

CREATING REHABILITATIVE PRISON ENVIRONMENTS: ANTI-CORRUPTION POLICIES

*Dr. Emiliano Blanco**

I. INTRODUCTION

When I assumed the position of National Director in 2014, one of the first steps needed was to define the objectives of the prison administration. These objectives would be the reduction of reoffending and recidivism,¹ public protection and the promotion of desistance from crime. This may appear as a trivial question, but in our tradition, it is central, due to, on the one hand, that these objectives were not seen as the purposes of punishment (because of the influence of critical criminology in our region), and on the other hand, as an aid to orientate and organize the reform process of our system.

Having our objectives in mind, an action plan was implemented to ensure its realization, based primarily on the need of having an objective system. To this end, it was fundamental to generate a solid database to be used in the decision-making process.

Likewise, in order to achieve better standards with a positive impact on rehabilitation, the following actions were taken: the implementation of the initial risk assessment system; the categorization of prisons according to physical, electronic and dynamic security levels; and the adoption of simple and clear standard procedures. Additionally, we have promoted evidence-based criminological research as a basis for the decision-making process, we have conducted a thorough examination and monitoring procedure to assess the institution's management processes, and we have developed a policy to promote public integrity and to prevent corruption. All these measures have been introduced to minimize discretionary decisions, so that the system is more objective and a science-based theoretical foundation is built for our work.

II. FOSTERING REHABILITATIVE ENVIRONMENTS

We would like to mention the importance of the “environment” of a prison, which has been the subject of several studies. What these studies have indicated is that the moral quality of a prison is closely related to its rehabilitative capacity. That is, the higher moral quality of the prison, the more rehabilitative capacity it has. We will later refer to these studies, which have been undertaken at our institution based on the research conducted by Professor Alison Liebling.

* President, International Corrections and Prisons Association Latin America (ICPA-LA); Former National Director of the Federal Prison Service of Argentina.

¹ We will use the terms “reoffenders” and “recidivists” to refer to two different groups of inmates, we will use the term “reoffender” to refer to those inmates who have not been convicted but are admitted to an SPF prison for a second time, and we will use ‘recidivist’ for those who have been officially declared as such by a court.

On the basis of that statement, and the creation of rehabilitative environments being the topic of the panel, we would like to share two distinct actions that SPF carried out between 2014-2019 in order to attain this goal: the corruption prevention policy and staff management.

III. ANTI-CORRUPTION POLICIES

Anti-corruption policies have the ultimate goal of creating an environment of integrity in any given institution. Given the question “why should prison administrations prevent corruption?”, the answer becomes evident as we accept that only a culture defined by transparency and commitment to ethical values allows the creation of healthy environments that, in turn, favour the reduction of reoffending and the rehabilitation of offenders.

Corruption has extremely negative consequences, and when corrupt practices become widespread, they become an obstacle to the attainment of the objectives of reoffending reduction, the promotion of desistance and public protection, and other standards such as the Mandela Rules.

In particular, corruption affects the legitimacy and trustworthiness of the system, generates inadequate working conditions, and creates inequities and grievances that affect the levels of violence of any prison establishment.

For these reasons and many others, it is necessary to guarantee healthy environments, and with that in mind, it should be noted that the mere sanction of corrupt practices is insufficient, as the damage of that particular corrupt act has been made. This punitive approach should be complemented with a preventive approach, one that promotes public integrity.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF CORRUPTION IN PRISON ENVIRONMENTS

Prisons are closed environments, which conspires against the idea of transparency. Moreover, the relations between staff and inmates have been described as having a “negotiated nature”. According to Goldsmith, who has studied the phenomenon of corruption in prison environments, the transactional nature of the relationship between inmates and staff implies that some degree of corruption will always be present, which goes against the usual “zero tolerance” government policies on corruption.

