

**The Jan Kochanowski University of Humanities
and Sciences in Kielce**

**PROBLEMS
AND PERSPECTIVES
OF SOCIAL READAPTATION**

SCIENTIFIC EDITOR

ANNA KIESZKOWSKA

KIELCE 2011

AGNIESZKA BARCZYKOWSKA

The Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan

HALFWAY HOUSES
– BETWEEN PRISON AND HOME
(THE ROLE OF RESIDENTIAL ESTABLISHMENTS
IN THE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM IN THE USA)

Introduction

Since the beginning of the 90's there has been a tendency of less and less crimes being committed in the USA. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in a report, dated 2009, concerning crime points out that in comparison to the previous year, the number of crimes committed has decreased by 5,5% (Mueller III, 2009). In response to this data there emerge many questions about the roots of this state of being. It seems that the current situation is a result of everything that has been going on in the area of correction from the XVI and XVII century up until today, and it cannot be considered in terms of a singular trend. Here I have in mind the seven basic models of influence (colonial, penitentiary, reformatory, progressive, medical/clinical, social, and the currently realized model of crime control), which may be distinguished in the history of correctional influences in the USA (Clear, Cole, 2003, p. 58–62). The mentioned models were based on differing levels of control and saturating the influences with correctional elements, however – almost until the XX century they did not lose their penal and isolation character. In effect, “it's [the policy of severe punishment – A. B.] heritage are 7 million prisoners being released annually from federal and state penitentiaries. Most of them have no education and no job perspectives. Indirectly they are sentenced to return to prison in a few years.” (Piatek, 2009, p. 32). The rising social and economical costs have forced establishing a new approach towards punishing and

working with the perpetrator, but what is more important – have directed attention to the necessity of reintegrating people who in their biographies have time spent in a penitentiary. It must be noted that in the beginning of the XXI century every year 630.000 people were leaving prison, which means 1700 people a day (Travis, 2005, p. VXII). Statistically, each of them spent 5 months under arrest, 29 months in prison and 19 months on parole¹; in total – for about 4,5 years the convict has been subject to different kinds of correctional influences (Petersillia, 2003, p. 91). The American society is more and more aware of the fact that almost everyone who has been convicted and sentenced to prison, or undergone other, less restrictive forms of correctional influences, e.g. probation², will one day return to the society, and maybe even live nearby. Thus, the question whether the time of the correctional influences is properly spent from the point of view of preparing the convicts to function in conditions of freedom, and money utilized is raised more and more often (Paparozzi, Demichelle, 2010, p. 82–85). Undoubtedly, much has been done so that the answer to this question might be positive. It's impossible not to notice the introduction of multiaspect diagnostics, and composing specialist tools, creating and evaluating the effectiveness of programs aiding in returning to a socially accepted model of life, or finally – creating specialist establishments and services, helping in resolving the life problems of ex-convicts. The activity of people in conflict with the law has been made a basis for reaching effective change and what is most important – the local environment has been deemed the most convenient and natural for correctional actions, resigning as much as it is possible from the conditions of prison isolation. In the last matter, the Second Chance Act of 2007: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention was a major breakthrough, in which the grant system allowed for e.g. modernizing and organizing institutions oriented towards working with perpetrators in a local environment.

¹ Parole is a counterpart to the Polish conditional anticipatory release, usually connected with supervision and the obligation to participate in correctional programs. The convict after leaving prison on parole may live in his own house, or be put in a residential institution called a halfway house.

² Probation is defined as a sanction set up by the court, existing on its own or as a part of the sentence. The convict is to be supervised by the local community, or in specialized institutions (Petersen, 2008, p. 3). The point of probation is to support the convict in his actions leading to returning to life being free, coordinating his actions, mobilization, and if need be – control and establishing sanctions related to violating the terms of probation.

The following article's aim is to analyze the halfway house institution in the American correctional system, on the example of the Sixth Judicial District of Iowa – Department of Correctional Service in Cedar Rapids.

The law towards the problems of social readaptation of ex-convicts

The evolution of beliefs regarding the penal punishment, the issues of its execution have induced changes in the law. In the context of social re-adaptation the most important acts seem to be the Omnibus Crime Bills and Safe Streets Act of 1968, The Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, The Crime Control Act of 1990, The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and Second Chance Act of 2007: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention. These legal acts clearly shift the weight of actions regarding the reduction of crime to the local level. This is especially the case with the last of the named acts because "never before has legislation been passed that on such a scale entitled the federal government to support local organizations in finding work, housing and a mentor for convicts and ex-convicts; in prompting them to undertake an addiction therapy, to support family ties, to show support to crime victims; also in offering different services aimed at counteracting the return to crime and violating the rules of probation and conditional anticipatory release (Płatek, 2009, p. 34).

