extent, it also contradicts Caruana (1993:1) in saying that the criminal justice system is not deterring prisoners.

When asked if the prisoners’ human rights are adhered to inside the Corradino Correctional Facility, none of the deviant respondents said that they are. Three replied with a plain ‘no’, six said things are moderate; not that bad but can be improved, while four said that this depends on who the prisoner and officer taken into equation are. When faced with
a similar question, nine students were not sure about such a situation, two agreed that prisoners are treated well, while another two disagreed. Therefore, this shows that students seem to have a more positive idea of how inmates are treated at the Maltese prison, possibly due to lack of correct information.

4.06 Rehabilitation at the Corradino Correctional Facility

To understand the respondents’ beliefs when it comes to the imprisonment sentences awarded and the rehabilitation that is supposedly taking place in the so called Corradino Correctional Facility, a number of questions and statements were posited.

Initially, the researcher asked the deviant respondents whether they think that imprisonment is the best solution for drug addicts. Unsurprisingly, all the responses were in the negative. In addition, they reacted with saying:

“Ħa ssib it-tgerfix, l-agharr nies.”

“You’ll find disorder, the worst people.”
“Bil-habs m’intix ħa titghallem. Mill-habs taf tkun żghir, ħa tithallat ma’ nies ikbar minnek, ħa tisma’ crimes kbar ... u jibbrejnwoxjawk, u abbli minn drug addict filli tkun tiehu d-droga umbaghad toħroġ tisraq u minn crimes żgħar tibda tagħmel crimes kbar.”

“Prison won’t serve you. You might be young, mix with older people, you’ll get to know of big crimes ... and they brainwash you, and probably from a drug addict you’ll go out stealing and from small scale crimes you start committing large scale ones.”

A statement in this regard was put forward to the student respondents, two of whom were unsure whether imprisonment sentences awarded for drug cases are the best solution, while the rest strongly/disagreed. Hence, both groups of respondents agreed that imprisonment is not the best solution for drug addicts.

Progressing with this, the respondents were asked whether they think that imprisonment is the best solution for drug dealers (who are not vice victims, though). Some differences in the answers gathered must be drawn. While eleven of the student respondents strongly/agreed with this statement, one was not sure while the other strongly disagreed. In turn, ten of the deviant respondents also replied that such people should be granted imprisonment, with one saying that:

“Ħaqqu min idendlu dak mhux ħabs biss.”  “He deserves to be hung not only imprisoned.”

However, the remaining three were uncertain on what to say, two of them claiming that:

“I don’t know, because nobody comes up to you to sell, you look out for people. If someone approaches you it’s because he knows you’re on drugs. Prison is bad.”


“I won’t side with the police. I’ve been to prison, I know the sadness that’s there. I don’t wish imprisonment to anyone.”

Consequently, when further asked if such imprisonment sentences are justified, eight students strongly/disagreed, four were uncertain, while one said they are just. Out of all the deviant respondents, ten said that they are not justified, one said they are, while the rest were indecisive since they hold that sometimes prison can serve a person good.

The next question asked whether an imprisonment sentence is enough for a person to rehabilitate. The absolute majority of the student respondents, twelve in all, said that it is not. One, however, was not sure. Moving on to the deviant respondents, twelve said that it is not. One of these argued that time showed how imprisonment would not rehabilitate a person since many people who serve a sentence end up behind the bars once again. However the remaining respondent said that:

“Ir-reabilitazzjoni qieghda għal ftit persuni. M’hemmx bizżejjed rizorsi.”

“Rehabilitation is the case for a small number of people. There aren’t enough resources.”

Thus, there seems to be a mutual agreement between the different groups of respondents on this matter.
The following question asked whether the amount of time spent inside prison affects the rehabilitation process. Five of the students agreed that it does, four were not sure, while another four strongly/disagreed. Hence, these answers imply that most of them hold that time does not affect such a process. Almost all of the deviant respondents said that the time spent in prison affects, however, they gave various reasons for this. Making up the majority, twelve of these informants said that it affects in a negative way, some expressing themselves in saying that:


“The more time you spent, the worse. There too much sorrow. You can only meet your family once a week, for only one hour and a half.”

“Jaffetwa ħafna, fil-hażin. Tajjeb ma tistax tieħu mill-ḥabs, qatt qatt. Tħdar għas-soċjeta’ hemm ġew ... Ghax inti dejjem maqful wahdek u tahseb fuq min ghamillek, dejjem indannat...”

“It affects a lot, in a negative way. You cannot achieve any good from prison, never ever. While there you keep on turning sour towards society even more ... Because you are always locked up alone and think of who did you wrong, always damned.”

However, the last respondent was not sure and gave an ambiguous answer. He said that the rehabilitation process might be affected by the length of an imprisonment sentence in that a little amount of time in prison might serve a person never to offend again. Then again, a lot of prison might get a person fed up, having the same function on a person. On the other hand, it might work contrarily because there is nothing interesting to do while in prison, thus most of the prisoners turn to drugs. Therefore, this does not only work against rehabilitation but encourages its opposite.
Following the same lines, the next question sought to grasp whether the respondents saw prison as a rehabilitative institution or just as a punishment. Eleven agreed that it is only there for punishment, with one of them quoted saying that:


“Just to remove you from society for a while but you have everything you’d want in there. You have no liberty, but prison isn’t that hard to scare you. Do whatever you please but don’t bring in syringes, because they’re afraid of syringes.”

One replied by saying that prison is “doing time”, while the other person said that it is not a punishment since drugs are widely available inside.

To compare their views, the student respondents were provided with a phrase stating that prison is a rehabilitative institution functioning to cure crime. Only two agreed with this statement, six were not sure, while the remaining five strongly/disagreed. Therefore, there is some discrepancy in the answers obtained from the different groups, showing that those who have never been there have a slightly more faith in prison curing crime to produce a better society.

Since all respondents were relatively approaching the end of their sentence, the interviewer asked whether their prison experience was better or worse than they had expected. Quite surprisingly, irrelevant of their negative comments about prison, ten said that it was better than they predicted, two said it was worse, while one was unsure because
while it was not that bad as an experience, there was a drug invasion in the division he was situated, thus making it difficult should a person wish to quit.

However, the researcher then asked whether the prison environment including all its buildings and facilities provides the adequate atmosphere to encourage rehabilitation. Unfortunately, the results pointed negatively. Seven students strongly/disagreed with this, five were unsure, while only one agreed. Similarly, all deviants replied in that manner too, some of them explaining that:

“Jekk ikun habit tieħu xorta.”

“Iżjed ikollok aptit tieħu, hin kollu maqful! Kem ḡa ddum tara televixin u DVDs, u hemm min qas dawk ma jkollu. Xi dwejjaq hemm għadek qas taf!”

“Qisek qed trabbi kelb ġo kamra.”

“M’hemmx affarrijiet. Qabel konna nilghabu futbol. Issa hi biss, hi l-ewwel u qabel kollox.”