At this point, it is important to notice that the environment has a direct impact on the individual’s behaviour. It has been proved that the pressure of authority and peer pressure are key conditioning factors of our behaviour (Milgram and Asch experiments). For example, on Asch’s experiment, it was proved that individuals conform or follow the group’s behaviour, even when the group appears to be wrong, either because they start to believe that the group is right, or out of fear of contradicting others.

This principle applies to the phenomenon of corruption in prisons, the environment of a prison and the behaviour of the individuals in it vary depending on whether our system is affected by marginal corruption or systemic corruption.

A marginal corruption scenario occurs when the system works in accordance with its regulations, and the control organisms detect and sanction corrupt practices when they do occur. Systemic corruption, on the other hand, occurs when the organizational culture is permissive of the breach of regulations, corrupt practices are seen as natural, the control organisms are not effective, impunity is the rule, and those who try to abide the law are set apart and fear reprisals if they decide to report wrongdoing.

V. CAUSES OF CORRUPTION

It has already been indicated that the problem of corruption, and of corruption in the penitentiary setting, is extremely complex and must be approached from a multidisciplinary perspective. Strictly speaking, the efficient cause of corruption is always a decision made by the subject who performs the act of corruption. The fact that there is discretion in decision making by a public official is not in itself a determining factor of corruption, since the official can fulfil his duties and act with principles of ethics, honesty and probity. Along these lines, if we take as an example the factor that the public official has economic or financial problems, this situation does not in itself carry a risk of corruption, since the official can maintain its integrity and ethics in the exercise of the public function, especially to keep their job.

Therefore, the causes of corruption are not determining factors but factors whose presence facilitates the occurrence of an act of corruption. These factors can be studied with a view on ethical and moral, legal, cultural, sociological, criminological, psychological, anthropological, economic, political, personal, social, institutional, philosophical and historical perspective.

These facilitating elements may be related to personal or individual aspects (subject values, mood, etc.), organizational aspects of the institution (high level of bureaucracy, insufficient salaries to cover basic needs, etc.), or external aspects, such as pressure from third parties outside the institution.

In general, we can mention the following:

- Absence of rules, regulations, policies and laws.
- Weak enforcement systems.
- Weak control and supervision systems.
- Lack of accountability to the public.
- No transparency.
- Lack of mechanisms of balance between the powers of the State.
- Lack of integrity.
- Monopoly of power.
- High sense of discretion.
- Low salaries.
- High profits compared to risks.
- Low detection and sanction rate.
- Favourable context for corruption.
- Problematic and cumbersome regulatory systems.

Ultimately, it is the official who chooses to act in a corrupt way or to abide by the law. All these factors that favour corruption have a particular expression in relation to the prison setting. When taking into account the particular forms of relationship created in these settings, there are certain risks – situations that favour or make prison staff be corrupt or corrupted – that, in addition to the causes described above, are typical of this environment.

According to international experience and John Podmore's Handbook on Anti-Corruption Measures in Prisons, such risks are:

- Financial problems and family pressures.
- Envy and resentment about the conditions of inmates or other staff, especially senior staff.
- Greed or desire for personal enrichment.
- Doing an “altruistic” or good action by means of a corrupt action
- Pressure from the close group or from the “culture” in which they are immersed.
- The need to commit an act of corruption for survival, whether in terms of psycho-physical integrity or career.
- Ideological issues.
- Lack of clear rules or non-compliance. This is especially true in systems where there are no written protocols or objective rules, leaving it all to the discretion of officials
- Poor training.
- No leading by example by senior staff.
- Lack of commitment to the strategic direction set by the authorities of prison administrations.

The factors that are most influential and difficult to address due to their complexity are those related to the culture that takes place in the prison world and the way of interaction between the actors in that environment. In fact, the cultural pressure of the environment can cause large-scale bureaucratic institutions – of any nature – to be at risk of high levels of corruption caused by the very dynamics of the system. The factor that has the most influence on this point would be the pressure of the environment on staff and inmates to undertake these practices and not report them. This situation creates ideal conditions for the reproduction and expansion of corruption within the system. Within this framework, the situation can only be tackled through a progressive cultural change, based on the development of a new conscience and ethical work culture of the staff, with special attention to future public officials.

