

Perspectives of Correction Officers on Crime and Criminals and Their Relationship with “Power” and “Authority”

Ceza İnfaz Koruma Memurlarının Suça ve Suçluya Bakışları, “Erk” ve “Otorite” ile Olan İlişkileri

Çiçek Nilsu VARLIKLAR DEMİRKAZIK *

Emrah AKBAŞ**

Article Information

Submission: 18.07.2024

Acceptance: 09.05.2025

Doi:

10.20296/tsadergisi.1518249

Key Words:

Correction officer

Crime

Criminal Justice System

Forensic Social Work

ABSTRACT

The criminal justice system in Turkey has consistently shaped its own agenda and remained a central focus of both political and social scientific inquiry. This study seeks to contribute a fresh perspective by centering on correctional officers—key actors within the penal system who have received limited scholarly attention. To explore their lived experiences, in-depth interviews were conducted with 12 correctional officers working in three major cities in Turkey: Ankara, Istanbul, and Bursa. The interviews focused on their views regarding the prison system, professional identity, working conditions, interactions with inmates, and broader issues related to incarceration, including the probation system and prison labor. The findings reveal several recurring themes: many officers entered the profession out of necessity rather than choice; they considered their training inadequate; they emphasized the need to maintain a delicate balance of authority in their interactions with inmates; and they perceived their roles as socially isolating. Notably, participants expressed skepticism toward the rehabilitative function of prisons and highlighted pervasive structural deficiencies within the penal execution system. The study concludes that the current prison environment adversely affects both inmates and staff, and that ongoing reforms have failed to address these deep-rooted structural problems.

Makale Bilgisi

Geliş Tarihi: 18.07.2024

Kabul Tarihi: 09.05.2025

Doi:

10.20296/tsadergisi.1518249

Anahtar Sözcükler:

Adli Sosyal Hizmet

Ceza İnfaz Koruma Memuru

Ceza İnfaz Sistemi

Suç

ÖZET

Türkiye’deki ceza infaz sistemi her zaman kendi gündemini yaratmış ve hem sosyal bilimlerin hem de politikanın ilgi alanında kalmıştır. Bu araştırma sayesinde, literatürde eksik kaldığını düşündüğümüz, suçluluk alanının aslında başat aktörlerinden olmalarına rağmen kendileri ile yeteri kadar çalışılmamış ceza infaz koruma memurlarıyla çalışarak, alana yeni bir bakış açısı sunulması hedeflenmiştir. Araştırma kapsamında Türkiye’nin üç büyük kentinden (Ankara, İstanbul, Bursa) 12 infaz koruma memuru ile derinlemesine görüşmeler gerçekleştirilmiş ve görüşülenlerin meslek algıları, iş yaşamları, mahpuslarla iletişimleri hakkındaki ve mahpus şartları/denetimli serbestlik/mahpusların çalışması gibi infaz sistemiyle ilgili konulardaki düşünceleri alınmıştır. Araştırmada katılımcıların çoğunun mesleklerini zorunlu olarak icra ettikleri, aldıkları eğitimleri yetersiz buldukları, mahpuslarla iletişimde otorite dengesi kurmaya çalıştıkları, hapisanedeki konumlarını yalnızlaştırıcı gördükleri, hapisanelerin “ıslah edici” görevine inanmadıkları ve infaz sisteminde yapısal sorunlar gördükleri sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Hapisaneler gerek çalışanlar gerekse mahpuslar için olumsuz bir ortam oluşturmakta, yapılan reformlar yapısal sorunları giderememektedir.

Atıf İçin

Varlıklar Demirkazık, Ç.N. & Akbaş, E. (2025). Perspectives of correction officers on crime and criminals and their relationship with “power” and “authority”. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 29(2), 332-353. doi: tsadergisi. 1518249

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyal Hizmet, Ankara, c.n.varliklar.demirkazik@aybu.edu.tr , ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4576-9991>

** Prof. Dr., Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyal Hizmet, Ankara, emrahakbas@aybu.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2807-4055>

INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system in Turkey, as it is in the rest of the world, has always been able to create its own agenda with its judiciary and prosecutors, prisons and resistance, news of abuse, and its changing system, and has never stayed out of the interest of both social science and politics. Especially what happened in military prisons after the 1980 Coup, the “Return to Life” operation in 2000, the physical and administrative changes that took place in prisons after this operation, the changes made in the prison system with the start of negotiations for full membership to the European Union (EU) in 2005 brought along many issues that needed to be examined and discussed such as quality of prisons, inmate rights, rehabilitative environments etc.

The Birth of The Prisons

The history of the birth of prisons as institutional places (and generally closed institutions) is also the history of the changing criminal law/system and power relations. Widescale social changes that began in the 17th century forced the governments to take different positions on management. With changing management styles, new institutions were formed, and one of these institutions was the prisons where punishment took place.

Foucault, in his book *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, questioned whether it is possible to build the history of punishment through the history of the body, and he explained the changing criminal justice system in this theme by always focusing on power relations built over the body. The body is in a political field where power relations directly interfere with it. The said body is surrounded, stigmatized, disciplined, tortured, put to work, and forced into ceremonies (Foucault, 1992). The biggest reason why the body is so surrounded by power is that it is productive, and this can only be useful and used if it is somehow subordinated. Subordination of the body was carried out by intimidation until the 18th century, with regard to punishment.

In the 18th century, there was a paradigm shift in criminal reform, and the power of punishment shifted from the revenge of the ruler to the defense of society (Foucault, 1992). Ağaş (2013) said that the existing governance structure at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century has given “society” with a new rationalized way of management and described “society” as: “Is a reality that differs from those of the state or even politics; has its own laws, rules, can be measured, can be predicted, therefore has regularities open to intervention, can be worked on, can be the source of a specific way of knowing, and can allow many expertise, institutions, and discourses to emerge from itself”. The Classical School, which was effective in the creation of the new punishment mechanism, defines the individual as “rational” and emphasizes that he committed a crime by his own choice, and that the criminal should be punished for breaking the “social contract”. This “rational man”, which was also at the center of the Enlightenment in the West, was also discovered within a criminal. Foucault (1992) said: There will be a day in the 19th century when this “human” discovered in the criminal will become the target of the intervention, the object claimed to correct and transform, will be the field of many strange sciences and practices – “prison science”, “criminal science”. With that, a transition happened to a criminal justice system that affects the heart, thought, will, and mental state by intervening not on the body, but on the soul, and aiming to “correct”, “improve” and “heal” the individual.

The New Criminal Justice System

The functioning of the prison with a disciplinary and regulatory power took place in harmony with the structure of the system from the 19th century until the middle of the 20th century. With the advances in medicine and psychiatry, the criminal justice system declared the criminal as sick and defective. On the other hand, the social transformations that took place during the 19th century required having social explanations for crime.

The 19th century was a time in which urbanization was experienced on a large scale in Europe and America, and a more suitable environment for crime was formed in cities with their physical, social, cultural, and economic structure (Karasu, 2008). The Chicago School brought a sociological-criminological approach to crime by explaining crime not with genetic structure but with social and environmental factors. To this theory, also known as the ecological approach,

social disorganization or cultural transfer theory, the strain-anomie theory, subculture theories, social learning theories, and stigmatization theories have been added in time (Kızmaz, 2005). It can be said that at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the political meanings of crime and criminal, which included “justice” and “resistance”, were replaced by “villain/felon” or “social pathology” (Özkazanç, 2010). With this, crime and punishment are no longer a class and therefore a political issue, but a social issue as a subject of sociology.

Özkazanç (2011) states that this state of being a social issue reached its highest level in the Welfare State period after the World Wars and is defined as a deviant individual that committed a crime “needs to be socialized until they resemble us, to be cured” and is tried to be swallowed and assimilated through social services, clinical psychology and related positivist disciplines. While biopolitics used in wartime Europe and America served to determine who would live and who would die, post-war biopolitics were implemented as social engineering at the societal level and normalization at the individual level with remedial therapeutic intervention (Özkazanç, 2011). However, the 1950s and 1960s were the years when “norms” began to be questioned in the world, and social movements that were pro-peace and that focused on daily life struggles, gained intensity. The protests, which were held for the demands, were immediately declared “disorderly and disruptive” by the politicians and were tried to be pushed out of the law. This period came to end with the strengthening of the liberal and conservative discourse against the Welfare State and the suppression of the rising “left” and the rise of the “new right”, and a new era began in the field of crime and punishment as well.