“You’ll take just the same if it’s a habit.”

“It renders your craving even more, locked up all the time! For how long will you stay watching television and DVDs, and some won’t even have those. You haven’t a clue of the sorrow that’s there!”

“It’s like keeping a dog in a room.”

“There aren’t things to do. We used to play football before. Now it’s only her, she’s first and foremost in everything.”

Therefore, such statements make real Davies’ (1974:21) claims that prisoners constantly emphasise the ‘harshness, the depersonalisation and the overbearing aimlessness of life in jail’.
Subsequently, the deviant informants were asked whether there are any or enough opportunities to improve one’s skills or to work while serving a sentence. The most common answer here was that opportunities are the case for a few selected people. However, there were some who attended lessons. Also, out of thirteen respondents, seven worked while serving time at the Corradino Correctional Facility. When a statement to acquire the students’ thoughts about this was cited, four agreed that most prisoners engage in lessons or work while serving their sentence, eight were not sure, while one disagreed. Once again, these propose more or less similar answers. However, it cannot but be noticed that while the majority of deviants did work while in prison, they still had negative comments about this, which might be seen as a kind of contradiction.

Even more so, the latter were further asked whether kind of any help is accessible inside the Maltese prison. Four gave a negative response, five said that it depends – on the person, the officer, and what kind of help is needed, while four said they always found help when in need. An interesting yet uncomfortable comment was that claiming:

“Jghinuk imma m’hemmx ghajnuna, jaghmlu xogholhom u hekk, imma m’għandhomx ċans għal miegħek.” “They help you but there is no quite help, they do their job, but have no time to spare for you.”

This statement makes us aware that prisoners are not always the tough and bad people that come to mind and are usually perceived like, but in reality, they are in need of care and long for sympathy.
When proposed with the through-care concept and asked whether the rehabilitation process starts and ends at the Corradino Correctional Facility or if it is a much longer process, starting before and ending after the sentence has been served, nine of the students believed that the longer process should be the case, while four were not sure. Moving on to the deviant responses, they all claimed that rehabilitation is a much longer process, yet for all of them, it started as soon as they stepped at the home they were residing in. In spite of this, three proposed staying off drugs while in prison to be granted the chance of a drug rehabilitation programme. If they are tested positive for drugs, they will not be allowed to be transferred and follow such a programme.

Finally, the respondents were asked which helped the greatest deal; the Corradino Correctional Facility or the home they were residing in while undergoing the drug rehabilitation programme. Twelve agreed that the latter was where rehabilitation occurred, however, one gave credit to both. Two of the respondents said that the home helps as long as the person really wants to start a fresh page, since if not, they would prefer prison as they are less strict. Similarly, eleven student respondents agreed that a drug rehabilitation programme helps the drug addict more than prison does, while two others were not sure.

However, as Clinard (1974:423) said, drug addiction is one of the most difficult forms of deviant behaviour to be effectively treated. Yet again, the utilitarianist belief that punishment should be reformative (Ten, as cited in Banks, 2004:116) and changes the inmates’ values is only being carried out by the different organisations providing drug rehabilitation programmes, since as the results above show, prison is not succeeding in rehabilitating its inmates.
This can be caused by doing the opposite of what Hough (as cited in Crow, 2001:194) advised, namely that treatment should be given as soon as its need is recognised. Unfortunately, not only aren’t there drug rehabilitation programmes available in prison for inmates to follow, but even in cases such as those of the deviant respondents, a drug rehabilitation programme is only allowed to be taken during the last six months to two years of their sentence. This means that if a person has been sentenced to spend five years in prison, for instance, only the last two years can be utilised to help this person quit drugs and rehabilitate oneself.

Finally, Crow (2001:188) claimed that ‘in the past, treatment in prison for people with drug dependency problems has been limited and inadequate’. Such findings show that disappointingly, this is still the case at prison on our islands. Thankfully, though, organisations are trying to make up for this.

### 4.07 Drug Availability in Prison

While these can be rumours, claims are that drugs are largely available inside the Maltese prison. Thus, this section seeks to get to know what the respondents had to say on this matter, especially those who have a first-hand experience.
The student respondents were provided with two statements claiming that it is hard both to bring and to access drugs in prison. While five were not sure whether it is hard to bring in drugs at the Corradino Correctional Facility, eight strongly/disagreed with the statement, hence implying that such a manoeuvre is not quite difficult to carry out. Correspondingly, four were not sure how hard it is to access drugs in prison, while nine students strongly/disagreed that drugs are hard to be accessed. This means that the majority perceive drugs in prison to be mainstreamed.

Such perceptions were proved right by the answers gathered from the deviant respondents, out of whom ten said that it is easy. However, they claimed that it is easier to access drugs rather than to bring them in. They also asserted that finances play an important role since only money will incentivise people to risk in bringing them inside, while it is also very expensive to buy from other fellow prisoners. Some quotes the interviewer came across were:

“Faċli ddahħal u faċli li ssib tieħu. Ἡafna ukoll.”

“It’s easy to bring in and easy to access. Very easy.”

“M’hemmx għalfejn iddahħal inti, idahlulek. Id-droga qatt m’hi se tispiċċa ġol-habs, zgur. Jagħmlu x’jagħmlu għalxejn. Għax inti trid tqis li hemm 600 u xi ħaġa, tista’ tlahħaq ma’ 600 mohħ? Meta dawn kulħadd għamel il-hażin? Hemm min mohħu jtiħ hemm ġew.”

“You don’t need to bring them in yourself, others do. Drugs will never run out in prison, for sure. Whatever they do is all in vain. Because you have to keep in mind that there are over 600 prisoners, can you keep up with 600 minds? When they all did wrong? There are some wise people over there.”
“U mhux l-uffiċċjala jġibuhielek?!”  “Aren’t they the officers who bring it for you?!”

“Il-hin kollu ħdejk ha tkun.”  “It will always be right next to you.”

An interviewee suggested that it differs according to the time taken in consideration; at times they are strict, at others they loosen up. The two remaining respondents who were both in the juvenile section confessed that no drugs were ever present or available in their division. Even if such substances are widely available in all divisions, it is a positive sign that at least, young inmates are not exposed to drugs.

Following this, the deviant respondents were asked whether they had ever been subjected to the Mandatory Drug Test (for which they referred to as ‘urine sampling’) while at the Corradino Correctional Facility and how likely it is to reduce if not stop at all a person from taking drugs. Twelve of them admitted that they were subjected to it, while one did not. However, only three said that it reduces drug intake incidences. As clear as they explained, prisoners are asked whether they want to give urine or not, thus contradicting its name since it is not mandatory at all. Secondly, if tested positive, they will be punished by having 28 days remission reduced. Thirdly, this means that such a test would not influence those willing to keep on leading such a life, as a clear MDT result is only needed once a person is going to be transferred elsewhere to undergo a drug rehabilitation programme. In supporting their claims, some deviants remarked that:
“Meta tidhol ituk il-pilloli u tibqa’ fuqhom is-sentenza kollha, jiġifieri ħadd mhu ha jinduna jekk tieħu jew ma tieħux.”