VI. CONSEQUENCES OF CORRUPTION IN PRISONS

The harm generated by corruption is not always detected immediately, which reinforces the need to act before it occurs, i.e. at the time of prevention. In order to account for the magnitude of the damage, a relationship with the degree of corruption can be established.

As regards specifically the public service that must be provided by prison administrations, the damages directly caused by corruption are the following:

- **Impact on Human Rights:** for example, if money intended for the construction or maintenance of new accommodation spaces is diverted to the benefit of a public official, as unfair conditions of detention occur for persons deprived of liberty.

- **Impact on the public security function of the penitentiary administration:** in contexts with a high index of corruption, persons deprived of their liberty could obtain, in exchange for money, places of accommodation with less security than that required because of the risks they pose, which would allow their escape or even continue to handle illicit activity from prison.
- **Increased levels of violence:** the extension of corruption – accommodation, sale of accommodation, gifts, sale of narcotics, etc. – can create a loss of control by the prison administration of the spaces where people deprived of their freedom lie. This loss of control will almost certainly result in arbitrariness and unequal treatment, which in turn will encourage conflict and high levels of violence. An institution that works on the basis of arbitrariness, bribes or gifts, cannot provide security about the future of the people who are part of it, which results in increased anxiety and tension in the environment.
- **Impact on public trust in the correctional institution:** people who engage in acts of corruption hide their actions. When the activity is generalized, the affected organization becomes isolated and becomes less and less transparent. The lack of transparency results in the loss of public trust in their actions.
- **Damage to the rehabilitative purpose of the penitentiary administration:** the impact on this function occurs in various ways: on the one hand, because of an undue allocation of resources, which will no longer be used to address criminogenic needs; on the other hand, because the central axis of the rehabilitation function is the intervention in the conduct of the persons deprived of their freedom, and a morally unhealthy institution will not have that capacity due to the propagation of corrupt acts, or crime replicating practices.
- **Impairment of staff attachment to conduct based on professional standards:** if the principle on which rewards – promotions, salary increases, etc., sanctions, transfers, dismissals – are assigned focuses on corruption, staff will not feel inclined to develop their careers, but to meet the demands of the system.
- **Creating conditions for increased corruption:** the existence of high levels of corruption is the breeding ground that increases it, due to the naturalization of these practices and, in the absence of legitimate objective parameters, actors are tempted or forced to meet their needs or desires through acts of corruption to survive in the system. In this sense, the very dynamics of corruption tend to increase both qualitatively and quantitatively and end up affecting the entire functioning of organizations if not properly managed.
- **Loss of legitimacy of the prison system:** if prison organization is corrupt, it loses the trust of users and operators in the public authority and, consequently, its moral authority to demand changes in behaviour.
- **Generation of individual criminal, administrative and civil responsibility of staff and the institution, both nationally and internationally:** acts of corruption are prohibited by law and, those who commit such acts, are subject to a sanction, including a conviction. In addition to criminal liability, acts of corruption may result in the civil liability of officials – with an obligation to compensate victims for

money – and also administrative responsibility, which may result in the dismissal or exoneration of the person responsible, as well as loss of retirement benefits. It may also affect the State's responsibility before the international community for violations of conventions and as civil liability.