After the 1970s, with the world system beginning to be shaped by neo-liberal policies and the effects of globalization, the criminal justice system was also impacted and changed. Feeley and Simon (1992), who said that the punishment ideology and practice became more conservative in the 1970s and 1980s, stated that the change took place in three main areas. The first of these is the shift from the discourse of clinical diagnosis and punitive judgment to a discourse focused on probability and risk. The second area is the purposes of the punishment system. The main purpose of reducing criminal activity has changed, and the intention of social inclusion has decreased. The last change is that the goal of the unifying approach in techniques and creating equality used in the past has turned into creating a place where only criminals will be gathered. New criminologists in this system do not receive sociology or social work education but instead get trained in management research and system analysis (Feeley & Simon, 1992).

At this point, it would be useful for the discussion to focus on the applicability of the anti-oppression practice, which is a stance against the risk-oriented, managerial structure of the new penal system. Dominelli (2015) defined anti-oppression social work as a form of social work practice carried out together with the applicant, emphasizing social classes and structural inequalities, and aiming to minimize power differences in society. In the new penal system, the assumption is made that access to good options is equal for all people, and this assumption ignores the historical, social, and political realities in access to options (Pollack, 2004). Anti-oppression social work practice proposes a ‘deindividualize’ approach that takes all these factors into account. Only with this approach can the inherent oppressive structure of the prison on all its components be broken.

The following themes emerge as prominent within the evolving global punishment system: the worldwide prison population is steadily increasing. While there are notable exceptions—such as the Netherlands, where crime rates have declined and prisons have closed due to more lenient drug laws and the successful reintegration of former inmates into the workforce (HapisteGenç, 2016), and Germany, which reduced its prison population from 80,000 to 55,000 over a decade through effective use of probation—the number of such cases remains limited compared to the broader global trend. According to the 2014 report of the Council of Europe, the number of prisoners has increased in most of the countries covered by the survey (SPACE, 2014), and this number is also increasing in Third World countries (Prison Studies, 2016). While the number of prisoners in Turkey, which was 55,870 in 2005, increased threefold and reached 184,494 in 2016 (Evrensel, 2016), the number of prisoners in 2020 became 297,019 after the failed coup attempt in 2016 (DW,

2021). Turkey currently ranks 7th in the world and 1st in Europe in terms of the number of prisoners, and again 1st in Europe in terms of occupancy rate (Szmigiera, 2021).

Throughout Turkey's history, there have been many military coups, and after each coup "imprisonment" has been the ultimate solution. The torture of political prisoners in prisons, especially after the 1980 Coup, is a history that Turkey has not forgotten (Zeydanlıoğlu, 2013). In the following years, when political repression continued, the F-type cell system in prisons attracted the most reaction. In 2000, the "Return to Life" operation was organized against prisoners who opposed the isolation system. When the process of accession to the EU began, many changes began to be made in the execution system, such as the closure of old prisons, the establishment of campus prisons, developing joint projects with the EU, increasing staff training, further developing prisoner evaluation programs, and the active implementation of probation period (CTE, 2022). The presence of social work in the forensic field has increased thanks to the Psychosocial Assistance Service in prisons, which has become widespread after this EU process, although prisons have never been highly preferred by social workers, precisely because of the issues we have discussed.

The main objective of this research is to provide a detailed analysis of the opinions of the correction officers working in these institutions; on crime and criminals, via the findings that will emerge by the interview conducted with people working as correction officers in the three big cities of Turkey and using the outcome as a foundation and supporting these with academic literature. With this analysis, based on the opinions of the correction officers, the aim is to reveal findings on the perspective of the institution they work at and that of the criminal justice system in Turkey towards crime and the criminals in general. These findings will be useful in identifying the structural problems and needs of policies in the field of criminality. Also, the field of criminality, contrary to what is mostly studied in sociology and psychology, has not been addressed from a Foucauldian perspective in social work. We believe that a forensic study without Foucault's analysis of institutions, the concept of 'biopower', and the disciplinary society thesis would be quite incomplete.

One of the aims of the research is to examine the perspective of correction officers on crimes and criminals, and the effects of the "power" they have, the "authority" they use, and their relations with the "authority" they are reporting to in the hierarchical system. When the power and authority of the correction officers are considered as the privileges 'granted/given' to them by the institution they are in, the limits and dimensions of this power become related to the existing institutional structure. Within the framework of these objectives, the research questions were formulated as follows:

- What are the main motivations for correction officers to choose their job?
- What do they think about criminality?
- What do prisons provide?
- Which dimension of incarceration predominates: reintegrating the criminals into society or isolating criminals from society and establishing a disciplinary power over them?

These questions are being tried to be answered via the opinions of the correction officers who work in these institutions the most, in terms of time and communication with the prisoners. It would be important to discuss how incarceration, which is the biggest punishment method in Turkey, and the prison itself, ensure justice within. In the following sections, while explaining the formation of the prison in history and the evolution of criminal justice systems over time, an answer to this question will always be sought: What is the function of imprisonment?

METHODOLOGY

In our research, qualitative methodology was preferred, which does not ignore structural and systemic problems and is based on people's own experiences and views, which are believed to make the field valuable. The structure of qualitative research, which focuses on the actions expressed by the participants and has the potential to reveal different truths as different people can attribute different subjective meanings to the same event, was emphasized (Büyüköztürk et al.,

2014). In the research, which was conducted in the phenomenology design of qualitative research, the thoughts of the correction officers in the sample about crime and criminals and their experiences in the penal execution system were learned, and how they made sense of these experiences were conveyed (Cresswell, 2021).

Participants

The position of the research corresponds to the use of purposive sampling. This sample allows us to understand social events and phenomena in the context of selected situations and to explore and explain the relationships between them (Büyüköztürk et al., 2014). In order to reach the target sample, the “snowball” method of purposive sampling was preferred. Within the scope of this sample, key informants were reached, and then the identification of the participants was completed with the key informants reaching out to others (Öner, 2015). In order to reach the sample, key informants were contacted through various means such as telephone and social media. Contact was made with people who knew a correctional officer and who worked in courthouses in big cities. The research area was limited to large cities, both because key informants were located in large cities and because small cities may have a different functioning structure due to a lack of institutional control and employee training. Correction officers who wanted to join voluntarily and other officers recommended by these officers were recruited. In qualitative research, it is important to reach a saturation level in determining the sample size. Interviews were terminated when similarities began to be observed in the participants' discourses and no new information was obtained (Er & Duyan, 2023).

As can be seen in Table 1, of the participants who belong to different age groups and work in open or closed prisons, 9 are male and 3 are female. Considering some of the important socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, it is seen that all the participants are married, the educational status of the older ones may be as high school graduates, while the younger ones have at least an associate degree. Since the husbands of female correction officers also work, their monthly income levels are higher than that of male correction officers. Of the male participants, only the spouse of one is working, and those with a monthly income of more than 3,000 TL have additional income such as rental income (While the minimum wage was around 1,300 TL in Turkey in 2016, when the research was conducted, the salary of a correction officer varied between 2,300-2,700 TL).

Table 1. *Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants*

Code Name	Gender	Age	Education	Home Income	Institution/ Working time
Esra	Female	45	Master's Degree Candidate	8.500 TL	11 years- Closed Prison 5 years- Juvenile Reformatory 3 years- Open Prison
Meral	Female	35	Bachelor Degree	7.000 TL	3,5 years- Closed Prison 1,5 years- Open Prison
Pınar	Female	34	Associate Degree	5.000 TL	10 years- Closed Prison 1 year- Open Prison
Ahmet	Male	47	High School Degree	3.000 TL	13 years- Closed Prison 3 years- Open Prison
Ali	Male	49	High School Degree	2.800 TL	6 years- Closed Prison 12 years- Open Prison
Hakan	Male	52	High School Degree	5.000 TL	14 years- Open Prison
Ferit	Male	55	High School Degree	4.500 TL	26 years- Closed Prison
Hasan	Male	29	Bachelor Degree	2.600 TL	5 years- Open Prison
Serkan	Male	32	Bachelor Degree	2.600 TL	5 years- Open Prison
Can	Male	35	Master's Degree	2.600 TL	5 years- Open Prison
Mehmet	Male	31	Associate Degree	5.500 TL	2.5 years- Closed Prison

İsmail	Male	48	High School Degree	6.000 TL	1.5 years- Open Prison 10 years- Closed Prison 11 years- Open Prison
---------------	------	----	--------------------	----------	--

Data Collection Tools

In the research, a semi-structured interview form was used, and the desired findings were reached through in-depth interviews. There are 50 questions in total in the form created in light of the literature. The questions were grouped under 5 sections, including the participants' perceptions of their jobs, their work experiences, their perceptions towards prisoners, their relations with prisoners, and their views on the penal execution system. A pilot interview was conducted with a key informant to finalize the interview form. The interviews were held between February 20th, 2016, and April 1st, 2016, in Ankara, Istanbul, and Bursa. In addition, a collective interview was conducted with 4 correction officers at the Istanbul courthouse, who could not be interviewed individually due to a lack of time, and some quotations were included in the findings as important data was obtained during this conversation.