“As soon as you enter prison they hand you pills on which you will stay for the length of your whole sentence, so no-one will know whether you’re taking drugs or not.”

“Ma jistax inaqqs ir-riskju. Jekk ikun bhalna, halliel, m’għandekx ċans. Ittellalu bott b’ieħor u lanqas jinduna.”

“It can’t reduce the risk. They don’t stand a chance with persons is like us, robbers. You show up with a different tin and he won’t even notice.”

“Ma taffetwax, ghax jekk tkun qed tiehu ma tagħtix kas.”

“It doesn’t affect because if you’re on drugs you won’t mind.”

“Tgħin, pero min ikun irid jibqa’ f’dik il-ħajja xorta jara kif jilgħab ma’ rashom.”

“It helps, but whoever wants to keep leading that life will still find a way around it.”

“Ma tnaqqasx ir-riskju ... Huma l-aqwa li jagħmlulek kas ieħor, mhux jaqbduk biex jghinuk.”

“It doesn’t reduce the risk ... all they are after is to open up a new case, not seize you to help.”

Thus, this seems to stand in parallel with MacDonald’s (1997:13) findings, namely that while some believed that such testing would reduce drug use, twice as much thought that it would make no difference at all.

In comparison, nine student respondents strongly/disagreed that such a drugs-test can reduce or stop prisoners from taking drugs while four agreed that it does. Also, three students strongly/agreed that the Corradino Correctional Facility is strict on drug issues,
six were unsure, while four disagreed. More or less, the answers obtained stand in line with those analysed beforehand.

These findings go against what Foucault (cited in Crow, 2001:103) proposed as prison producing docile bodies, since whoever wants to keep on misusing and abusing drugs is still doing so. Similarly, while he referred to prison as ‘the gentle way in punishment’, for some, this is not being a punishment at all. It is rather a safer place to consume drugs, as everyone knows about it and the means not to get caught are various.

The next question sought to grasp how hard or easy it is for people (imprisoned for various offences) to turn to other vices while serving their sentence. Nine students strongly/agreed that it is easy to do so, while four were not sure. However, although this was the set up of the question, the researcher soon got to realise that due to different reasons, with money being on top of the list, nobody seems to turn to vices such as gambling while in prison. Instead, the only vice alive is that of drugs. Hence, this question was altered and asked how hard or easy is it for people to turn to drugs while serving a sentence at the Corradino Correctional Facility. Twelve said that it is very easy. However, one contrasted to this and replied that:

“Jien ma nghidx li min ma jidholx bid-droga jaqa’ hemm ta.”

“I wouldn’t say that someone who was never on drugs will fall for it while there.”
Consequently, a question was asked to check whether a typical day in prison encourages drug intake. Interestingly enough, only four student respondents strongly/agreed with this, seven were not sure, while two strongly/disagreed. This contrasts quite a lot with the answers obtained from the deviant respondents, who unanimously agreed that in fact, it does.

The latter respondents were then enquired to state how they ended up undergoing a drug rehabilitation programme; thus whether it was on their own initiative or whether they were forced to do so. Apart from two respondents who were highly encouraged by family members, and another one sent by a court order, the rest all applied on their own request. In providing responses, they made it clear that none of the prison officers would ever suggest such a programme. Somewhat shocking was the discovery that two of these respondents did not induce themselves in this programme so as to get rid of their addiction. Instead, they claimed:

“Ħafna min-nies jiġu hawn biex johorġu minn hemm ġew.”  
“Most people would come here to get out of there.”

“[Ċejt hawn] ghax xbjt mill-ħabs u xbjt mil-ħajja ta’ barra.”  
“[I came here] because I was fed up of prison and fed up of the outside life.”

Although it is nevertheless a good approach when compared to the seemingly aimless life with constant drug abuse in jail, such a programme would possibly have more positive outcomes should the people entering it be looking for an end to their habit. However, while as proposed by Garland (cited in Crow, 2001.ix), the process of reform should be a voluntaristic one, it is not being taken on the best grounds in certain cases.
Sadly, by the end of this section, we realise that Crow (2001:188) got it spot on when saying that drug use inside prison is ‘substantial, if not widespread’.

### 4.08 Re-integration After Release

As earlier indicated, due to the way the system works, the interviewed deviants were approaching the day they return back to society. A series of questions were posited to see what they had to say, and then observably compared to what those who have never entered prison think on such matters.

Initially, the student respondents were provided with a statement saying that prison leaves a positive impact on the ex-prisoner. Seven strongly/disagreed, five were not sure, while only one respondent strongly agreed with this statement. The deviant respondents had much more to say, though. While two of them said that this sentence affected them positively in a manner that they will do their best never to end up behind the bars again, the rest did not denote such positive comments. One even said that he has become immune to prison, hence made no difference this time round. Other statements the interviewer stumbled across were:
Furthermore, the respondents were asked whether a prison sentence leaves a person feeling guilty and sorry for the crime committed or because one has been sent to prison. Eight of the student respondents were not sure about prisoners feeling sorry for the act committed, one agreed that they do, while four disagreed. However, three agreed that a prisoner feels only sorry because he has been caught and put to prison, another three disagreed, while the rest were not sure. When compared to the answers gathered from the other group of respondents, some discrepancies cannot but be outlined. Ten confessed that they feel sorry because they were put to prison. One said that while on drugs, you will only
feel sorry for the time spent in prison because it makes you insensitive. However, the latter person together with the remaining two said that they feel sorry for the act committed, together with what they passed their relatives through and all the time they wasted.

Next, the students were asked to show their degree of agreement or disagreement with whether prison prepares a person to re-integrate in society. While four were not sure, nine strongly/disagreed. Hence, this shows that the student respondents have bitter faith in prison reforming its inmates and preparing them to return back to society. Similarly, all the deviant respondents admitted that prison does not prepare you to such an event. However, when asked whether they are looking forward or dreading this awaited return, twelve said that they are looking forward, even if five of them are somewhat afraid of what they might be facing outside. The other seven, though, said they are not afraid, while providing reasons including that they will definitely keep in mind what they have been through, they are looking for a job, and having no other pending court cases. One respondent said he awaits nothing from the outside life, but is still afraid of his return since all his friends are of negative influence. Nonetheless, they all credited the home they were residing in for all the good deeds it performed during their stay.

Finally, the respondents were asked whether they perceive entering prison as entering a vicious circle, characterised mainly by a first entry to prison, unemployment after release, criminal offences to get life going, and eventually ending them up back in jail. Twelve students strongly/agreed with this, while one was not sure. These were more or less symmetrical to the answers obtained by the deviant respondents, who all said that it is a horrid circle, especially with the young offenders, who according to the majority, have
wasted or ended their life before they even knew it once they stepped on the court’s threshold.