The basis for such a shape of this approach towards punishing seems to be the more and more common belief that recidivism is not only the effect of the individual's traits, but depends in a major part on the conditions that the person comes back to after being deprived of freedom. Therefore, the programs mainly put emphasis on actions taking place both in prison, and in the local environment. The beginning was a presumption that the reduction of criminal behavior is impossible if it is not followed by actions aimed at preparing the convict for an independent free life, which requires a "different program of executing the punishment than the case where the aim is mainly to prepare the convict to live in a prison" (Płatek, 2009, p. 34). On the other hand, the outside world must also be prepared to accept the convict, and the convict must be able to blend in. The trainings organized in prison are worthless if the convict is to encounter a wall of disdain and incomprehension, which will prevent him from satisfying his most basic needs. Thus, the establishments which allow for stabilization in the local community are the halfway houses, more often called residential centers,

work release centers, residential facilities or community reentry centers (Płatek, 2003, p. 99).

The place of the halfway house in the correctional system

For over two decades, the state and federal actions connected with reducing crime and raising the level of public security are developed according to a new vision, aimed at cost reduction, better risk management, adhering to justice and the effective execution of the penalty of freedom deprivation towards adults. A lot of them are realized in forms of intermediate sanctions (Caputo, 2004, p. 6).

They fill the space between traditional probation and freedom deprivation³. Their differentiation, especially in the area of control and offered forms of support is broad enough to allow for an individual fitting of the sanctions to the convict, his needs and risk factors⁴. Intermediate sanctions are meant for people who are in need of less control than those who undergo the punishment of imprisonment, but at the same time more control than those who in conditions of controlled freedom function in local societies. The main advantage of intermediate sanctions is the elasticity in choosing the actions accordingly to the needs of the perpetrator but also the society, and in consequence – better risk management. Financial issues cannot be omitted, because the execution of intermediate sanctions is cheaper than other forms of influence (Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 216).

The dynamic development of intermediate sanctions took place in the beginning of the 80's when a coalition formed, between the acade-

³ The need to fill the space between probation and imprisonment results from the limitations of both. Literature emphasizes that probation is ineffective towards multiple perpetrators of serious offenses, a result of probation officers being overwhelmed by cases. Under severe time restrictions, probation officers are able to fulfill only the control aspect of their job, outside of the main stream of interest they leave supporting the lifestyle of the convicts. However, imprisonment has so many negative, described multiple times in subject literature, consequences that we should not condemn everyone who broke the law to it (Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 214–215).

⁴ Risk factors are divided into static and dynamic. The first include: the age of the inmate, the age of his criminal initiation, sex and race, the second one include: the cognitive functioning of the individual, attitude towards work, education, peer group, family relations and addictions. Metaanalysis of resocialization programs conveyed for many years point out that correctional work concentrated on "skillful eliminating such traits as: inadequate cognitive representations, negativism towards work, educational failures, the presence of antisocial authorities tends to minimize the risk of a repetition of breaking the law" (Sztuka, 2007, p. 317).

mic environment and the world of the correctional system workers, their argument being that well thought-out and organized intermediate sanctions protect the victims, the society and the justice system better than indiscriminate imprisonment (Petersilia, 2003, p. 234). Contemporarily, the most often used intermediate sanctions include: Intensive Supervision Program, Boot Camps, Day Reporting Center, Home Confinement/House Arrest, Electronic Monitoring, Monetary Penalties (fine and restitution), Community Service and Halfway Houses/Community Correctional Centers⁵ (Caputo, 2004, p. 11–12; Tonry, 1997, p. 8–13; Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 70–71, 215). In the mentioned catalogue, a specific role is filled by halfway houses/community correctional centers, being a bridge between prison and freedom. They are often called a “transfer to the environment”, emphasizing their (re)adaptational, “turning on” function. It must not be forgotten, that ineffectiveness of this means may result in placement in conditions of penitentiary isolation. This means must also be treated as a potential “transfer to a penal institution”.