Data Analyzes

The names of the participants were withheld, and they were given code names. The interviews were analyzed by the researcher who conducted the interview, without using an analysis program, within the framework of the thematic analysis method. In thematic analysis, data are transcribed, read and re-read, initial codes are created, codes are grouped under themes, each theme is clearly defined, and salient quotes are selected (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Within the scope of this research, the analyses were reviewed, and themes and codes were created.

FINDINGS

The thematic analysis resulted in 4 main themes (Table 2). Under the theme of “Professional Experiences,” there were 3 codes, under the theme of “Perceptions of Crime and Criminal,” there were 2 codes, under the theme of “Relationship with Authority,” there were 2 codes, and under the theme of “Penal System Evaluations,” there were 3 codes to be reached.

Table 2. Themes and codes table of the research

THEMES			
Professional experiences	Perception of crime and criminal	Relationship with authority	Penal system evaluations
Preference vs Mandatory	What is crime?	Under the authority	Prison conditions
CODES Training	Who is a criminal?	Use the authority	Functioning of the system
Weariness and burnout			Purpose of prison

Professional Experiences

3 codes were identified under this theme: “preference VS mandatory”, “training”, and “weariness and burnout”.

Preference VS mandatory

When the interviewees were asked whether they chose to become correction officers willingly and gladly, they said that they mostly entered the job unwillingly. Most of the interviewees cited “being a civil servant” as the reason for choosing the profession, and they regarded this as a necessity. Another reason was given as “not being able to find another job”. Reasons such as seeing this profession as a stepping stone in order to be promoted or to move to another place with the government were also presented. According to some of the interviewees, they started to work without even knowing what their job would entail.

I saw it in the newspaper advertisement, I took the exam. I didn't know exactly what penitentiary protection was. When I was appointed, I learned that I had become a prison guard (İsmail, M, 48)!

I have an undergraduate degree in physics. I waited for a long time to be appointed as a teacher, but it did not happen. I was married, and I had to have a job, and so I applied for this job (Hasan, M, 29).

Being a correction officer is a physically and mentally challenging and risky profession, and it is a tiring profession in terms of working conditions because of the shift system. It is a big problem of the system in Turkey that people start working without knowing these conditions. In a study carried out in England (Scott, 2006), correction officers stated that they were “driven” into this job, that the job protection as a correction officer and the disappointment they experienced in the places they worked before, led them to choose this profession. People are being ‘pushed’ towards a profession that should be “preferred”.

Training

It is known that correction officers in Turkey did not receive pre-service training and did not do internships before starting their working life, until very recently. After the establishment of the personnel training centers, the first comprehensive training was completed in 2006, and most of this training is in-service training (CTE, 2016). It is seen that mandatory internships have been applied for the last 4-5 years.

Only 1 of the 12 interviewees received pre-service training and conducted an internship. All the interviewees who did not do internships and did not receive pre-service training have then received in-service training at different times. Those who started the profession a long time ago generally received a 7-day in-service training and started to communicate with the prisoners and work starting from the very first day.

There should be more training. There are too many who do not receive any training. Training is necessary for communication with the administration as well. They handed us the keys directly. We dived in without knowing how to work with terrorism and the judicial system. How then will we benefit the convicts (Esra, F, 45)?

The training of correction officers is, of course, vital for the smooth running of the system. Theoretical training is important so that correction officers can understand the functioning of the prison system, learn about and respect human and prisoner rights. Educations that are done superficially and that do not have an adaptive teaching process in terms of ethical values will bring many problems in prison life. In addition, practical internships teach what to do in times of crisis in order to prevent physical harm to prisoners, themselves, and other employees.

In England, the process, which starts with entering a graduate program and taking a 10-week course, is followed by a 1-year internship with a supervisor (AGCAS, 2019). In the US, supervised internships ranging from 2-3 months to 2 years are conducted (CorrectionalOfficerEdu, 2016). In private prisons, the number of which is increasing in the USA, correction officers, who receive about 60 hours less theoretical training compared to public prisons, experience great difficulties. Security problems in private prisons are doubled in the rate compared to those in public ones (Mason, 2012). Considering the education in Turkey, recent innovations and developments are coming to light. Within the scope of pre-service training, adaptation training, theoretical, and

applied training programs are implemented. In-service training, on the other hand, is provided in the form of candidacy training, induction training, information refresher training, and preparation training for senior staff. In the project named “Improving the Professional Competence and Increasing Social Development of Prison Staff”, which was carried out jointly with the EU in 2015, it aimed to develop the necessary training modules (GOPEdu, 2017).

Weariness and burnout

All correction officers interviewed described their jobs as “very stressful” and “weary”, even the 3 people who said they took these jobs willingly. There are many factors that affect these definitions. Being a correction officer is a profession that poses a safety risk to life. Possible physical risks can also bring some mental problems. While there may be anxiety due to physical harm, the spatial conditions of prisons can also affect the mental state of the correction officers. Since they work in prisons and with that have certain restrictions, the distance of the prisons from the city centers causes them to feel social exclusion. The thought that prison management does not support them also increases their anxiety. In the profession, where working in shifts is common, this workload also creates weariness. Correction officers, who already did not want these jobs in the first place, experience great stress for many reasons, and this can lead to professional burnout.

If the one inside is a convict, you're also a semi-convict. The guy has been working for 30 years in a closed prison, he is like a prisoner himself. Prisons and Detention Houses are a little interested in our situation, but they are not interested in the state execution officers at all (Mehmet, M, 31).

High security prisons are very challenging. When you see the sun, you become like a blind chicken (laughs), you have a glare (İsmail, M, 48).

In addition to working conditions, it has been stated that the “weariness rate”, which is one of the personal rights, is not considered among the correction officers, the only organization that will protect their rights is CİPDER (Solidarity Association of Correction Officers), but since this organization is only an NGO, they cannot defend their rights like an established union could.

Two studies conducted by Griffin et al. and Lambert et al. (2012; 2012) in the USA, in one private and one state prison, examining the effect of job characteristics on the burnout of correction officers, yielded debatable results. Supervision, job diversity, importance of tasks, the feedback received from the job, and job autonomy are all types of “job characteristics”. In the study carried out in the state prison, it was observed that occupational burnout decreased in cases where there is feedback received from the job and job autonomy. Receiving feedback according to their performances has impacted their jobs positively. This feedback includes the degree of value of their work and the job duties, and the job needs provided to employees. Correction officers feel more comfortable knowing what is expected of them as a duty. Having a certain job autonomy also allows them to have positive feelings towards their job. Allowing employees to exercise some control over their work sends the message that they are valued, respected, and trusted (Lambert et al., 2012). In our study, some of the interviewees stated that they think that they “do not have the slightest value in the eyes of the management”. One of the interviewees said that they are all “psychologists, sociologists, and prison guards” at work. It can be said that this state of feeling worthless and thinking that they are juggling multiple jobs has an impact on increasing the weariness of the interviewees.

Two of the very few studies conducted with correction officers in Turkey are about professional burnout and the psychiatric disorders of correction officers. In a study conducted in Kocaeli open prison, it was examined whether socio-demographic characteristics affect occupational burnout and found that there was no significant difference between men and women, but it was discovered that single and younger correction officers experienced higher occupational burnout (Özkan&Bayraktar, 2015). The other research was carried out in Konya closed prison, and the prevalence of psychiatric disorders among correction officers was investigated. According to the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria, a psychiatric disorder was found in 23% of the correction officers, and

the most common ones among these were nicotine addiction at a rate of 28% and major depression at a rate of 10% (Kaya et al., 2003).

Perception of Crime and Criminal

Before starting this section, it is imperative to explain the preferred concepts, especially in terms of their use in Turkish. Thus, the concepts used in the title of the research will also be explained. In this research, we, as the authors, have preferred to use the concepts that we think are appropriate to our approach to social sciences. The word 'prison' refers only to 'confinement' in terms of its root, while the word 'prisoner' is used in the sense of 'confined'. Thus, rather than the concept of 'criminal' that the word 'prison' automatically attributes to those 'inside', the words 'prison' and 'prisoner', which do not have a positive or negative meaning, were preferred in order to avoid stigmatization. However, the words in the quotations used in the study have been used as the authors used them, and the existing uses in official and institutional discourses have been left as they are. The terms 'crime' and 'criminal' in the title of the study were used in order to be inclusive since the correctional officers were not only asked about prisoners in prisons, but also about the act of crime and the people who commit this act in a broad sense. Participants mostly used the word "prisoner" during the interviews and preferred the concepts of 'crime' and "criminal" in terms of comprehensibility and inclusiveness. Our two codes under this theme also include these words: "What is crime?" and "Who is a criminal?"