Thus, such answers go against what Woolf and Tumim (as cited in Crow, 2001:105) suggested that the prisons system must ensure that inmates are provided with training to help them become law-abiding citizens and hence appropriately prepare them for their return to society. While some of the convicts feel prepared, this is only due to their negative experience and no credit can be assigned to the Corradino Correctional Facility or its officers since no treatment is being provided to those who need it. Whereas Crow (2001:8) identified some quasi-medical interventions and therapies to help the latter such as psychiatric treatment, group work, development of skills, and those directed towards the social re-integration of offenders, none of these are being the case inside our prison, which is a shame.

Davies’ (1974:2) cynicism on whether prisons serve as a lesson to delinquents while making the society they must return to seem as a ‘foreign land’ might be disproved at this point since the majority of the respondents do not perceive society in that manner. However, Davies (1974:21) got it right when speaking about the ‘crisis of coming out’ due to the problems people face after release. As illustrated by the findings, the obstructions which the respondents are mostly troubled with are getting a job and finding positive peers. This also links to the repercussions identified such as the damaging of the ability of economic survival, which were also noted by Coyle (as cited in Crow, 2001:107).
4.09 Additional Findings

The final query put to the deviant informants was that to suggest what can be improved inside the Corradino Correctional Facility for it to be more effective in rehabilitating its inmates. While one of them said that nothing really can be done since everything will probably be to no avail, the others had something to say. The most remote idea was that of changing the whole system so as to be adapted to suit its name, hence a correctional facility. Along with this, the environment and family counselling were mentioned. Two suggested that prisoners should be provided with employment upon release since it is a big insecurity issue once they are no longer in custody. The provision of treatment while in prison also showed up a number of times. However, one of the most unpleasant ‘things’ inmates face is the prison officers and their attitude. As a matter of fact, some of these informants suggested that:

“Irid ikun hemm nies dedikati mhux jahdmu għall-paga. Jagħmlu x-xogħol minn qalbhom mhux jaraw kif ha jaqbdum ma dak u l-iehor ... jaghtuk hard time.”

“There must be dedicated people not the ones who work for money’s sake. They should carry out their job heartedly not picking up on people and giving them a hard time.”

“Jekk ikunu burdata hażina teħel int magħhom, u hemm xeba preferenzi.”

“If having a bad mood you’re the one to blame, as well as a lot of preferences.”

Another fact which was present in all interviews and suggested by the majority in increasing the rehabilitation effectiveness was that of the separation of prisoners. Being
already proposed by Caruana (1993:23-30) in order for rehabilitation to be effective, this was confirmed by the responses gathered.

Although the Corradino Correctional Facility incorporates within it quite a number of different divisions, it seems like no organisation goes on within them. As a matter of fact, prisoners coming from different backgrounds and awarded different sentences are mixed in these divisions. According to the inmates themselves, this does nothing but harm.

As they put it, people with life imprisonment sentences, or lengthy ones such as those stretched to twenty or thirty years are being mixed with people awarded imprisonment sentences as little as one month. They expressed how a short imprisonment sentence might serve a person good in that one might be deterred and make the best to never offend again. However, if let to mix with the people mentioned above, the influence might be too negative to bear. This could be due to the most mentioned fact that people carrying a life sentence behind them have nothing to lose, thus a lifetime on drugs or more criminal records while in jail would not affect their imprisonment or life in general. Yet, this is not the case for those who will be returning to society in a few months or years time. Even worse, inmates of separate divisions are not allowed to mix together, hence their options are not too wide.

With inmates always ending up talking about the crimes they had previously committed, and the hideous offences they intend to carry out as soon as they are out off the leash, the new prisoners might get their ‘skills’ and tactics of how to perform such crimes.
This might also help them in making advances when it comes to criminal offences, such as hold-ups.

**Analysing the Corradino Correctional Facility’s principal goals**

While the CCF is maintaining its first goal, that is, keeping its inmates in custody, not the same can be said for the rest four main goals. With its second aim being to maintain order, control, discipline and a safe environment, these are not being carefully carried out as the responses in the previous sections uncovered. Order may be maintained, but when it comes to control, discipline and safe environment especially in relation to drugs, we all know that this is not being the case by now. Thirdly, this institution’s goal is to provide decent conditions for prisoners and meet their needs, including health ones. While the prisoners interviewed admitted that health needs are met at some point or another, even if they are locked up for two extra hours in order to see a medical doctor, other needs are not being really met. If the well-being of society is (as should be) an underlying aim, the researcher would hold that the prisoners’ basic needs apart from food and shelter are to feel alive, or as Mr. Justice Lawrence Quintano (Johnston, 2010) put it, give them a reason to live. However, unfortunately enough, the only ‘need’ that is being met while it should be done away with is that of drug intake. The fourth goal identified by the CCF is to provide positive regimes which help prisoners address their offending behaviour and allow them as full and as responsible a life as possible. Yet as the responses gathered showed, none of this is being the case. Instead, it can be seen as some sort of joke. The interviewees were constantly emphasising how negative prison is, and how their offending behaviour is not only not being addressed, but can be perceived as encouraged at times. This draws a sharp
contradiction which must be truly addressed should we want a proper correctional facility. Finally, the CCF’s fifth and last goal is that of helping prisoners prepare for their return to the community. Yet again, this goal is either being totally abandoned or seriously misunderstood since as portrayed by the respondents, the only way prisoners are prepared to return back to society is in an even worse manner than they had left it! The only few prisoners who are being properly prepared to re-enter society are those who engage themselves in a drug rehabilitation programme, thus making the absolute minority of the prison population.

As we have seen, while the goals are positive, the means to reach them are not so much. In addition, this might also coincide with the most frequent critique Davies (1974:136) faced, in which as stated, it is ‘concerned with the hypocrisy of a system which claims to be reforming its inmates’. Evidently yet unfortunately, this is the case inside the Corradino Correctional Facility.