- **Damage to staff:** high levels of corruption change the rules of the game, affecting the welfare and the rights of the personnel. In addition, the incidence of corruption in the levels of conflict creates stressful working conditions that also affect the well-being of the staff.
- **Alteration of legitimate rules established by applicable regulations:** high levels of corruption make the benefits, sanctions or rules set by applicable regulation not properly enforced. For example, if a person deprived of his or her liberty does not meet the legal requirements for access to a benefit such as house arrest, he/she may do so by paying a sum of money.
- **Risk of facilitating organized crime and self-government in prisons:** high prevalence of corruption in prison creates a risk of self-government. It occurs as a consequence of the existence of an informal system created by the generalization of corrupt actions regulating life in prison contrary to what the rules establish. This creates a number of imbalances in the dynamics of prisons. The risk grows in the case of organized crime. The following is an example of this: through informal rules, penitentiary staff, in exchange for money, allow a group of inmates to freely manage the spaces, and even grant them protection. This could create a situation of constant abuse and the setting of new rules of coexistence contrary to legal norms; for example, if the rest of the people deprived of their freedom had to pay the dominant group a certain amount of money in exchange for this group not attacking or killing them.

VII. ANTI-CORRUPTION POLICIES WITHIN SPF

Corruption has been perceived as a critical issue by most countries, and as such it has become an important part of the international agenda. In this sense, a universal instrument against corruption, that is the UN Convention against Corruption, has been subscribed by several countries.

The UN Convention against Corruption encourages the adoption of certain measures against corruption, such as international cooperation, asset recovery and the engagement of the private sector in the prevention of corruption.

In line with this instrument and others that Argentina has subscribed, the anti-corruption policy within SPF started in 2014 with a comprehensive diagnosis of the situation of the institution in terms of corruption, and it turned out that the main problem was that corruption had always been present but it had been systematically denied, the risks of corruption were higher in some areas than in others, corrupt practices in general were perceived as natural and there was no specific training on this topic for staff.

The following are concrete policies that were adopted between 2014–2019 to reduce corruption risks, promoting a culture based on values and principles of law enforcement, proper management of public affairs and goods, integrity, transparency and accountability:

- **Creation of the Corruption Prevention Service:** with the objective of designing, formulating and implementing policies, plans, programmes and actions to prevent corruption. The main axes of action are: the analysis and measurement of risks and vulnerabilities, the definition of appropriate strategies to address those risks, and the coordination of activities that everyone involved in the system must carry out to prevent corruption. Within SPF there are other organisms related to the fight against corruption besides the Corruption Prevention Service, they are:
 - o The Department of Internal Affairs.
 - o The Directorate of Information Analysis.
 - o The Service of Monitoring and Inspection of Prison Establishments and Compliance.
- **Action Plan of the Corruption Prevention Service:** The Action Plan is based on five strategic axes: “Declaration of Institutional Ethical Principles”, “Institutional Assessment”, “Staff Training and Awareness in Ethics, Transparency and Prevention of Corruption”, “Regulatory Changes and Improvements in Procedures” and “Joint Detection, Monitoring and Evaluation Actions”.
- **Code of Ethics for the staff of the Federal Prison Service:** It embodies the values, principles and duties of the personnel, taking into account the specificity of confinement settings, with the aim of fostering an institutional culture in which the principles of integrity, legality, honesty, efficiency and transparency are strengthened. The Code guides prison staff in the performance of their duties in the face of specific situations that may arise.
- **Creation of a hotline for complaints:** to detect and report irregularities or cases of corruption by officers in the institution. The hotline is staffed by Internal Affairs, being the punitive approach divided from the preventive approach. Anonymous complaints may be received.
- **Protocol for processing complaints:** This instrument establishes, in an exhaustive way, the procedure to be followed once a complaint is filed. One of its main purposes is to ensure at all times the confidentiality of complaints. On the other hand, the protocol sets categories for the classification of complaints, which ensures objectivity and transparency. These categories are: 1. Highly probable 2. Probable: 3. Inadmissible.
- **Rules for the protection of whistle-blowers:** this resolution provides protection of the job of officials who, in good faith and with well-founded reasons, report irregularities or crimes by other prison officials.
- **Map of corruption risks:** implemented as a pilot programme at the Judicial Detention Centre (Unit 28), in order to identify sectors that are risky or vulnerable to abuse or corruption. Another objective was to foster the participation of staff who provide services in Unit 28 on a daily basis, trying to break the taboo around the issue of corruption, and to create a consensual document that integrates the staff of the institution in the process of change.