What is crime?

The participants were given a list of the types of crimes categorized by the Ministry of Justice, and they were asked to name the three most negative among these types of crimes according to their perspectives. The type of crime that all interviewees gave as an answer in common is sexual crime. This is followed by political crime (terrorism), and this type of crime was mentioned as the first answer by almost all interviewees. The interviewees see terrorism as the most negative crime. While an interviewee defined terrorism as "anyone who violates the integrity of the state and its territorial integrity" (İsmail, M, 48), some defined it as "a crime that harms everyone" (Esra, F, 45) and "for me it is no different than murder" (Can, M, 35). This crime was usually followed by sexual crimes. The third most negative offense varies between the following types: drugs, theft, extortion, fraud, manslaughter.

As mentioned above, since having knowledge of the criminal act has the potential to create 'prejudice', it is necessary to take preventive measures because prejudice can bring difficulties in service delivery.

I worked in Ankara where there were PKK members, I experienced many difficulties. This is the main reason why I came here from the open prison. I am extremely nationalist. That's why I had trouble. Child abuser (no chance I will have contact with), terrorism (traitor), prostitution etc. are the weakest link (Mehmet, M, 31).

There is KCK (a branch of PKK), and there are terrorists. The hardest part is serving them. They say that they do not recognize this state and the law; they are making propaganda on this. Then, when they encounter the slightest problem in prison, they put forward the laws they say they do not recognize. Of course, it is difficult. I think sometimes, when these people go to the hospital, they are prioritized because they are prisoners, and they take advantage of the hospital service. They say that they do not like this state, the nation, we provide these people with state services (Group meeting).

After the interviews, it can be said that the following point of view about the prisoners is dominant: Prisoners convicted of sexual crimes are perceived as "perverted" and sick people with "disorders," and no contact is made with them. Manslaughter, on the other hand, is often described as a momentary lapse in judgment and is felt to be seen as an almost "acceptable" crime among correction officers. Theft and drug crimes are explained by economic, social, and cultural reasons and can be perceived as "being forced into committing a crime". Terror-related crime can be said

to be the most different category. Those convicted of this crime are perceived as “traitors”. They are not seen as sick or forced to commit a crime; it is perceived as a deliberate act of committing a crime, and perhaps for this reason, it draws the greatest reaction from the correction officers and stands out as the first type of crime that contradicts their values.

Who is a criminal?

When asked about people's reasons for committing crimes, the participants made different evaluations.

If there is a bad upbringing, economic dimension (unemployment), criminal mindset in the family, things that can work, things to not develop with any improvement. He abused 45 children, you know, he has a personality disorder (Esra, F, 45).

I think people are doing it because they have nothing. Because of the accumulated stuff. It incites people to commit a crime. There is a reason behind it all. Domestic violence, insult. Well, the result is always looked at, the punishment is given, but the reason is never considered (Pinar, F, 34).

Depending on the crime, of course. I keep sexual crimes separate. For example, theft is different-either he saw it around, his financial situation was bad, or he saw it as a profession. The crime of homicide can happen with a momentary anger, some do it for family honor (Can, M, 35).

One of the interviewees said that “their understanding of morality is very different” while interpreting the types of crimes. Haney (2008) stated that correction officers also create their own moral universe. Due to the nature of the prison, correction officers can create their own standards, inmates can be seen as morally excluded, and create an alternative moral universe. It can be said that the exclusionary relations among the prisoners, the exclusionary attitude of the correction officers towards the prisoners, and the possible reactions of the prisoners to the correction officers make the tense relations in the prisons permanent.

Their own perspectives were also reached through other people's thoughts about criminals.

Our environment is negative about criminals. We try to enlighten them, tell them the truth, and correct their point of view. They become prejudiced. I look at them as if they committed a crime, the law has punished them, we look at them as human beings, we don't blame them (İsmail, M, 48).

There is no thought of reintegration for them. They want these people to be there all the time, to be kept there, not to be seen. They don't want them to leave; they see problems when they do. When you get involved, you see criminals as people who need to be reintegrated. For example, there are those who are forced to commit crimes, and there are those who go to prison for a very small reason. It is mostly about ignorance. Sometimes prisons add to it. They put the same kind of criminals in the same ward, and when they get out, they say, let's work together. It adds to the crime (Hasan, M, 29).

Relationship with Authority

2 codes were identified under this theme: “under the authority” and “use the authority”.

Under the authority

The participants were asked about their communication with their supervisors in order to address their relations with ‘power’. Communication with supervisors is closely related to the place where the correction officers work. Especially in large campus prisons, communication with supervisors is very low if the unit they work in is physically distant and does not require frequent communication with the supervisor.

When there is a problem, we definitely want to solve it among ourselves before the supervisors. Because when we do something wrong, the supervisor does not stand behind us. We intervene where we can. 2nd manager, I talk well with administrative officers. We are one click further away from the 1st manager, because we are more intertwined with the others. You see the 1st manager as a warning, advice, not for a one-on-one solution. (Pınar, F, 34)

When there is a problem, the first preference is to solve the problem among the correction officers because most of the participants think that the administration does not stand behind them when there is a negative situation.

If the incident is small, we solve it among ourselves. If it gets bigger, we have to tell the institution, the supervisor. There can also be conflicts between employees; if it gets bigger, it is reported to the superior. A report is kept. There is no problem in communication with the supervisors here. In terms of standing behind us, how can I put it, how did others put it? I mean, they don't stand. We are alone. You can't do anything (Ali, M, 49).

First, they seem to be behind you, then when you have a problem, they are gone (Hasan, M, 29).

The participants who said that the situation of supervisors standing behind them varies from person to person agreed that the whole situation changes with the change of a manager.

When there is a problem, we go to the 1st administrative supervisor, who is responsible. We try to solve it ourselves, but it is still forwarded to the supervisor. An investigation can be opened for very small things. he came to my room, I fired him, so he would sue. Relations with the manager vary a lot from manager to manager. The manager changes all the time. While I was here, 5 first managers and 6 second managers changed. There are not always people of the same quality. They support us 50 percent (Serkan, M, 32).

When there is a problem, they usually try to find someone, depending on the management. It usually happens in organizations. They try to cover up individual mistakes, they try to cover it up, they think that we should not be replaced. I can talk to my supervisor easily, and we have good bilateral conversations. One prosecutor and management will stand behind you, one will not. There are more who don't. There are pro-government, anti-government; politics is very influential. It creates a big problem. In our country, the manager's qualifications are weak. Everything is in the hands of the prosecutor; everyone stands at attention when he comes (Mehmet, M, 31).

The correctional officers, who are at the bottom of the hierarchical order of the prison, do not feel that they are 'looked after' by their supervisors, and this situation causes them to feel anxiety in the work environment. In a study conducted in a private prison (Griffin et al., 2012), the belief that a supervisor 'has their back' leads to more positive results in the behavior of correctional officers towards both their colleagues and prisoners. According to the findings of our study, many correctional officers stated that their supervisors did not stand behind them and they felt that they were on their own, and they complained that this situation varied from administration to administration. The lack of a clear job description on some issues and the fact that there is no established structure, and the institution's managed differently with each new manager decreases the sense of trust of the interviewees towards the institution, and it is seen that the feeling of uncertainty may be reflected in the work life in the form of stress.

Use the authority

The participants were asked how often they communicated with the prisoners and their relations with the prisoners were explored.

I have a lot of communication with the prisoners, it is usually about work. That man will go back to life from there, it is necessary to talk to him to prepare him. The chief officer in charge asks about his problems, troubles, family matters, etc. You need to know the pulse of the crowd. If you know the pulse, any issues are resolved immediately. No matter what, you're working with the criminal, even if we don't see them as criminals, to a certain extent. Your perspective on the criminal must change. We will make this man a craftsman, and maybe he will not commit a crime again when he leaves (Serkan, M, 32).

I am in constant contact. They are human after all, they have met with a destiny, maybe it's a necessity, maybe there is a different gain involved. Of course, you do not become buddies. You have a forced conversation in the open area, from morning to evening, you have to talk too (Mehmet, M, 31).

You don't communicate much when you're in a closed prison. There is a ward-room system. In the ward, you were inside as well; now you are not. There is no communication in this system. There will be a distance between you and the prisoner, but we have to treat everyone with understanding (Ferit, M, 55).