4.10 Hypotheses Testing

After analysing and discussing all the findings which arose out of the interviews and questionnaires carried out, this section is about to check whether the hypotheses identified by the researcher in chapter 3 were proven right or wrong.
i. **Drug addiction emanates from peer pressure.**

This hypothesis was proved right, as most of the deviant respondents confessed that their peer groups had an impact on their initial drug intake. This was also illustrated with the help of the other questions asked.

ii. **Prison serves as a deterrent to crime.**

Up to an extent, this hypothesis was also proved right, since the majority of the deviant respondents claimed that now, they will have second thoughts before committing another offence. However, since the interviewees were partly rehabilitated, their answers are not representative of the whole prison population, thus it might not be the case for the other prisoners still residing at the Corradino Correctional Facility.

iii. **CCF prisoners rehabilitate themselves.**

This hypothesis was proved wrong, as most of the deviant respondents interviewed were either serving their second or third imprisonment sentence, or still had other pending court cases. Therefore, this shows that the Corradino Correctional Facility is not being a rehabilitative institution, neither is it being correctional as its name proposes.
iv. **Drugs are widely available inside the Maltese prison.**

Such hypothesis was proved right, because as inevitably made clear, all deviant interviewees (excluding those put in the juvenile division) stated that drugs are widespread inside the Maltese prison and a temptation hard to resist.

v. **Prisoners are well prepared to re-integrate themselves.**

Up to a point, this hypothesis was proved wrong for the same reason provided in (iii). Being well prepared or not, prisoners are put back on the streets as soon as their sentence is served and over and done with. However, no-one seems to be aware that some of them might have nowhere to go and hence follow the easiest way, which in turn ends them up behind the bars once more. On the other hand, such a hypothesis may be partly proved right since there were interviewee cases which feel they are prepared to re-integrate themselves back in society. Having said that, this is again only representative of the prison population who undergoes a drug rehabilitation programme, by and through which its patients learn not to go back and look for the same company they hung out with before their imprisonment.
4.11 Drug Rehabilitation Programme

Although this section will not analyse any further information gathered from the respondents, it will illustrate what the drug rehabilitation programme that the deviant respondents were undergoing consists of, as patiently explained by the director of the home that they were residing in at the time the interviews were taking place.

After a number of bureaucratic procedures, once the prisoners find themselves inside this home, the first aim is to teach them how to live decently again. This is due to the fact that inside prison, they induce themselves in a culture of ‘time-serving’ and rebellion, in addition to their coarse background which usually includes lack of education, unemployment, and crime.

The rehabilitation programme is divided into four parts, in and through which residents achieve hierarchical positions. During the time spent here, they are handed responsibilities such as cooking and cleaning for themselves among their busy scheduled which is characterised by a number of lessons related to almost all areas in life such as philosophy and languages.

Stage 1: Treatment

This is the longest process of all, and includes working on the self to be stable once again and get out of the prison culture.
Stage 2: Giving back

By giving back what they have gained in the previous stage, it is meant that now a person is assigned to be the “authority” or guardian of a person who is still in Stage 1.

Stage 3: Job hunting and preparation

In this stage, the residents are encouraged to search for a job as well as be guided and helped throughout all the processes this involves.

Stage 4: The final stage

Being the last period of their sentence, residents are allowed to go to work during stipulated hours, yet sleep there at night.

While this is the outlay of a drug rehabilitation programme, after which residents are no more dependent on drugs, they are still encouraged to follow an after-care programme.

4.12 Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with all the data gathered and the various propositions of its findings, both coming from the deviant and student respondents. Comparisons were also
drawn in relation to the theories and claims reviewed earlier in the literature. This will now lead to the next chapter, in which recommendations by the researcher will be proposed.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.01 Synopsis

The content of this study sought to analyse whether rehabilitation from drugs is possible or encouraged at the Corradino Correctional Facility. While the findings suggest similar views of the prisons system as the theories in Chapter 2, the data collected in this research confirmed Bennett’s correlation between drugs and crime, as 92.3% of the deviant respondents were imprisoned for drug-related offences. It must be kept in mind, however, that the respondents are not representative of the whole prison population. Thus, the true value might be quite different.

Basing the study on five further hypotheses, it was established that:
i. Drug addiction emanates from peer pressure

Although this aspect was intentionally not included in the literature review as it would have widened the scope of this study too much, it is held that drug abusers initially turn to this habit because of their fellow ‘friends’. This was confirmed by the data gathered since while the majority of the deviants claimed that their initial drug intake was shadowed by the company they used to hang out with, all the students additionally voiced that one’s peer group affects the turn to drugs. Thus, this hypothesis was proved right.

ii. Prison serves as a deterrent to crime

Davies’, Hegel’s and Crow’s claims that the criminal justice system and the prisons system deter people have been supported by this study’s findings as almost half the deviants said it serves a deterrent purpose while the same number of students supported such a claim. However, challenges are offered to Caruana’s conclusion that the criminal justice system is not effectively deterring the criminals. This hypothesis was proved right since it was found that the majority of the deviants interviewed will have second thoughts before committing another offence, and therefore, their experience served to deter them and their actions.

iii. Inmates at the Corradino Correctional Facility do not rehabilitate themselves

While the rehabilitationist theory sees crime as a social disease and cured by treatment, it has been established that inmates at the Corradino Correctional Facility are not being
given adequate treatment. Instead, this study shows that while in prison, inmates are being exposed to more ways how to commit crime. The results therefore show that the current Maltese system is having the opposite effect to what the utilitarianists maintain, namely that punishment should have rehabilitative effects and changes the offender’s values. Hence, the hypothesis that inmates at the CCF rehabilitate themselves was proved wrong.

iv. Drugs are widely available inside the Maltese prison

This study confirmed and clearly illustrated claims that drugs are widely available and usually easily accessed inside the Corradino Correctional Facility. It has to be noted, however, that this was not true for the respondents placed in the juvenile division (Y.O.U.R.S.).

v. Prisoners are not well prepared to re-integrate themselves

The data gathered substantiate Davies’ emphasis on how ex-prisoners stress the crisis of coming out. While all informants agreed that prison does not prepare a person to re-integrate in society, it is true that they are looking forward for their return once they would have completed the current drug rehabilitation programme which seems to be effectively helpful. Similar views were expressed by the students, the majority of whom held that prison does not prepare its inmates to return to society while a drug rehabilitation programme can be more fruitful. Therefore, the hypothesis that prisoners are well prepared to re-integrate in society was proved wrong.
5.02 Recommendations

After reviewing the conclusions drawn from this study, in this section the researcher will recommend what can be done in order to produce a safe environment within our society. These can be taken as the main critique towards the current systems:

- Education with regards to drug misusing and addiction can always be improved.
- Although this might sound radical, a compulsory Mandatory Drugs Test should be introduced together with the routine tests already being conducted (such as posture tests) with students taking their secondary education. Since the results will indicate if any students are consuming drugs, treatment can be offered immediately before the problem grows more in-depth.
- In addition, posters or things of the same kind showing shocking pictures and exposing warnings (similar to those lately being printed on cigarette packets) should be hung around especially in areas where drug intake is said to take place at a higher rate, such as parties and Paceville.
- While a person’s background should be taken into consideration when awarding a penalty, imprisonment should be the last resort and treatment should be a primary remedy on the agenda. However, those who are inevitably put to prison are to be separated according to the offence they have committed and the length of the sentence they have been awarded. In that manner, there would be less room for vices such as drug misuse to spread.
Also, efforts are to be made for pending cases to take less time. Unfortunately, having a pending court case does not encourage rehabilitation, or if it does, people are still likely to turn back to drugs if they are awarded imprisonment at a later stage. In fact, most people opt for a drug rehabilitation programme and look forward to reunite in society once they have no other pending sentences.