- **Working together with other organizations:** for instance, with the Anti-Corruption Office, the Judiciary, and other security forces and corruption experts.

VIII. STAFF TRAINING

Ethical prison environments cannot exist without an extensive training of staff. Through the implementation of a public ethics course, awareness of the importance of the prevention of corruption and the insidious consequences of corruption can be raised. The organizational culture as a whole can be modified and a culture of integrity achieved. Staff have to be provided with sufficient resources to generate and maintain positive appropriate relations with inmates, independently of peer pressure and the transactional nature of staff-prisoner relations.

It was noted that there was no specific bibliography on the topic of corruption in prison environments in Spanish and accessible for our staff, other than some publications of the United Nations for the reform process of Panama, and therefore the Corruption Prevention Service published SPF's Anti-corruption Handbook. This handbook has become the basic bibliography for the mandatory courses of ascension, and it addresses topics such as the issue of corruption in prison contexts and measures to prevent it. Previously, our policies were based on John Podmore's Handbook on Anti-Corruption Measures in Prisons, which at the time was a preliminary draft that would then be published by UNODC.

SPF's handbook is the result of academic and applied research and was adapted to the Latin American reality and particularly that of Argentina, and to be accessible to our staff.

IX. IRIC

One of the most important preventive measures was the creation of the System of Intervention for the Reduction of the Corruptibility Index (IRIC) in 2016. The main reason behind the creation of this system was a shift in the prison population composition. Through the course of the last years, our prison system has received inmates with certain characteristics, risks and needs that differ greatly from the usual profile. This new profile comprises inmates that committed offences linked to the action of criminal organizations, such as drug trafficking, and those who committed offences linked to corruption or economic crimes.

Before this trend, the prison administration was used to working with low socio-economic status inmates, who came from dysfunctional families, with impulse control disorders, involved in substance and alcohol abuse, with poor symbolic resources and no external support. Their associated risks in prisons were mostly related to risks of conflict and violence.

On the contrary, the new profile of inmates has a low risk of conflict but has a high risk of escape and of continuing their criminal activity from prison and high risk of manipulation, due to their military power, their economic capacity and their links to power, with the objective of obtaining undue benefits and gaining power over the rest of the inmates and, ultimately, the prison as a whole. Further, their deficits and needs are completely different.

For that purpose, the concept of corruptibility was created. The concept of corruptibility indicates, on the one hand, the ability of some people deprived of their liberty to violate, through acts of corruption, the proper functioning of the prison system and, on the other hand, the risks of these prisoners to be the victims of acts of corruption during their prison term. This risk can materialize itself through acts of violence, manipulation or infiltration. Thus, the ultimate goal of the IRIC system is to detect and manage the corruptibility risks, to achieve a transparent management of inmates, prevent them from using their resources to obtain dysfunctional decisions from the administration and guarantee the satisfaction of their specific needs, under the logic of the principle of normality. From this perspective, actions are being developed to allow greater closeness and interaction between the staff and prisoners, and information management. In this way, it is possible to prevent any kind of act that contravenes the normal operation of the system, among them, acts of corruption.

X. MEASURING THE QUALITY OF LIFE

The concept of moral performance has been developed by Professor Alison Liebling as a result of a set of research studies carried out at the Prisons Research Centre at the University of Cambridge (United Kingdom). Her work on this area was meant to understand the complexities of the prison world by analysing the role of values and the quality of life in the prison environment. The study consists in administering a structured questionnaire to each prisons' inmates in order to gain knowledge and compare how certain values of prison life are experienced. Among these values, we may mention "respect", "trust", "safety" and "well-being" in prisons. The study is based on the following guiding principle: what defines the quality of prison life does not only include the material/objective conditions and access to rights, but also and particularly the way in which those rights are delivered by the institution; that is to say, the way in which staff-prisoner relationships are built and developed. Another aspect that may be analysed within the scope of this study is how prisons are operated, by exploring the role of values, emotions and staff-prisoner relationships inside prisons.