Halfway houses yesterday and today

The idea of influence on the perpetrator in the local environment during his punishment sprang to life in the middle of the XIX century in England and Ireland. In the USA, the first halfway house came to be in 1816, in contrast to the then prominent trend of strict isolation determined by the character of the cell system. Tumults and riots that took place during that time in the Pennsylvanian prison resulted in a lustration being commenced in the penitentiary institutions and hastened the reforms, which in turn resulted in abolishing the injunction of working in cells, still with the necessity to maintain silence. The consciousness of penitentiary isolation’s consequences provoked voices about the need to create adaptation facilities for

⁵ Boot camps are a stationary means, aimed mostly at juvenile delinquents, organized to resemble a military unit, putting emphasis on discipline, education and physical labor (Muskala, 2009, Baładynowicz, 2010). Day reporting centers revolves around the defendants making an everyday report of their activities, and are obliged to inform the probation officer regarding progress in therapy, job searching education. Home confinement/house arrest (with or without electronic monitoring) incorporates a greater degree of control, it relies on spatial and temporal limitations to movement. Monetary restrictions (fine and restitution) are tied to paying a set amount of money on behalf of the court, or the person damaged by the crime. An often encountered form of intermediate sanction is compulsory labor in the form of community service (Caputo, 2004, p. 11–12).

people leaving prison. The then contemporary philosophy of punishment left no room for state forms of support, thus this area has been taken up by patronage and charity⁶ organizations and religious movements, with Quakers being the most engaged in working with prisoners (Hanser, 2009, p. 324). It was these donators that became the creators of the first halfway houses. An example of the new way of thinking and acting was the one opened in New York in 1845 by Isaac T. Hooper "Home", aimed at men who left penitentiary institutions (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 165). Nearly 20 years later, a similar institution – Temporary Asylum for Discharged Female Prisoners will be established in Boston⁷ (Hanser, 2009, p. 323). In that time, halfway houses were mostly aimed at securing the basic needs. They offered only food and shelter. There were no correctional and therapeutical actions there. A change was brought by the 1896 opening in New York the "Hope House", financed by a group of philanthropists united in the Volunteers of America association. "Hope House" was special in the manner that it was the first one to exceed with its program the security of biological needs incorporating – from today's perspective – a poor program of correctional actions (Hanser, 2009, p. 323). By the end of the XIX century, private halfway houses were working in 8 states, but their further development was stopped by a lack of support or even dislike on the part of Criminal Justice and by the coming of the Great Depression in the 30's (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 165). Many of them were closed and the only new one was the Pittsburgh "The Parting of the Ways", opened by Rollo H. McBride and a group of local activists in 1913. Men that made their way there could count on securing their basic needs connected with clothing, food, but could also start working, or receive help in solving the countless problems which plagued their lives. The institution was able to work thanks to donations from private investors (Curie, 1945, p. 118).

⁶The surfacing new philanthropy was engaged not only in humanitarian actions towards helping convicts, but also the ill. A major postulate was the abolishment of slavery and voting rights for women and workers (Leś, 1999, p. 5).

⁷It is worth mentioning that even then the localization of the institutions aimed at ex-convicts stirred heavy resistance on the part of the society, currently dubbed as the "NIMBY syndrome". In this context it should be said that the creation of the Boston institution was surrounded by definitely less resistance and protest than the New York one. The reason for that was the belief that women demoralize themselves and their surroundings to a lesser extent than men (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 165).

In the 50's, the halfway houses again have started to be portrayed in a different light, as institutions which may be useful to limit the increasing criminality and problems connected with effective execution of paroles. However, to utilize its potential, a change of profile was necessary. They started forming specialist services, and realize programmed correctional influences. American pragmatism came to voice because it was noticed that it is a cheaper and more effective form of influence than the previously used isolation forms of influence. The issue of raising the level of security of local environments has also been often emphasized, because the placement of people released from penitentiary institutions in residential facilities allowed for their strict control and forcing them to take part in re-adaptational programs (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 165).

The 60's were a "golden period" for the development of halfway houses, proven by statistics noting that in 1976 in the USA there were about 400 institutions of this type, and the rough estimates of Latess and Allen speak about a number between 556 and 796 (Walsh, Beck, 1990, p. 140). The creation of halfway houses in this period was also tied to obtaining official government support and legal changes. In 1965 the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act was published, authorized by the Federal Bureau of Prison. According to this act, thanks to the support of R. F. Kennedy, the Congress of the USA designated funds for the creation of federal level halfway houses for young offenders. The environment of activists, united around the idea of transitory institutions mobilized itself enough to establish in Chicago in 1964 the International Halfway Houses Association, working until this day (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 165, Hanser, 2009, p. 324). The 70's and 80's in the history of halfway houses are the time of donations being heavily cut, resulting in their decrease to a number of 55 in 1999. The negative tendency reversed only in the beginning of the XXI century, when another turn in the criminal policy made halfway houses one of the most important elements of the correctional system. Nowadays, halfway houses create a set of different institutions, aimed at working with those on parole, probation and their families in a local environment, which makes for a system approach. It is in accordance with the philosophy proposed in the 60's by the Presidential Justice Committee, for which crime and criminality are a manifestation of the failure and disorganization of the society and the main task of correction was formulated as