The participants were asked whether they had ever clashed with prisoners, whether they were physically harmed during this process, and how they coped with the process.

There were prisoners I had conflicts with. There was a foreign woman. She kept pressing the button, asking for something for free, even though I knew she had money in her account. She asked me for an Orkid, and I didn't give it to her for free. She complained to the manager. The manager scolded me. There was no lawsuit; I just hated the manager. There are a lot of physical fights with women. With Gypsies, there are always fights (Meral, F, 35).

We hear insults a lot. Mature people don't do it anyway, but some of them, who have come from a certain place, who have no family upbringing, try to make us angry. There was a child prisoner who used to push the button and swear all the time. We filed a complaint against her. She doesn't get wise. Maybe she will, but it's very difficult. She used to love me too, she would say, "Sister, you complained too? That child didn't receive love, always stayed with someone, was left in the void, and then became a monster. If she was cared for a little... (Pinar, F, 34).

Another question posed to the interviewees is whether they learned about the crimes committed during their communication with the prisoners. While some of the interviewees said that they may act with prejudice when they learn about the crimes, others stated that their crimes do not concern them at all. There are those who say, "We do not know about their crimes, we cannot do our jobs if we knew" (Ahmet, M, 47), there are also those who say that "for me, they are all guilty, the crime they commit outside is not my concern" (Ferit, M, 55) and that knowing about their crimes does not prevent them from doing their job. They can learn about the crimes of the prisoners when they see their files, as well as if the prisoner tells them or they ask the prisoners themselves.

I know their crimes, but I do not dig into them. Many colleagues are talking; they are judging because they did this and that. My job is to serve him, not tell him about what he did. You cannot get emotions involved; you'll hate it. I don't judge him for his crime, the state gives a punishment anyway, I cannot give an extra punishment on top of it (Pinar, F, 34).

You become prejudiced when you learn, so I try not to learn anymore. The guy rapes someone and you look to see how the man will be punished, and you see, that he has access to hot water here to shower. You get angry (Group meeting).

I am very curious about their crimes. I ask why he did what he did, I talk to them. There is no prejudice. But sometimes I act prejudiced according to his crime. You're guilty regardless of if it's a little bit or a lot, right (Esra, F, 45)?

In addition to the authority given to the correction officer by the social order, there is also an institutional authority given by the prison. Foucault (1992) calls the prison guard a “penalizing agent”, who “must exercise complete power that no one else can break; the prisoner to be reformed must be completely surrounded by the power exercised over him”. Ergüden (2007) who states that prison guards in institutional authority, as part of a hierarchical and centralized system, leave their personalities and become institutions/buildings, “generally, like all the members of security systems, the guards from the lower class, here retain the right of domination and sovereignty that they did not have perhaps nowhere or in any institution (for male guards, their families may be excluded).” This right can sometimes also be characterized as arbitrary power. Crewe (2011) stated that this type of power is concentrated on issues such as determining the privilege levels of prisoners and the daily use of authority. The reports written by the correctional officers on the early release or categorization of prisoners can provide them with psychological power over prisoners' feelings of hope and disappointment. In our interviews, it was concluded that the reports kept by the correction officers are very important for the prisoners. Especially in open prisons, a negative report kept by a correctional officer can send the prisoner back to a closed prison. It is understood that the authority that they have is very important here.

The participants think that it is necessary to have a certain firmness while working. Especially in closed prisons, an authoritarian attitude is seen as a ‘necessity’.

I am generally understanding and humane at work. I am not too harsh. But sometimes you get to the point where the shit hits the fan, then of course, you have to be tough. Otherwise, it will get on your head; you have to do it (Ali, M, 49).

In a study examining the ties of correction officers with the principle of ‘rule of law’, it is stated that 3 strategies are used to ensure a dominant position over prisoners: Legal authority, coercion, and personal authority (Scott, 2007). ‘Legal authority’, which operates with a great commitment to legality, is not frequently used among correction officers. As for ‘coercion’ to maintain order, although conditions vary from prison to prison, it is not widely used as it brings with it dehumanization, physical distancing from the closed population, and an institutionalized authoritarian culture. ‘Personal authority’ is the most commonly used strategy and weakens relationships while reinforcing existing hierarchies of power, status, and control. Developing ‘good relationships’ with prisoners may be seen as important by some correction officers, but they are careful that these positive relationships are not ‘like social work’ (Scott, 2007). During our interviews, one of the participants said ‘we are both psychologists and sociologists’, but then added that he was authoritarian to keep relations at a certain level. As the employees who have the most contact with the prisoners, the correction officers sometimes try to solve the problems of the prisoners, but mostly they do not completely give up their ‘authoritarian’ attitude in order not to lose their control over the prisoners.

Penal System Evaluations

3 codes were identified under this theme: “prison conditions”, “functioning of the system”, and “purpose of prison”.

Prison conditions

The interviewees gave their perspectives on crime and criminals based on their own value judgments. Once the value judgments were learned, they were asked to evaluate the prison conditions. Thus, it was tried to discover whether they evaluated the prisons in accordance with the

'criminal' in their minds. Some interviewees stated that they found the conditions of the prisoners too good, and that this situation reduced the “deterrence effect of punishment”.

Prison conditions are also very comfortable, a friend who saw the atmosphere in France said that they throw the food in front of people. The ones here are not deterrents. We're too good. They can get out very easily, I think it should be made harder (Serkan, M, 32).

Some of the interviewees emphasized that the occupancy rates of the prisons cause great problems.

There is a large crowd, it is not enough, and the crime rate is high. The capacity of the place where I work is 400-500, currently there are 800 (Ali, M, 49).

The new ones are more luxurious than necessary. The old ones get better as they are restored. The administration is constantly trying to make it better. There are workshops, and prisoners paint on the walls. They made a ventilation, it's like one with air. There is also a burden, paint and money, after all, on the state. The biggest problem in prison is the high occupancy rate. It affects both the guards and the inmates. Sometimes they say that the bunk beds are too close, it's a problem while sleeping, and there is a long line to use the sink. Now they are throwing the files in, and the number of prisoners has skyrocketed. There should be a pardon granted, but a conditional pardon, of course. Not for everyone. If they take DHKPC out, I'll go crazy (Mehmet, M, 31).

When asked if they evaluated all these prisoner conditions and if they ever put themselves in the place of the prisoners, the respondents gave different answers.

I have thought of myself in the place of a prisoner. I thought very moderately and humbly because this thing could happen to us. I saw many ministers and undersecretaries here (İsmail, M, 48).

One interviewee explained in detail how she felt when she thought of herself in prison, and another described his experience by locking himself in a ward.

I thought of staying there all the time. During those night shifts, that moment of release from prison, I am happy to see that sun, it is good even for us. You pick up the phone, call your loved ones. You know how I said prisoners are happy when they go to the hospital, we are also happy when we get out of our shift. They say, 'You are a prisoner just like us'. Traveling, spending time with family relaxes us. If you are on shift on holidays and New Year's Eve, you will be with prisoners. We used to go to their wards and celebrate New Year's, we would go try to make them happy, I have danced during the songs too, no lie. Seeing someone having fun also makes us happy. After that day is over, a sadness covers them again. I would call my family, it's okay, I'll see them the next day anyway. Because I think this way, I look at it from the positive side. If you put down on yourself, then this profession ends, and you always want to escape. I came here for my child, he is sick, he needs to be taken to school, the management gave me this location because it is close to the school. If I were in a closed prison, I would always work. Maybe if they didn't make it easy for me, if I couldn't take care of my son, I would have committed a crime as well, who knows, I wouldn't kill, of course, but it's human nature (Pinar, F, 34).

One day, I locked myself in a ward. There is a delegation ward, they visit it, it is empty, we smoke there too. I stayed there for like 20 minutes. I knocked on the door, but it wouldn't open. A pack of cigarettes can be finished in 20 minutes. Of course, it was more difficult because I am not guilty (Mehmet, M, 31).

Functioning of the system

Information from the interviewees about how they evaluate this system as a subject of the criminal justice system in which they work was collected. As the first topic, they were asked to evaluate the probation method, one of the forms of restorative justice, which started to be implemented in 2007 under the influence of the Council of Europe's recommendations in the EU harmonization process in Turkey. The interviewees are divided into two views about probation. Some find this system useful, while others consider it “not a substitute for prison” (those with this view also think that prisons “do not work very well” anyway). Criticisms are that the probation system operates on 'just signing' and 'giving urine' (for 'substance use offences'), and is similar to existing criticisms. It is very important to provide guidance before and during the release process (Yumak, 2014), but this process does not work very well. With the inclusion of probation sanctions in the Turkish Penal Code and the realization of social participation in the execution of probation decisions, the system can be made more functional (Usta & Öztürk, 2010).