The data obtained from this empirical study is chiefly important as it could be used to formulate policies to promote desistance and to reduce recidivism. In addition, the results are similar to those obtained from research studies conducted in other countries. This work on moral performance also proves interesting and useful to obtain more information on violence and conflict issues, humanity and relational dimensions in our prisons, compliance with management goals and, ultimately, the formulation of public policies that work effectively in prison, as well as the implementation of reforms that can correct the moral standard at our prisons and promote any positive aspects detected.

The above-mentioned study on moral performance was also carried out in Module VI of the Federal Prison Complex, where the Intervention Program to Reduce the Degrees of Corruptibility (IRIC Program) is run, in order to identify the levels of quality of life inside each prison. Inmates' perceptions were taken into account to get to know their strengths and weaknesses. Surveys were conducted between July and October 2018. Taking this finding into account, specific actions were taken in order to address this issue and provide a greater amount of activities.

As a result of this study, we can conclude that:

- 85.7 per cent of inmates have claimed that they are treated with respect.
- 75.7 per cent of inmates stated that staff–prisoner relationships are good.
- 91.2 per cent of inmates assert that they are not bothered or threatened by the rest of the inmates at the facility.
- 57 per cent of inmates rated the quality of life inside Module VI positively (between 7 and 10 points).
- Negative aspects should be considered and improved in Module VI.

These values are considerably different from the other settings we measured, so we can suggest that in a place where risk of corruption is controlled, there are better perceptions of other dimensions in daily life.

XI. MEASURING CORRUPTION

As I said before, corruption is a risk from which no organization seems to escape. In order to be prevented and punished wherever it occurs, the phenomenon must be understood in its own manifestations within the specific organization in order to provide an adequate response.

Consequently, since 2014 an action plan has been implemented to promote public integrity, to prevent and to fight corruption. Measures such as the creation of its own code of ethics, the implementation of a system for reporting corruption cases, and the corresponding protection for the agents who report it have been developed. In addition, there has been constant training of personnel in matters associated with ethics, transparency and the prevention of corruption, among others. The truth is that the taboo that always existed in relation to the issue of corruption has been broken.

Anti-corruption policies must be evaluated to determine their effectiveness and allow their correction and expansion where necessary; it is a constant and cyclical work. Bearing this in mind, it was decided to carry out a study on the perception of the staff about it within the Institution. We need to highlight that we had run some surveys before (Public opinion in 2014, Models of Management and Working Environment in 2015), where when we asked about corruption it appeared as a serious issue, but at the same time nothing was said or done.

So, through this study, it was sought to know the perceptions, expectations and representations about corruption in general and within the Federal Penitentiary Service. In addition, an attempt was made to gain knowledge about the public policies developed within the institution to prevent it and the appreciation that prison staff have on the causes and damages that it generates. The results contribute to detecting the real perception of the personnel related to this topic, as well as the knowledge of the actions carried out and the reporting channels. At the same time, it warns about the level of awareness present among prison agents on issues of public ethics and transparency, allowing a more adequate understanding of the problems that exist with respect to the design of institutional policies aimed at addressing this conflict.

Having this in mind, and noting that the reality of Latin American countries is mostly described by systemic corruption scenarios, it was decided that corruption within SPF should be measured by the use of some reliable method. To that end, we turned to the

methodologies that some of the most important international organizations that work with the prevention of corruption have used, Transparency International being the most renowned. Their method relies on the perceptions of corruption rather than on reports and legal cases.

On the Corruption Perceptions Index developed by Transparency International, in 2018 Argentina ranked in the 85th position on a list of 180 countries, with a total score of 40 over 100 (being 100 very clean and 0 highly corrupt). In short, there is a clear perception of high levels of corruption in our country, which means that the policies implemented have to consider that their starting point will be that of a systemic corruption scenario, which probably does not reflect the reality of Europe or Japan.