(re)building and sustaining social ties (with special emphasis on family and local ties), continuing education, taking up a job, and also upholding abstinence, if the criminal activities were tied to addiction. It implies the necessity of transferring the actions with convicts and on behalf of convicts to the local community. The Americans understand that every person who by isolation measures has been placed outside their own local environment will come back one day, and that return will be the more difficult, the longer the absence period. Therefore, as much as it is possible, the convicts are left in the local environment, and work is undertaken also with than environment. Thanks to this solution a stabilization of the ex-convict in the local environment is possible, alongside reducing the environmental risk factors. Remaining under the probation or parole officer's control, the convicts have the option to work, continue education or choose a vocation. Many of them, thanks to the residential forms of punishment are allowed to continue working, and as a consequence – financially support their families. There is no, well known from the Polish penitentiary system, loop of debt. Preventing the delegation from the living environment positively influences the quality of family ties, which are often under much strain due to the current situation, and could disintegrate entirely. The use of non-isolation measures has also enormous meaning for the parent-child relation. Practice tells us that therapeutic influence realized in conditions of freedom is more effective than those realized in prison. With reference to the justification of using freedom measures it seems to be necessary to raise the issue of stigmatization. It must be remembered, that many convicts are people that already have been touched by marginalization. Isolation and stigmatization connected with labeling the person as a criminal may in many cases become a factor heavily deepening this negative process (Lynch, Sabol, 2001, Dibi-din, 2009, Petersilia, 2003). Finally, for the pragmatic American society an important matter in favor of the local influence is money. Residential facilities may be more expensive than traditional probation, but are still cheaper than penal institutions. Besides, people in halfway houses often take care of a large part of the cost of upkeep and participating in the program (Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 139). It must also be emphasized that the institutions have the characteristics of private firms, and do not burden the country's budget. Specific data is shown in table 1.

Table 1. The daily cost of maintaining the convict in different forms of influence

Jurisdiction	Probation	CCRC	Jail or prison
Federal	9, 46 USD	55, 07 USD	63,57 USD (prison)
Sulfolk Co. New York	4, 00 USD	—	125,00 USD (jail)
Texas Dept.	2, 00 USD	36, 50 USD	44 USD (prison)
Georgia Dept.	1, 27 USD	39, 05 USD	46,62 USD (prison)

Source: Alarid, Cromwell, Del Carmen, 2008, p. 138.

Currently in the USA and Canada there are about 2300 halfway houses, offering about 100.000 places. The majority of them are aimed at men, but more and more often there exist facilities specializing in working with women. Halfway houses are institutions working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Depending on the jurisdiction, the convicts may stay in the facility for 8 to 16 weeks. The residential facilities bring together a disparate clientele. Their offer is mostly aimed at those on parole and those who require supervision greater than what is offered in terms of standard probation, parole or house arrest. Halfway houses may also be used by people waiting for a trial who do not have the money to pay bail, or those who need to remain under supervision. In the last years, due to the better recognized needs of people in conflict with the law there can be observed a trend to professionalize the influences proposed in terms of residential facilities. However, the majority is accounted by the general characteristic connected with the stationary character of the stay, the necessity of taking up work or education, participating in programs and therapies and sharing in upkeep costs (30–40 USD a week). Halfway houses work according to regulations to the main rules of which are included: a strict ban of using alcohol, drugs or alternative substances, including methadone and suboxone, organizing and participating in gambling, swearing and animal breeding. Clients may use tobacco, but only in designated areas. In terms of organizing everyday life obligations to refrain from physical violence are important. Screaming is forbidden, and all activities should be done in a way that does not disturb the welfare of other clients. Inmates are responsible for maintaining tidiness in their rooms, but also participate in general cleaning of the whole campus. As has been mentioned, the residents are encouraged to take up work in a full amount of

hours, therapy and participating in activities of local societies. Regulations tackle the issues of contacts with the opposite sex while remaining in the halfway house, as these are usually non-coeducational. Only clients and employees are allowed to stay on the premises. Due to the "transitory" character, the institution is usually not fenced and special safety measures are not used (see www.nicd.us/hwhrules.html).