Those interviewed on the subject of “reintegrating” prisoners into society, and more commonly used as “rehabilitation”, expressed their negative views and said that rehabilitation does not take place. A high rate of repeat offenders is shown as the biggest indicator for this situation. The repeat offense rate in Turkey ranges from 40% to 60%, and these high rates may be due to the “prison subculture” and unemployment/uncertainty after leaving prison (Kızmaz, 2007).

Most prisoners do not deserve to be healed, too many who do not understand healing (Esra, F, 45).

Some interviewees on reintegration back into the society think that the state should take care of prisoners. They said that the most important thing after prisoners were released from prison was for them to have a job, and they stated what should be done about this in their opinions.

Officers are important here, not the rules. The rules of Prison Detention Houses are not to have a profession; this happens in the workshops. The guy who makes tea here will he find a job making tea or not? When they come out, the state should support them; otherwise, nobody will hire them. A prisoner comes to me, for example, tells me about what he will do when he leaves, his projects, I listen and support (Mehmet, M, 31).

No one hires prisoners directly. If there could be a place where only prisoners work, if they do it in one province or in a few provinces, I do not know. For example, there was someone who didn't want to leave prison. No job, no power, no home. He says Where will I go? This minority must be protected. Otherwise, this man will commit a crime again. Nobody cares if this guy has been rehabilitated; he is immediately tagged. Build a farm, for example, set up a factory in an institution farther out. Only in this way crime rate decrease. If someone takes care of those kids. For example, this place makes a lot of profit, and it is also spent on the prison. But if they build factories instead of a lot of prisons, the country will also develop. Have them plant trees. For example, a farmer should come and say I need 20 men and let them work (Pınar, F, 34).

They saw that it wasn't working, so they made an F Type. Only political convicts, PKK, DHKP are there. Is this the solution? It is very different when you look at Ulucanlar in the past. Imagine that there are 80 people left in one place, and the 5th system has changed a lot. There was an incident every single day in Ulucanlar. Now there is no ganging up, no power (Ferit, M, 55).

The transition to F-Type prisons is a major breaking point in the criminal justice system. This system, which is based on the transition to the “room system” and which includes the improvement of the negative physical conditions of the ward environment for the prisoners, is not referred to as 'improvement' but as riots because there have been practices that have deviated from its purpose and involve the isolation – especially of political prisoners. As in many other issues in Turkey, a top-down approach was adopted in this system change, and legal and institutional changes were

made in order to catch up with the standards of the West and modernize the institutions (Oral, 2012). However, while making these changes, a political 'divide and conquer' tactic was adopted by transferring political prisoners to these prisons for the first implementations. Death fasts were carried out to protest the practices, and after this resistance, operations called "Return to Life" were carried out in all 20 prisons. The Minister of Justice at the time defended the intervention as: "It is unthinkable for the state to stand by and watch as people are led to death. The goal of the intervention is to save people's lives. At the same time, the state authority, which has been shaken in various prisons since 1991, will be fully established" (Eren, 2014). At the end of the operation, 32 people, consisting of 30 prisoners and 2 soldiers, lost their lives. The opinions of the interviewees clearly reveal the system's view of this event.

They made us watch a documentary about Return to Life, in prison. I think the operation is positive. There was a 'ward master' setup. Political and judicial were hand in hand. Men and women stayed together. There is a documentary on Youtube, watch it if you would like. Then, of course, when they put them in a room for 1-3 people, they saw it as torture. If it were up to me, I would throw them all in the ward one by one. It did not suit their interests, so they rebelled. I did my military service in Şırnak. There are smugglers. They were afraid their way of earning would be hindered, and their comfort would be disturbed (Mehmet, M, 31).

Purpose of prison

Prisons and possible alternatives will be considered in the structural context, based on the question "What do you think prisons provide", which was asked as a last question to the participants.

It is a common thought among those interviewed that prisons do not provide justice and reform; but contribute to public peace by 'keeping people closed'. In other words, it is understood that the interviewees see the institutions they do not see the institutions they work in as places aimed to 'reintegrate prisoners into society' or to provide criminal justice, and therefore, see them as having no other function than "incarceration, detention and security".

Prison does not provide justice, it just keeps the prisoner in (Ferit, M, 55).

I can say that prison is a place where there is no justice. You cannot defend your rights, neither can you as an employee. Nobody is getting better (Ali, M, 49).

The main aim is to protect the society from criminals, but we should discuss how much this is actually achieved (Can, M, 35).

I think the question should be whether we open the prison to increase the number of prisoners or so that the society can relax (Mehmet, M, 31).

Özkazanç (2011) argues that there is such an approach in the literature, and that this approach, called "neutralization", has the main function that even if the prison does nothing else, at least prevents criminals from committing crimes again by incarcerating them.

DISCUSSIONS

Some of the problems of correctional officers revealed in our findings can be addressed relatively quickly: for example, giving them the right to a special depreciation allowance to increase their sense of belonging to the job and the quality of their service delivery, or expanding mandatory and in-depth vocational training for all. However, participants' views on the current penal system made us think about the need for much more structural changes.

It is clear that we are faced with a vicious cycle in Turkey. While prioritizing the reintegration of the prisoner into society, we are returning to 'punitive justice' before we even get close to 'restorative justice' by opening new prisons. While we are opening prisons that meet EU standards in terms of conditions, we are filling these prisons with so many people that the number of people exceeds 2 times the capacity of the place, and we see the solution in opening new prisons instead of evacuating the prisons and looking for alternative execution methods. While the number of

prisoners is increasing and repeat offense rates do not decrease, it is debatable to what extent “reintegration into society” is a realistic goal.

Prisoners stigmatized as criminals experience even more negative things in the prison environment, which harms both their social positions and their families' social positions, making it difficult for them to return to society. These people are “imprisoned” by losing their ability to adapt to the cultural and social structure (Eren, 2014). As Foucault (1992) states, prisons do not decrease but increase the crime rate, neglect prisoners with low-level life standards provided, make possible a hierarchical criminal environment in solidarity, push the prisoner's family into misery by indirectly making them criminals as well, and actually paint a “failed” image overall. Despite all these negatives, why are prisons still the most common form of punishment? Ergüden (2007) draws attention to the following: “While closing prisoners in a space is legally meaningless and dysfunctional; economically – for the system – extremely burdensome; philosophically – for human existence – absurd; but still continues to exist in such a huge mass, is because it coincides with another truth behind utopian words and plans”.

Foucault (1992) thinks that it is necessary to question what this failure he defines actually serves. He answers himself: “Prisons produce an environment of ostensibly marginalized but centrally controlled criminals; they are actually very successful in creating the criminal as the pathologized subject and fabricating a closed, segregated, and useful illegality”. Ergüden (2007) is of the opinion that this criminal justice system does not give any importance to the crime committed, the punishment given, or the rehabilitation of the perpetrator. According to him, the only thing that matters for the system is “to show that the system can exclude and destroy someone in order to maintain its existence, and thus to be threatening, moreover, of course, to exclude and destroy effectively”.

So, what can replace these “total institutions” (Haney & Zimbardo, 2009), which have a pathological structure on their own, not based on the people inside, but draw prisoners more into crime and push the correction officers to exhibit uncharacteristic behaviors that they have never shown before and will likely not show in the future? Foucault thinks that as long as the 'punitive system' we live in remains, even if all prisons are abolished, society will produce new tools that will continue to function in the same manner (Eren, 2014). “As long as the current system continues, we will not be able to abolish prisons because prison is the heart of our society” (Davison, 2016).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main objective of this research is to provide a detailed analysis of the opinions of the correction officers working in these institutions on crime and criminals, the effects of the “power” they have, the “authority” they use, and their relations with the “authority” they are reporting up to in the hierarchical system. At the end of the research, most of the officers stated that they performed their profession because they had to, they found the education they received insufficient, they tried to establish an authority balance in communication with the prisoners, they see their position in prison as isolating, they did not believe in the “remedial” function of the prisons, and they saw structural problems in the execution system.

It's hard to argue that the current panel system may change anytime soon, does this mean that nothing can be done? Eren (2014) stated that although prisons, which are pathological institutions, do not accept reforms and are sometimes uninhibited in brutality, it is necessary to try to curb these institutions. When it comes to prison reform or striving to make the prison a more humane and effective place, it is often thought of in the context of the following changes: reforming the recruitment and training of workers so that people who adhere to certain principles work in prisons; by improving the physical, social, psychological, moral/ethical structure of prisons, enabling prisoners to not only 'live' but also to 'change their lives'; the use of evidence-based rehabilitation programs, etc. (Pollock et al., 2011). In addition to these elements that need to be developed and given importance, more emphasis can be placed on ensuring adherence to the principles of restorative justice.