Even if for a short period, there should be a place for the ex-prisoner to go to if no family support is present. This would provide an adequate post-prison environment and prevent people from choosing the easy way out, that is returning to their old lifestyle and peers which is most likely to get them back behind the prison bars.

Prison officers should undergo a course on how to treat inmates; by being truly firm but gentle. Since claims are that some actually bring drugs to prisoners, they are to be monitored by other parties.

Finally, a drug rehabilitation programme should be available at the Corradino Correctional Facility and must be undertaken by anyone who is tested positive for drugs. Therefore, the MDT should be made really mandatory as its name implies.

With more organisation and good will, our current systems can be updated and not only punish people, but also reform and rehabilitate them, producing a better society and a safer environment to all.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: The Panopticon

Figure 3: Panopticon image 1
Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panopticon

“At the periphery, an annular building; at the centre, a tower; this is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. ... By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery. They are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. The panoptic mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately.” (Foucault, 1977:200)
Figure 4: Panopticon image 2


Figure 5: Panopticon image 3

Source: http://www.utilitarianism.com/panopticon.html
Appendix 2: Qualitative Interviews with Prisoners

(Maltese & English versions)

Verżjoni Maltija

Data: ____________________________

Sess: □ Maskil □ Femminil

Età: □ 18-30 □ 31-45 □ 46-60 □ 61+ (________)

Livell ta’ edukazzjoni: □ Primarja □ Sekondarja □ Post-Sek. □ Terzjarja

Impjieg: ____________________________

Opinjonijiet Personali

- Tahseb li esperijenzi personali bhal dawn li ġejjin ikabbru r-riskju biex persuna iddur ghad-drogi? □ Sfont tal-familja □ Edukazzjoni □ Grupp tal-hbieb □ Bullying □ Ohrajn ____

- Kif kont tara l-habs qabel ma qattajt xi żmien hemm ġew? Inbidlet din il-perċezzjoni wara?
Meta u fejn esperijenzajt l-ewwel tehid ta’ droga?

X’kienet ir-raġuni wara dan? Kien att voluntarju jew involontarju?

Kont konxju li dan kien vizzju jew ħsibt li stajt tieqaf fi x’hin trid?

Kont konxju li b’hekk stajt tidhol fl-inkwiet jew twettaq reati kriminali? Kont tibża li taghmel hekk?

Qatt fittixt ghajnuna mingħand l-organizzazzjonijiet differenti li joffru programmi ta’ reabilitazzjoni mid-droga?

**Sentenzi ta’ Priġunerija**

Tahseb li l-ḥabs huwa l-ahjar soluzzjoni ghal nies bil-vizzju tad-droga?

Tahseb li l-ḥabs huwa l-ahjar soluzzjoni ghal nies li jitraffikaw id-droga?

Tahseb li s-sentenzi ta’ priġunerija relatati mad-droga li jinghataw huma ġġustifikati?

Tahseb li sentenza ta’ priġunerija hija biżżejjed biex persuna tirreabilità ruħha?

Tahseb li l-ammont ta’ żmien li persuna tqatta’ ġewwa l-ḥabs jaffettwa l-процесс ta’ reabilitazzjoni?

Bħala esperijenza, kienet aħjar jew aġħar milli ħsibtha li se tkun?
**Il-Habs bhala Istituzzjoni**

- Skontok, x’inhuma l-għanijiet ta’ ħabs? Qegħdin jintlaħqu dawn ġewwa l-FKK?
- Il-habs huwa istituzzjoni għar-reabilitazzjoni jew qiegħed hemm sempliċiment biex jaghti kastig? Fi kliem ieħor, qiegħed hemm biex isewwi l-ħsara u jkollna soċjetà aħjar jew biex jikkrea stigma u jifred it-tajbin mil-hżiena?
- Id-drittijiet tal-priġunieri jiġu mharsa kif xieraq ġewwa l-habs?
- L-ambjent tal-habs (il-bini u l-faċilitajiet) jipprovdi l-atmosfera xierqa u adekwata biex jinkuraġġixxi r-reabilitazzjoni? Jekk LE, ghaliex?

- Hemm biżżejjed opportunitajiet biex persuna ttejjeb l-edukazzjoni jew is-snajja tagħha jew biex taħdem waqt li tkun qed isservi sentenza? Int sfruttajt xi wahda minn dawn l-opportunitajiet?

**Il-Habs wiċċ imb’wiċċ il-Kilba għad-Droga u r-Reabilitazzjoni**

- Kemm hi iebsa/faċli li ddaħhal jew tixtri d-droga waqt lit kun qed isservi sentenza fil-ħabs?
- Qatt kont suġġett għall-MDT (Mandatory Drug Test)? U tahseb li dan jghin biex inaqqas jekk mhux iwaqqaf għal kollox it-tehid tad-droga mill-priġunieri? Kemm huma stretti fuq dawn l-affarijiet?
- Kemm hi iebsa/faċli li ddur għal vizzji ohra waqt li tkun qed isservi s-sentenza tieghek?
• Taħseb li ġurnata tipika gol-ħabs (hin twil fiċ-ċella, solitudni, eċċ) tkabbar ir-riskju li persuna ddur ghad-drogi waqt li tkun hemmhekk?

• Kull tip ta’ ghajnuna hija faċilment aċċessibbli ġewwa l-FKK?

• Int ġejt mibgħut f’din id-dar fuq rikjesta tieghek jew kont imgieghel biex tagħmel hekk?

Wara l-Ħabs

• X’impatt ihalli l-ħabs fuq persuna?

• Il-proċess ta’ reabilitazzjoni jibda’ u jispiċċa ġewwa l-FKK jew ħuwa proċess ħafna itwal, li jibda’ qabel u jispiċċa wara li persuna tiskonta s-sentenza tagħha?

• Sentenza ta’ priġunerija thalli lill-persuna thossha ddispjaċuta minhabba l-ħafna ħin allokat biex persuna tirrealizza r-reat li tkun wettqet jew sempliċiment minhabba s-sentenza innifisha?

• Il-ħabs jippreparak biex toħroġ lura fis-soċjeta’? Qiegħed thares ‘il quddiem għal dan l-avveniment jew qed tibża’? X’jimmmotivak u xi jbeżżghek mill-futur?

• Taħseb li li tidħol il-ħabs huwa bħal meta tidħol f’ċirku vizzjuż li jerga’ jpoġġik eżatt fejn tkun bdejt? (ħabs – minghajr impjieg – kriminalita’ – ħabs)

• Il-ħabs għinek biex tirreabilita’? Thossok persuna differenti/aħjar issa?
Konkluzjoni

- Inġenerali, x'taħseb mill-FKK?
- X'jista' jiġi miżjud, imtejjeb, jew imnehhi biex dan ikun iktar effettiv?