It may seem that the advantages, numerous times confirmed by scientific research, and also the precisely set rules of functioning of the Halfway House clients make them to be institutions safe and desired in the eyes of the local community, but the reality is different. Even though Americans understand and accept the necessity of social re-adaptation of criminals, they prefer those actions to take place far away from their households. This way, halfway houses become another area in which the NIMBY syndrome ("not in my backyard") surfaces (Cole, Smith, 2003, p. 530). This results in the fact that many halfway houses are created in societies with low socio-economical status (often the neighborhoods of emigrant districts), which do not have the political consciousness and cannot block unpopular programs. Aside from that, they do not offer the very needed alternative models of behavior, accepting the (para)criminal models of life. Looking from the perspective of local societies, for many of them the creation of residential facilities may be a chance for change, because halfway houses usually make for one of the links of working with the man and his environment, becoming surrounded by other facilities, e.g. organizing children care or helping crime victims.

Halfway houses in the structure of the sixth judicial district of Iowa

The Sixth Judicial District of Iowa came to be in 1973. From the very beginning it was driven by the principle that "We Believe People Can Change". From the end of the 90's, the activity in the area of parole, probation and executing other forms of intermediate sanctions relies on the conception, formulated by Wilson and Kelling in the beginning of the 80's and modified to the field of correction, named "Broken Windows" (Corbett, Beto, Coen, and others, 2000). Not going into details and discussion of the correctness of the proposed solutions (see Osiałyński, 2003), in presentation the work both "in" and "with" the local society must be emphasized, the active posture of which is treated as a basis to prevent pathological occurrences (Kelling, Coles, 2000, p. 180-222).

The above issues also point towards potential areas which may provoke a wide array of problems connected with adaptation. For people that have undergone prison isolation, residential institutions are an element that makes reintegration/adaptation to a local society easier, but also allow for supervising them. In the Sixth Judicial District of Iowa there function 4 institutions that may be qualified as halfway houses. Situated in the industrial part of town one storey tall building, built in the plan of a star/a cross do not resemble a prison in any way. They are meant for people who have been classified as heightened risk, and require intensive readaptational and therapeutic influences, due to occurring addiction, but their level, quality, and frequency of abnormal behavior does not warrant the usage of standard isolation measures. Their stay in residential facilities is to serve their stabilization and rooting in the local society. The first institution is the Gerald R. Hinzman Center, servicing nearly 100 men and women under probation, parole sentenced to work for the local community, also dealing with the problem of addiction to psychoactive substances (especially concerning drunk drivers). Another facility – Hope House – is aimed at men on parole, or those for who, due to their work in a full amount of hours, the punishment of freedom deprivation is administered only on a weekend basis. Men may also be in the Lary A. Nelson Center. It is a facility of work release center character, i.e. convicts are set free to work with the local society, but are obliged to return for the rest of the day and night⁸ (Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 409). Due to the fact that there is an increasing number of people with mental disorders among the convicts⁹, in the turn of 2008 and 2009 another halfway house was created in the Sixth Judicial District of Iowa – the Anchor Center, a special residential facility for people with mental disorders. Its specifics are connected with the dominance of therapeutic activities over control ones. In accordance with diagnostic tools, the individual needs of the convict are recognized, which is a beginning for working with specialized services in the local community, which allow for satisfying the identified needs. The center also accommodates people who were subsequently found to be driving under the influence of psychoactive substances.

⁸ Currently, work release centers function in two forms. The Lary A. Nelson Center proposes a more strict variation, because in the more lenient one, the convicts return to the facility only on the weekends, remaining in their own houses during the week (Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 409).

⁹ As of the 31st December of 2006, 40% of people undergoing correctional influence diagnosis confirmed the presence of mental disorder.

Every one of the discussed institutions gathers a specific clientele, people who may be described as having "multiple needs" (McSweeney, Hough, 2006, p. 109). Perpetrators are characterized by a set of traits concerning education and employment which may successfully exclude them from economic and social life. Among the most important ones there are: low education, limited qualifications and work experience, a deficit in social competence (limited trust, low level of self-esteem, passivity, low level of motivation), poor vocational ambitions, problematic and narrow social networking, a pretence posture; a specific type of unemployment, characterized by a long period of remaining without a job or undertaking part time jobs beyond the legal work market. Many of these people have been plagued by problems of the financial nature (McSweeney, Hough, 2006, p. 110). The contemporary philosophy of working with the convict, and in the broader perspective of limiting crime is based on the presumption that solving the convict's problems (with his active participation) based on precise risk assessment is an important factor in the process of positive readaptation. This results in numerous programs concentrated on reducing the most criminogenic, i.e. addictions, personality disorders (including sexual preferences), low social and vocational competences and the deviant influence of the local environment.