If probation is implemented as a well-structured system that ensures regular guidance and effective collaboration among all relevant institutions, it has the potential to significantly reduce prison populations. The structures that prioritize socialization rather than “closure”, as in the case of Norway, are likely to yield more positive results for both prisoners and correction officers. Alternatives such as ‘halfway houses’ in Rome, which are funded by the municipality and operate for the main purpose of providing support for prisoners who have reached the end of their sentences, in areas such as finding a place to stay, finding a job and getting back to work life, benefiting from national health services, finding treatment centers for toxic substance addicts etc.; have started to be implemented, although not commonly used so far (TCPS, 2015). Depending on the different economic and social structures of the countries, different alternatives can be found as well.

The presence of NGOs in the field of criminal justice is of great importance. The main shortcoming of Turkey in this regard is that there are very few NGOs for this purpose. There is more need for NGOs such as CISST (Civil Society in the Penal System Association), which try to raise awareness on issues such as being a woman, child, young person, LGBTI+, elderly, disabled or a foreigner in prison. The biggest goal of these NGOs should be to create public pressure against the authorities in the policies developed against disruptions.

Examples such as the Stanford Prison Experiment and the Milgram Experiment are important because they allow us to understand the pathological nature of the distribution of authority and to see that 'good' authority in an environment will increase 'good' and 'bad' authority will increase “evil”. Eren (2014) suggests that examples of “good authority” can be applied in prisons. This good authority is one to be established for the prison administration, capable of defending the rights of prisoners and supervising the prison administration and management. Suggesting Monitoring Committees for "good authority", Eren says that the components of this structure should be reorganized to include representatives of democratic mass organizations, prisoners' relatives and even prisoners' representatives. Thus, the view that prisoners who are reduced to the status of “sick” and “abnormal” have the right to have a say about their own lives can be established and embedded.

By adopting the basic elements of anti-oppression practice in social work practice, it can be ensured that experts working in penal execution adopt the view that prisoners have the right to control their own lives and become aware of the oppressor-oppressed distinction in the relationship between prisoners and correctional officers. The theoretical and practical essence of anti-oppression practice should be integrated into penal execution policy and research. The exclusionary mentality of the institutions does not have a content that intends to put NGOs and universities in prisons. At this point, forensic social workers in the institutions should take an active role, break the perception of the institution and fight for cooperation. Striving for transparency in prisons can be the first step to overcome many negativities.

Additional Info

This article is derived from the author’s master’s thesis entitled “Ceza İnfaz Koruma Memurlarının Suça ve Suçluya Bakışları, ‘Erk’ ve ‘Otorite’ ile Olan İlişkileri”.

REFERENCES

- AGCAS. (2019). *Job profile-Prison officer*. Retrieved from <https://www.prospects.ac.uk/job-profiles/prison-officer>.
- Agtaş, Ö. (2013). *Ceza ve adalet*. Metis.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2019). Psikolojide tematik analizin kullanımı. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 7(2), 873-898. <https://doi.org/10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.7c.2s.17m>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E.K., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem.

- CorrectionalOfficerEdu. (2016). *Corrections officer training*. Retrieved from <https://www.correctionalofficeredu.org/training/>.
- Creswell, J.W. (2021). Nitel araştırma yöntemleri: Beş yaklaşıma göre nitel araştırma ve araştırma deseni. M Bütün & SB Demir (Trns). Siyasal.
- Crewe, B. (2011). Soft power in prison: Implications for staff–prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6), 455–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370811413805>
- CTE. (2016). *Ceza ve Tevkifevleri Genel Müdürlüğü personelinin 2016 yılı eğitim programı*. Retrieved from <http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr/>.
- CTE. (2022). *Ceza infaz alanında yürütülen projeler*. Retrieved from <https://cte.adalet.gov.tr/home/sayfadetay/ceza-infaz-alaninda-yurutulen-projeler>.
- Davison, C. (2016). *Foucault: Society and prison*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/344213/Foucault_Society_and_Prison.
- Dominelli, L. (2015) Baskı karşıtı uygulama: Yirmi birinci yüzyılın zorlukları. T Tuncay (Ed) *Sosyal hizmet: Temel alanlar ve eleştirel yaklaşımlar* (p. 83-95). Nika.
- DW. (2021). *Nüfusa göre tutuklu oranında Türkiye Avrupa birincisi*. Retrieved from <https://www.dw.com/tr/n%C3%BCfusa-g%C3%B6re-tutuklu-oran%C4%B1nda-t%C3%BCrkiye-avrupa-birincisi/a-57133469>.
- Er, F., & Duyan, V. (2023). I’m about to explode, I’m about to strangle: Emotional experiences of Turkish veterans and their spouses diagnosed with post traumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 20(6), 780-799. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26408066.2023.2213231>
- Eren, M. (2014). *Kapatılmanın patolojisi: Osmanlı’dan günümüze hapishanenin tarihi*. Kalkedon.
- Ergüden, I. (2007). *Hapishane çağı: Kapatılan insan*. Versus.
- Evrensel. (2016). *Mahpus sayısı 10 yılda 3 kat arttı*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/275974/mahpus-sayisi-10-yilda-3-kat-artti>.
- Feeley, M. M., & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*, 30(4), 449-474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01112.x>
- Foucault, M. (1992). *Hapishanenin doğuşu*. İmge.
- GOPEdu. (2017). *Cezaevi personelinin mesleki yeterliliklerinin geliştirilmesi sosyal yeterliliklerinin artırılması projesi çalıştay*. Retrieved from <https://www.gop.edu.tr/duyuruDetay.aspx?d=en-US&m=duyurudetay&mk=30542&id=141>.
- Griffin, M.L., Hogan, N.L., & Lambert, E.G. (2012). Doing “people work” in the prison setting: an examination of the job characteristics model and correctional staff burnout. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(9), 1131–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812442358>
- Haney, C. (2008). A culture of harm: Taming the dynamics of cruelty in supermax prisons. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(8), 956–984. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854808318585>
- Haney, C., & Zimbardo, P.G. (2009). Persistent dispositionalism in interactionist clothing: Fundamental attribution error in explaining prison abuse. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(6), 807–814.
- Hapistegenc. (2016). *Hollanda hapishaneleri kapanyor*. Retrieved from <https://hapistegenc.wordpress.com/2016/03/24/hollanda-hapishaneleri-kapanyor/>.
- Karasu, M.A. (2008). Türkiye’de kentleşme dinamiklerinin suç etkisi. *AÜHFD*, 57(4), 255-281. https://doi.org/10.1501/Hukfak_0000001555
- Kaya, N., Çilli, A.S., & Güler, Ö. (2003). Cezaevinde çalışan infaz ve koruma memurlarında psikiyatrik bozuklukların bir yıllık yaygınlığı. *Genel Tıp Dergisi*, 13(2), 59-63.
- Kızmaz, Z. (2005). Sosyolojik suç kuramlarının suç olgusunu açıklama potansiyelleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. *C. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 29(2), 149-174.