English version

Date: ____________________________

Gender: □ Male □ Female

Age: □ 18-30 □ 31-45 □ 46-60 □ 61+ (______)

Level of education: □ Primary □ Secondary □ Post-Sec. □ Tertiary

Employment: ____________________________

Personal Opinions

- Do you think that personal experiences such as the following increase the risk to turn to drugs? □ Family background □ Education □ Peer Group □ Bullying □ Other _____
• How did you perceive prison before spending time there? Did this perception change afterwards?

**Background**

• When and where did your first drug intake take place?
• What was the reason behind this act? Was it voluntary or involuntary?
• Were you aware that this was a vice or did you think that you could stop at any time?
• Were you aware that it could get you into trouble/criminal offences? Were you afraid of doing so?
• Did you ever seek help from the different organisations providing drug rehabilitation programmes?

**Prison Sentences**

• Do you think that imprisonment is the best solution for drug addicts?
• Do you think that imprisonment is the best solution for drug dealers?
• Do you think that imprisonment sentences being awarded in relation to drugs are justified?
• Is an imprisonment sentence enough for a person to rehabilitate?
• Does the amount of time spent inside prison affect the rehabilitation process?

• As an experience, was it better or worse than you expected it to be?
Prison as an Institution

- According to you, what are the objectives of a prison? Are these being reached at the CCF?
- Does prison serve as a deterrent? Does it discourage crime? Will your sentence stop you from committing other crimes in the future?
- Is prison a rehabilitative institution or is it there just to give a punishment? In other words, is it there to cure crime and produce a better society or simply to create stigma and differentiate between the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’?
- Are the prisoner’s human rights adhered to inside prison?
- Does the prison environment (building and facilities) provide the adequate atmosphere to encourage rehabilitation? If NO, why?
- Are there any/enough opportunities to improve one’s educational and manual skills or to work while serving a sentence? Did you engage in anything of the kind?

Prison vis-à-vis Drug Addiction and Rehabilitation

- How hard/easy is it to bring in or access drugs while serving a sentence in prison?
- Were you ever subjected to MDT (Mandatory Drug Test)? Does it help to reduce if not stop at all the risk of prisoners taking drugs? Are they strict enough on such issues?
- How hard/easy is it to turn to other vices while serving your sentence? (Example: games, smoking)
• Does the layout of a typical day in prison (including long time inside the cell, solitude) increase the risk of a person to turn to drugs while there?

• Is help of any kind inside the CCF easily accessible?

• Were you sent to this home on your own request or were you forced to do so?

**After Prison**

• What impact does time in prison leave on a person?

• Does the rehabilitation process start and end at the CCF or is it a much longer process, starting before and ending after the sentence has been served?

• Does a prison sentence leave the person feeling sorry/guilty for what one had done because of the plenty of time to realise the acts committed or simply because of the imprisonment sentence itself?

• Does prison prepare you to integrate back into society? Are you looking forward or dreading such an event? What are your motivations and dreads for the future?

• Do you think that entering prison is like entering a vicious circle, ending you up where you started from? (prison – unemployment – crime – prison)

• Did prison serve for you to rehabilitate? Which helped the greatest deal, prison or here? Are you a different/better person now?
Conclusion

- What, in general, do you think about the CCF?
- What can be added, improved or done away with in order for it to be more effective?

Appendix 3: Quantitative Questionnaires for Students

This survey will deal with your perceptions of the drug rehabilitation that takes place inside prison. Answers are strictly anonymous and cannot be traced back to the respondents. Please answer ALL questions.

Thanks a lot!

1. Kindly fill in the following details:

   Gender

   Age
2. Has any close/family member of yours ever been to prison?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

3. Which (if any) of the following do you think increase the incidence of a person to turn to drugs? Tick all relative answers.

☐ Family background
☐ Education
☐ Peer group
☐ Bullying
☐ Other (please specify)

4. The first drug intake is more likely to occur in a person's:

☐ Childhood
☐ Early teenage years
5. In most cases, the first drug intake occurs on a:

- Voluntary basis
- Involuntary basis

6. a) What are the objectives of a prison? Tick all relative answers.

- Reform
- Rehabilitation
- Punishment
- Stigma

b) Is the CCF (Corradino Correctional Facility) reaching such objectives? Please indicate YES or NO to this question in the 'Other' allocated space.
7. Please read the statements and tick the best option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison serves as a deterrent and discourages crime.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a rehabilitative institution and cures crime.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prison environment provides the adequate atmosphere to encourage rehabilitation.

Most prisoners engage in courses/lessons or work offered while serving their sentence.

Prisoners' human rights are adhered to inside prison.
An imprisonment sentence will stop people from committing further crimes.

8. Please read the statements and tick the best option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to bring drugs inside prison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to access drugs inside prison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDT (Mandatory Drug Test) helps to reduce/stop prisoners from taking drugs.

The CCF (Corradino Correctional Facility) is very strict on drug issues.

It is easy to turn to other vices while serving a sentence in prison.
A prisoner's typical day encourages drug intake.

9. Please read the statements and tick the best option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment is the best solution for drug addicts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment is the best solution for drug dealers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imprisonment sentences awarded in relation to drugs are justified.

An imprisonment sentence is enough for a person to rehabilitate.

The amount of time spent inside prison affects the rehabilitation process.
10. After Prison...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison leaves a positive impact on the ex-prisoner.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rehabilitation process starts and end with the stay in prison.

An ex-prisoner feels sorry because of the act committed.
An ex-prisoner feels only sorry because he has been caught and put to prison.

Prison prepares a person to re-integrate in society.

Entering prison is like entering a vicious circle (prison-unemployment-crime-prison).

Drug rehabilitation programmes help the drug addict more than prison.
Appendix 4: Director’s Consent Form (English & Maltese versions)

English version

To whom it may concern,

I am a third year student reading an Honours degree in Sociology at the University of Malta. As part of my studies, I am carrying out a research that deals with different perceptions of people who have experienced prison and those who did not regarding the drug rehabilitation that goes on inside prison. In order to do so, I need the help of the people currently residing at the home by engaging with them in a private conversational manner interview, in which I will ask questions regarding their perception of prison as an institution in relation to drug rehabilitation. Similar questions will then be asked to some university students from selected areas of study in order to have both views compared.

I would like to meet the participants in private and carry out one-to-one interviews after introducing myself and explaining better the nature of my study, all the while giving them the opportunity to ask any questions related to this research. Unless any other
important issue is brought about after the interviews, only one interview will be carried with each participant, taking approximately half an hour.

Important facts with regards to this study include the participants’ free will to help me, together with their rights to: skip any questions which they feel are not adequate or personal in nature, stop me from publishing any data that they share, withdraw from the interview at any time without providing me or anyone else any reason for doing so or having any negative repercussions. It is also very important to know that none of the questions set before the respondents will reveal their personal identity or link to personal experiences, ensuring full anonymity and confidentiality. With their permission, I would like to record the conversations by means of an electronic device for a number of reasons (which are mentioned on the information sheet provided to them). All the data gathered during the interviews is for the sole purpose of the study and will not be used again in the future. Should they accept the conditions mentioned above, no-one except themselves will be given access to the data provided and/or the recordings. In addition, all the recordings will be destroyed right after the research is done.