Reeducational programs may generally be divided into two groups: the first one would include those concerned with gaining life skills, the other one would be those which aim at resolving a specific problem of the convict. A program of the first type may be often started in the penal institution, and continued on probation "Moving On". The second type includes: „Ticket to Work Program", „CALM", „Substance Abuse Treatment Program (SATP)", „Sex Offender Program (SOP)" or „Victim-Offender Dialog Program". All of the mentioned are realized by the institutions working in the Sixth Judicial District of Iowa.

The first mentioned "Moving On" program is aimed at women. The basic task is to work out an alternative for the criminal way of satisfying needs. A very important element is also the identification and mobilization of personal and social resources. These tasks are realized through individual or group actions concerning the place of a woman in society, organizing emotional life, expressing one's own feelings, building healthy relations with family members and other people, solving problems in a creative manner with avoiding destructive strategies of coping (Van Dieten, MacKeena, 2002, p. 1).

The type of "directed" is opened by the "Ticket to Work Program", encouraging employment. People on probation go through a process of vocational (pre)orientation, are taught to write a CV, participate in workshops of actively seeking out work and contact with the employer. Much attention is paid to career planning. An important element is the computer and Internet course. The process of return, or entering, the work market by the convicts is tied with the necessity to fill in lacks in education. In choosing one's educational path, help from vocational counselors is invaluable. Computer Labs functioning as training rooms for vocational workshops are a standard in Probation Centers.

Another program of this type is "CALM", the main aim of which is neutralization and dealing with aggression and anger in people who have committed crime using violence towards people and objects. The realization of the program consists of 24 sessions, 2,5 hours each, where the participants work on decreasing agitation, changing thought and reaction patterns, creative solutions to problems which omit aggressive behavior, upgrading communication, obtaining an insight into their own feelings and working out a strategy to prevent recurrence (Winogron, Van Dieten, Ganzas, 2005). The program has accreditation on federal level, which proves his high, documented, effectiveness.

The next program is an answer to a high, not only in the USA but in the whole world, number of crimes committed under the influence of psychoactive substances¹⁰. Therefore, effective therapy becomes an important factor protecting from subsequent criminalization. In order to increase the quality of the influence, in 1979 the Substance Abuse Treatment Program (SATP) was established, its main aim is motivating to maintain abstinence, forging wide social competences and promoting pro-health postures. The main executors of SATP are local courts and Parole Boards, functioning through probation officers.

Influences towards people treated for addiction include a wide variety of forms, beginning with the work of special courts for addicted (so called "Drug Courts"¹¹), group therapy usually based on the rules of

¹⁰ In case of the USA, the dominating psychoactive substance tied to committing crimes is methamphetamine. It's in contrast with Poland, where the dominating substance is alcohol.

¹¹ Drug Courts were created in 1980 as an answer to the rising scale of crimes committed under the influence of drugs and alcohol. At first they were organized by passing over certain types over cases to certain judges. The first fully autonomous Drug Court was in Miami, Florida in 1989. Now in the USA there are over 1500 of this type of court. They are staffed by highly qualified and professional judges.

AA, pharmacy-therapy¹² and tests connected to exposing the presence of psychoactive substances in the organism. "Drug Court" encompasses two, often thought to be contradictory, approaches to the issues connected with the beginnings of addiction and its connection to crime. The traditional model of penal responsibility treats dependence as one of the many forms of deviation; however, the medical model sees addiction as a chronic illness requiring treatment. Therefore classical courts result to strict sentences, usually connected with imprisonment, whereas the second model tries to influence the addicted by forming a therapeutic relation, which's truth and depth will be a motivating element to sustain abstinence. Drug Court is an alternative to prison (which cannot break the vicious circle of crime – addiction) but also possesses mechanisms thanks to which the addicted undergoes therapy for as long as necessary. Research shows that between 80 and 90% of people in addiction treatment programs is there less than a year, and that period is deemed minimal for the influence to take effect (Gonzales, Schofield, Schmidt, 2006, p. 8). An advantage of the Drug Court is comparatively strong non-formalized actions, in which stronger emphasis is put on supporting the convicts than execution. It might even be said that meeting with judge becomes part of therapy, because the main job of the judge is to motivate (through praise, financial rewards, diplomas, or vouchers for small pleasures). The defendants are called in front of the court once a week. During the proceedings, where the probation officer, social worker, psychiatrist, and a lawyer are present, the judge of the Drug Court decides about what measures will be taken towards the defendant, if he will remain in prison, be taken under "freedom" probation or to a halfway house. It is generally thought that Drug Court is a major factor for reducing recidivism among the addicted (National Drug Control Strategy, 2003, p. 28).