In order to measure the perceptions of our staff on the levels of corruption of Argentina in general and our institution in particular, we developed our Corruption Perceptions Survey, and some of its key findings were:

- 22 per cent of our staff said that SPF is affected by high levels of corruption.
- 51 per cent of our staff believes that the anti-corruption policy is being effective.
- 32 per cent of our staff thinks that there is less corruption in our institution today than 3 years ago.
- The most vulnerable areas to corruption, according to our staff, are: cell phone smuggling, drug smuggling and the management of public funds.
- 62 per cent of our staff said that corrupt practices are not reported, and that the reason behind that number is the fear of reprisals.

After analysing the results, we have made some necessary adjustments, such as disseminating the reporting channels and implementing a whistle-blower protection programme. The survey also proved that corrupt practices are no longer perceived as natural, which reflects the importance of staff training on ethics and corruption prevention topics.

The agents were also asked if they knew to whom this type of incident should be reported, and it turned out that:

- 40 per cent indicated they knew to whom to report acts of corruption.
- The complaint channels best known by agents are: the anti-corruption office, internal affairs, the hotline for complaints of acts of corruption (0800-222-7738), courts and prosecutors.

Likewise, 46 per cent believe that complaints made for acts of corruption end with the sanctioning of those responsible.

To find out the level of dissemination that the policies carried out by the Federal Penitentiary Service to combat corruption have had, the agents were asked to indicate what actions they were aware of. From this it emerged that the five best known measures to combat corruption, implemented in the Federal Penitentiary Service are:

1. Code of Ethics for SPF Personnel.
2. Staff wellness programmes.
3. Training on ethics, transparency and prevention of corruption.

4. Creation of the Corruption Prevention Service.
5. Monitoring and inspection of procedures in penitentiary establishments.

However, much remains to be done regarding dissemination. Although notoriously 60 per cent reported having received one or more trainings on ethics and corruption prevention issues; and just over 73 per cent knowledge of the Code of Ethics for Prison Service Personnel.

Furthermore, 54 per cent of the agents indicated that the implemented measures have been efficient in their objectives. 32 per cent stated that the level of corruption in the SPF, at that time, was lower than in the previous 3 years, and 46.3 per cent said the same with respect to the last 5 years.

On the other hand, the agents were asked to select three questions that they consider should be resolved within the institution as a priority. As a result, it was obtained:

1. Carry out an efficient selection of personnel entering the SPF.
2. Foster an ethical culture to combat corruption.
3. Provide more material resources to the units.

64 per cent of the agents consider that corrupt personnel should be separated from the institution.

With regard to the consequences of corruption, they were offered a list of possible consequences for the institution so that they could indicate which ones they believe have materialized. The agents considered that corruption has hindered the proper functioning of the institution, the security of the prisons, the quality of the work environment, and, to a lesser extent, the reintegration of the inmates.

Within the specific risk factors of the prison environment, it was observed that inmates with high purchasing power can influence decisions that directly affect them, being highly disruptive for the system and that there are extortionary practices among inmates that allow the creation of areas of violence.

Finally, a large number of the agents surveyed affirm that the greatest acts of corruption have to do with purchases and contracting by the State and the entry of drugs and cell phones into prisons.

XII. CONCLUSIONS

We can finally suggest, that:

- 1) There is a direct link between anti-corruption and rehabilitation efforts: a corrupt prison cannot perform its rehabilitation function correctly.
- 2) Prisons should promote a “culture of integrity”.
- 3) All staff should receive training on anti-corruption.

- 4) There is a case for housing high-risk-of-corruption prisoners in a separate unit with specially trained staff (Case Study: IRIC Programme).
- 5) Surveys and specific studies must be carried inside prison services, measuring the impact of policies and measures.
- 6) When there is a serious effort to fight corruption in an institution, society cares more about what the service is really doing for public protection and reducing reoffending, and we believe that this can affect reintegration in a good way.