Thank you for your co-operation.                           Date: ______________________

Sharlet Fabri (307290(M))                                      Signature: ______________________

Prof. Mario Vassallo (Supervisor)                            Signature: ______________________

Director                                                  Signature: ______________________
Lil min tikkonċerna,


Grazzi tal-ko-operazzjoni tieghek.  
Data: _________________________

Sharlet Fabri (307290(M))  
Firma: _________________________

Prof. Mario Vassallo (Supervisor)  
Firma: _________________________

Direttur  
Firma: _________________________
Appendix 5: Prisoners’ Consent Form

(English & Maltese versions)

Dear Participant,

I am a third year student reading an Honours degree in Sociology at the University of Malta. As part of my studies, I am carrying out a research that deals with different perceptions of people who have experienced prison and those who did not regarding the drug rehabilitation that goes on inside prison. In order to do so, I need your help by engaging in a conversational manner interview, in which I will ask questions regarding your perception of prison as an institution in relation to drug rehabilitation. Afterwards, I will ask similar questions to some university students from selected areas of study and compare their views to yours.

I would now like to make clear certain important facts. While your help is very useful for my research and highly appreciated, you are not obliged to help me. If then you decide to do so, it is your right to skip any questions which you feel are not adequate or personal in nature, and to stop me from publishing any data that you share. You can withdraw from the interview at any time, without providing me or anyone else any reason for doing so, and without having any negative repercussions. It is also very important to know that all the data gathered during the interview is for the sole purpose of the study and no-one (except you) will be given access to this data.
Since I am only interested in your opinion with regards to prison and not personal experiences, the questions set before you will not reveal your identity in any way. Hence, your full anonymity and confidentiality is guaranteed.

With your permission, I would like to record our conversation by means of an electronic device for a number of reasons, namely to be able to keep up with our conversation without taking time to write everything down, to make sure all the data is correct (no misinterpretations while writing), to help me sort out the data at a later stage in my study, and to serve as proof that I have conducted the interviews before my supervisor. Should you kindly accept, no-one except you will be given access to the recording, and it will be destroyed right after the research is done.

You are free to ask any questions in relation to the study and the interview itself before and during the interview. All my findings and conclusions can be handed to you on your request.

Unless any other important issue is brought about after our conversation, I will only carry one interview which is estimated to last for approximately half an hour.

Once you have understood the purpose of my research and all your rights when accepting to help me, please proceed to the next page to give me your consent.
As a resident here, I confirm that:

✓ I have read and understood the information sheet provided;
✓ I have had the opportunity to ask questions and received satisfactorily answers;
✓ My participation is voluntary and I have not been forced to participate in any way.
✓ I give permission to review the data only to the researcher and if necessary, the supervisor.

☐ I allow the researcher to record my interview for the previously explained reasons.

By signing below, I am acknowledging that I have been made aware of the nature of this research, and accept and confirm that all the details mentioned are true.

Date: ___________________________  Signature: ___________________________
While I would like to thank you for your time and co-operation, please find below my contact details:

Name: Sharlet Fabri
Contact Number: 79593282
E-mail address: sfab0002@um.edu.mt

Signature: _________________________

This informed consent has been reviewed and approved by the supervisor Prof. Mario Vassallo.

Signature: _________________________
Ghażiż Partecipant,


Peress li jiena interessata biss fl-opinjonijiet tieghek fejn jidhol il-ħabs u mhux f’esperijenzi personali, il-mistoqsijiet li ser inpoġġilek m’humiex ser jikxfu l-identita` tieghek bl-ebda mod. Ghalhekk, l-anonimita` u l-kunftenzjalita huma garantiti.
Bil-permess tieghek, nixtieq li nirrekordja l-konverżazzjoni tagħna b’mod elettroniku ghal numru ta’ raġunijiet, fosthom biex inkun nista’ nkompli miegħek waqt il-konverżazzjoni u ma niehux hafna ħin biex nikteb dak li jkun qed jintqal, biex inkun żgura li l-infornazzjoni li tghaddili tkun korretta u jitnaqqas iċ-ċans ta’ misinterpretazzjonijiet, bhalha għajnuna għalija meta nkun qed nanalizza l-infornazzjoni fi stadju iktar avvanzat tar-rirċerka tiegħi, u kif ukoll bħala prova quddiem is-supervisor tiegħi li jiena nkun verament għamilt l-intervisti. Jekk inti taċċetta, ħadd ħliefek ma jkollu access għat-tejp, u dan jigi meqrud wara li r-rirċerka tkun testtiet.

Inti għandek l-opportunita` li ssaqsini mistoqsijiet relatati ma’ dan l-istudju u dwar l-intervista nnifisha kemm qabel kif ukoll waqt l-intervista stess. Il-konklużjonijiet tar-rirċerka tiegħi jistgħu jiġu meqritja lilek jekk inti turi x-xewqa.

Hekk kif pjanat, jiena ser nagħmillek intervista wahda, li hija stmata li tieħu madwar nofs siegħa.

La darba inti tkun fhimt l-intenzjonijiet tiegħi għal dan l-istudju kif ukoll id-drittijiet tieghek jekk taċċetta li tghini, jekk jogħbok proċedi għal paġna li jmiss biex tagħtini l-kunsens tieghek.
Bhala resident hawnhekk, jiena nikkonferma li:

- Qrajt u fnim il-faċċata bl-informazzjoni li ġejt mghoti;
- Kelli l-opportunita` li nsaqsi mistoqsijiet u rċivejt tweġibiet sodisfaċenti;
- L-partecipazzjoni tieghi hija volontarja u ma ġejt imġieghel minn hadd biex nieħu sehem.
- Jiena nagħti permess li l-informazzjoni li naqsam tiġi aċċessata biss mill-persuna li qed twettaq ir-riċerka, u jekk neċessarju, is-supervisor.

☐ Jiena nagħti permess lill-persuna li qed tagħmel ir-ričerka biex tirrekordja l-konverżazzjoni taghna.

Billi niffirma hawn taħt, jiena qed nurli ġejt mogħti l-informazzjoni kollha meħtieġa dwar in-natura ta’ din ir-ričerka, u naċċetta u nikkonferma li d-dettalji msemmija huma korretti.

Data: _________________________ Firma: _________________________
Filwaqt li nixtieq nirringrazzjak tal-hin u l-ko-operazzjoni tieghek, jekk jogħġbok sib id-dettalji tieghi hawn taht:

Isem: Sharlet Fabri

Numru fejn tikkuntattjani: 79593282

Indirizz elettroniku: sfab0002@um.edu.mt

Firma: _________________________

__________________________________________

Din l-ittra ta’ kunsens ġiet revista u approvata mis-supervisor Prof. Mario Vassallo.

Firma: _________________________