Drug Courts are inseparably tied with the program connected with testing people who are addicted or taking risky behaviors under the influence of psychoactive substances. Samples are taken randomly, but taking into consideration their color (level) of "alert" which has been

¹²In this case, alcohol addiction is often treated by giving Antabuse – a drug which causes nausea when combined with alcohol, which causes an aversive reaction (Cole, Clear, 2003, p. 203). As far as narcotics are concerned, which are a much greater problem in the USA than they are in Poland, methadone is in common use since the 60's. It is used only by people with a very long history of heroin addiction, when stationary forms of treatment failed.

tied to them. The people who are most uncertain (with a short abstinence period, having recurrences) are described with the red color, meaning that virtually at any moment they could be demanded to undertake a test. Other alerts usually mean that the defendants are given a warning that they may expect a test during the following 24 hours. Urine tests for the presence of opiates, cocaine, amphetamine, pcp and marihuana are a routine. Special "sweat" plasters which work similarly are also in use. Breathanalysers are used to determine whether alcohol has been used. A positive result of any of the test may result in probation or parole being cancelled.

In the USA, halfway houses also accommodate sexual offenders. Americans are aware that "resocialization of sexual offenders is among the most difficult psychocorrectional tasks" (Pospiszyl, 2006, p. 198) find it necessary to control this type of perpetrators nearly to the end of their life. In accordance to that, they create two fronts of action. The first is connected with maximum security provided to the society, and the second with giving the person further help so as to prevent "a recurrence of his unnatural tendencies" (Pospiszyl, 2006, p. 201). In the discussed Sixth Judicial District of Iowa sexual offenders undergo hormone therapy (Depo-Provera) and those whose victims were children are subject to electronic monitoring. There are also trainings connected with acquiring social competences and coping with sexual drives, based on the cognitive-behavioral approach.

In the context of social deficits appearing in convicts it is worth to mention the Adult Mentoring Program, the main idea of which is to give help, through a cycle of trainings concerned with coping with vocational and family matters, building positive relations with members of the local community and minimizing negative outside influences. It is presumed that by forming a support network around the convicted it is possible for him to take up approved social roles.

The influences proposed by halfway houses pertain not only to perpetrators, but also their victims. An example may be The Victim Offender Mediation Program (VOMP), established in 1995, today functioning under the name victim Offender Dialog (VOD), thanks to which the victims of crimes may find answers to questions that remained unanswered during the trial, with a face to face meeting with the criminal. Aside from wisdom, the victims gain a feeling of subjectivity, and the perpetrators start to see a normal person in an impersonal victim. This type of program popularizes issues of preventing violence in local

societies, also by organizing places where victims might get help, where psychologists, social workers and lawyers are employed.

The discussed programs make for only a small part of those being realized in residential facilities. Their quantity, alongside precise recognition of the perpetrators needs allows for projecting effective influences.

SUMMARY

Even though halfway houses are not an essentially American idea, they became one of the most important elements of the correction system. They evolved from institutions providing "food and shelter" to specialized services. Their specifics result from being located in the sanction system, influences undertaken result in them being a most useful tool in limiting crime. On the one hand they are a chance for a "second beginning" for people who leave prison, giving a chance for stabilization in the local society by solving their current problems, on the other – they are a warning signal, by offering controlled freedom they allow to notice its worth. Supervision of perpetrators in halfway houses increases the life standards in local societies, and also allows limiting spending connected with the workings of the justice system. Thus, we cannot be surprised that by the beginning of the XXI century the halfway house institutions are in another height of popularity.

ABSTRAKT

Halfway Houses – między więzieniem a wolnością (o roli placówek rezydencjalnych w systemie korekcji w Stanach Zjednoczonych)

Halfway Houses choć nie są pomysłem rdzennie amerykańskim stały się jednym z najważniejszych elementów systemu korekcji. Ewaluowały one od placówek zapewniających „wikt i opierunek” do wyspecjalizowanych serwisów. Ich specyfika wynikająca z ulokowania w systemie sankcji i podejmowanie określonych oddziaływań powodują, że stają się one pożytecznym narzędziem ograniczania przestępczości. Z jednej strony są szansą na „drugi początek” dla osób, które opuszczają więzienia, dając szansę na stabilizację w społeczności lokalnej przez rozwiązanie aktualnych problemów, a z drugiej stanowią istotny

sygnał ostrzegawczy, bo oferując wolność kontrolowaną pozwalają dostrzec jej wartość. Kontrola sprawców przestępstw w ramach halfway houses podnosi jakość życia w społecznościach lokalnych, a także pozwala na ograniczenie wydatków związanych z działalnością wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Stąd też nie może dziwić fakt, że na początku XXI wieku placówki o charakterze Halfway Houses przeżywają kolejne apogeum popularności.

Bibliography:

Alarid L.F., Cromwell P. F., Del Carmen, *Community-Based Correction*, Belmont 2008.

Bałandynowicz A., *Obozy dyscyplinujące w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki Północnej – propozycją kar średniej mocy zamiast kary pozbawienia wolności*, „Probacja”, 2010, nr 1.

Caputo G. A., *Intermediate Sanction in Corrections*, North Texas 2004.

Clear T. R., Cole G. F., *American Correction*, Belmont 2003.

Cole G. F., Smith C. E, *The American System of Criminal Justice*, Belmont 2007.

Corbett R. P., Beto D. R., *Transforming Probation Through Leadership* “The Broken Windows” Model, New York 2000.

Curie R. E., *The Parting of the Ways Home*, „The Prison Journal” 1945, vol. 25, no. 4.

Gonzales A., Schofield R., Schmidt G., Drug Courts. *The Second Decade*, Washington 2006, (www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/211081.pdf).

Hanser R. D., *Community Corrections*, Monroe 2009.

Kelling G. L., Coles C. M., *Wybite szyby. Jak zwalczać przestępczość i przywrócić ład w najbliższym otoczeniu*, Poznań 2000.

Klein-Saffran J., *Electronic Monitoring vs. Halfway Houses: A Study of Federal Offenders*, „Alternatives to Incarceration”, 1995.

Leś E., *Działalność dobroczynna w Europie i Ameryce. Tradycje i współczesność*, Warszawa 1999.

Lynch J. P., Sabol W. J. , *Prison Reentry in Perspective*, „Crime Policy Report”, 2001, vol. 3

McSweeney, T., Hough M., *Supporting offenders with multiple needs: Lessons for the mixed economy model of service provision*, “Criminology and Criminal Justice” 2006, nr 6(1).

Mueller III, *Crime in the United States. Preliminary Annual Uniform Crime Report*, Washington 2010, www.fbi.gov/ucr/prelimsem2009/index.html

- Muskała M., *Juvenile boot camps – zmierzch eksperymentu?*, „Pedagogika Społeczna”, 2009, nr 1.
- O'Bryant J., Seghetti L., *Crime Control: Federal Resopnse*, „Congressional Research Service Update”, 2002, Sept. 12.
- Osiatyński W., *O zbrodniach i karach*, Warszawa 2003.
- Paparozi M., Demichelle M., *Amerykańskie służby probacji i warunkowego zwolnienia. Stan przeciążenia, niezrozumienia czy niedocenia?*, „Probacja” 2010, nr 1.
- Petersen J., *Crime Victim's handbook*, Cedar Rapids 2008.
- Petersilia J., *When Prisoners Come Home. Parole and Prisoner Reentry*, Oxford 2003.
- Płatek M., *Nowa ustawa o zapobieganiu przestępczości w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki*, „Państwo i Prawo”, 1995, nr 3.
- Płatek M., *Nowy etap w dyskusji nad karą pozbawienia wolności*, „Państwo i Prawo”, 2009, nr 1.
- Pospiszyl K., *Przestępstwa seksualne*, Warszawa 2006.
- Stańdo-Kawecka B., *Cele wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności w krajach europejskich*, „Czasopismo Prawa Karnego i Nauk Penalnych”, 2007, nr 1 (rok XI).
- Stańdo-Kawecka B., *Prawo karne nieletnich. Od opieki do odpowiedzialności*, Warszawa 2007.
- Sztuka M., *Efektywność oddziaływań w zorientowanym korekcyjnie modelu instytucji penitencjarnej. Doświadczenia amerykańskie*, „Czasopismo Prawa Karnego i Nauk Penalnych” 2007, nr 1 (rok XI).
- Tonry M., *Intermediate Sanctions in Sentencing Guidelines*, Washington 1997.
- Travis J., *But they all come back: facing the challenges of prison reentry*, Washington 2005.
- United States Department of Labor, [www. dol.gov](http://www.dol.gov).
- Van Dieten M., MacKeena P., *Moving On... A Program for Criminal Justice Involved Woman*, Dodge 2002.
- Walsh C. L., Beck S.H., *Predictors of Recidivism Among Halfway Houses Residents*, „The American Journal of Criminal Justice”, 1990, vol. XV, no. 1.