- Kızmaz, Z. (2007). Cezaevinin ve hapsetmenin suç engellemedeki etkisi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17, 1-25.
- Lambert, E.G., Hogan, N.L., Dial, K.C., Jiang, S., & Khondaker, M.I. (2012). Is the job burning me out? An exploratory test of the job characteristics model on the emotional burnout of prison staff. *The Prison Journal*, 92(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885511428794>
- Mason, C. (2012). *Too good to be true: Private prisons in America*. Washington: The Sentencing Project.
- Oral, T. (2012). *The place of the European and the United Nations based agreements in prison reformation process in Turkey: an evaluation of the effects of international dynamics versus external inputs on the application of F-Type prisons in Turkish legal system*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle East Technical University.
- Öner, A. (2015). *Beyaz yakalı eşcinseller: İşyerinde cinsel yönelim ayrımcılığı ve mücadele stratejileri*. İletişim.
- Özkan, Y., & Bayraktar, T. (2015). İnfaz ve koruma memurlarının mesleki tükenmişlik düzeylerinin belirlenmesi: Kocaeli Açık Ceza İnfaz Kurumu örneği. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 6(21), 172–186.
- Özkazanç, A. (2010). *Siyaset sosyolojisi yazıları: Yeni sağ ve sonrası*. Dipnot.
- Özkazanç, A. (2011). *Neo-liberal tezahürler: Vatandaşlık, suç, eğitim*. Dipnot.
- Pollack, S. (2004). Anti-oppressive social work practice with women in prison: Discursive reconstructions and alternative practices. *British Journal of Social Work*, 2004, 34(5), 693–707. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bch085>
- Pollock, J. M., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Ross, J.I., & Sundt, J.L. (2011). A utopian prison: Contradiction in terms? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 2011, 28(1), 60-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986211432194>
- Prison Studies. (2016). *Highest to lowest- Prison population total*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonstudies.org/highest-to-lowest/prison-population-total>.
- Scott, D. (2006). The caretaker of punishment: Prison officer personal authority and the rule of law. *Prison Service Journal*. 168, 14-19.
- Scott, D. (2007). Prison officers and the rule of law. *Justice Reflections*, 24.
- SPACE. (2014). *Prison populations survey 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilsole24ore.com/pdf/2010/03/03/ILSOLE24ORE/Online/Oggetti/Correlati/Documenti/Notizie/2016/03/carceri-report-consiglio-ue.pdf>.
- Szmigiera, M. (2021). *Countries with the most prisoners as of June 2020*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/262961/countries-with-the-most-prisoners/>.
- TCPS. (2015). *Hapishanede engelli, yabancı, LGBTİ olmak*. TCPS.
- Usta, İ., & Öztürk, H. (2010). Denetimli serbestlik. *Ceza Hukuku Dergisi*, 5(13), 2-44.
- Yumak, S. (2014). Karşılaştırmalı hukuk ve Türk hukukunda hükümlüyü topluma yeniden kazandırmak bağlamında salıverilmeye hazırlık, geçiş sürecinin yönetimi ve koşullu salıverme. *TAAD*, 5(17), 419–443.
- Zeydanlıoğlu, W. (2013). Diyarbakır askeri cezaevinde işkence ve Türkleştirme. *Toplum ve Kuram*, 8, 183-200.

Uzun Öz

Türkiye’deki ceza infaz sistemi - dünyada da olduğu gibi – yargısı ve savcısıyla, hapishanesi ve direnişiyle, istismar haberleri ve değişen sistemiyle her zaman kendi gündemini yaratma kapasitesine sahip olmuş ve gerek sosyal bilimin gerekse politikanın ilgi alanından hiç bir zaman çıkmamıştır. Özellikle 1980 darbesi sonrasında askeri hapishanelerde yaşananlar, 2000 yılında gerçekleştirilen ‘Hayata Dönüş Operasyonu’, bu operasyon sonrası hapishanelerde gerçekleşen fiziki ve idari değişiklikler, 2005 yılında Avrupa Birliği (AB)’ne tam üyelik için müzakerelerin başlamasıyla ceza infaz sisteminde yapılan değişiklikler (eski hapishanelerin kapanması ve çoğunlukla kampus hapishanelerin kurulması, AB ile ortak projeler geliştirme,

personel eğitimlerinin artması, mahpus değerlendirme programlarının geliştirilmesi, denetimli serbestliğin aktif bir şekilde uygulanmaya başlaması) gibi pek çok olay, incelenmesi ve üzerine tartışılması gereken pek çok konuyu da beraberinde getirmiştir. Suçluluk alanı sosyal hizmette, sosyoloji ve psikolojide çoğunlukla yapıldığının aksine, Foucaultcu bir bakış açısıyla ele alınmamıştır. Foucault'un kurum analizleri, 'biyo-iktidar' kavramı ve disiplin toplumu tezi olmadan incelenecek bir suçluluk çalışmasının oldukça eksik kalacağını düşünmekteyiz. Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye'deki üç büyük şehirdeki hapishanelerde ceza infaz koruma memuru olarak çalışan kişilerle gerçekleştirilen görüşmelerin temel veriler olarak ele alınıp akademik literatür ile desteklenmesiyle ortaya çıkacak bulgular sayesinde, bu kurumlarda çalışan infaz koruma memurlarının suç ve suçlu ile ilgili görüşlerinin detaylı bir analizini yapabilmektir. Bu analiz ile sadece tek tek bireylerin görüşleri alınmamış, aynı zamanda infaz koruma memurlarının görüşleri üzerinden çalıştıkları kurumun ve genel olarak Türkiye'deki ceza infaz sisteminin suça ve suçluya yaklaşımının da ufak bir göstergesinin ortaya konması hedeflenmiştir. Bahsedilen gösterge, suçluluk alanındaki politikaların yapısal sorunlarını ve ihtiyaçlarını tanımlamada yararlı olacaktır. Araştırmamızda nitel araştırmanın katılımcıların dışı vurdukları eylemler üzerine odaklanan ve farklı insanların aynı olaya farklı öznel anlamlar yükleyebildikleri için farklı gerçeklerin ortaya çıkması potansiyeline sahip yapısı kullanılmıştır. Araştırma, nitel araştırmanın fenomenoloji deseninde yürütülmüştür. Hedef örnekleme ulaşmak için amaçsal örneklemin 'kartopu' yöntemi tercih edilmiştir. Görüşmeler 20.02.2016-01.04.2016 tarihleri arasında Ankara, İstanbul ve Bursa'da yapılmıştır. Araştırmada yarı yapılandırılmış bir görüşme formu kullanılmış ve gerçekleştirilen derinlemesine görüşmeler ile istenilen bulgulara ulaşılmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında tematik analiz kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın bulgularını kısaca şöyle özetleyebiliriz: İnfaz koruma memurlarının büyük çoğunluğunun işe başlama süreci bu meslekte çalışmak istemelerinden kaynaklı değil, 'başka iş bulamamak', 'memuriyet garantisi' gibi nedenlerle gerçekleşmiştir. Katılımcılar aldıkları eğitimleri yetersiz bulmakta, yeni bir uygulama olan zorunlu stajı ise olumlu görmektedirler. Fiziksel olası riskler, katılımcıların kendilerinin de hapishanelerde izole bir ortamda çalışmaları, vardiyalı çalışma şartları gibi faktörler onların işlerini 'stresli' ve 'yıpratıcı' olarak tanımlamalarına neden olmaktadır. Hapishanenin çalışan hiyerarşik düzeninde en altta yer alan infaz koruma memurları, amirleri tarafından 'kollandıklarını' düşünmemektedirler ve bu durum iş ortamında kaygı duymalarına neden olmaktadır. İnfaz koruma memurları mahpuslarla en çok iletişime giren çalışanlardır ve bu iletişimi belli bir sınırdan tutmak ve mahpus üzerindeki 'kontrol'lerini kaybetmemek için 'otoriter' pozisyonlarını dengelemeye çalışmaktadırlar. Mahpusların kendi aralarındaki dışlama ilişkileri, infaz koruma memurlarının mahpuslara karşı takınabildikleri dışlayıcı tavır, mahpusların infaz koruma memurlarına karşı olası tepkileri hapishanelerdeki gerilimli ilişkileri sürekli kılmaktadır. 2000'lerle birlikte değişime uğrayan Türkiye'deki ceza infaz sistemi hakkında katılımcılar arasında fikir ayrılıkları vardır. Denetimli serbestlik, dış güvenlik gibi konuların işlerlikleri hakkındaki görüşlerin zaman ilerledikçe daha çok netleşmesi beklenebilir. Hapishanelerin adaleti ve ıslahı sağlamadığı, 'kişileri kapalı tutarak' toplum huzuruna katkıda bulunduğu katılımcılar arasında yaygın olan düşüncedir. Bulgularımızda ortaya çıkan infaz koruma memurlarının bazı sorunlarına görece hızlı bir şekilde uygulanabilecek öneriler getirilebilir: örneğin onlara özel yıpranma payı hakkı verilerek işe aidiyetliklerinin ve hizmet sunum kalitelerinin artmasının sağlanması ya da herkese zorunlu ve detaylı bilgilerle donatılmış meslek eğitimlerinin yaygınlaştırılması gibi. Fakat katılımcıların mevcut ceza sistemiyle ilgili görüşleri bizleri çok daha yapısal değişikliklerin gerekliliği üzerine düşündürmüştür. Türkiye'de büyük bir kısır döngü ile karşı karşıya olduğumuz açıktır. Bir yandan mahpusun topluma kazandırılmasını öncelerken bir yandan yeni hapishaneler açarak 'onarıcı adalet'in yanına bile yaklaşmadan 'cezalandırıcı adalet'e geri dönüyoruz. Bir yandan AB standartlarına şartlar bakımından uygun hapishaneler açarken bir yandan bu hapishanelere o kadar çok insan dolduruyoruz ki buradaki insanların sayısı mekanın kapasitesinin 2 katını aşıyor, çözümü de hapishaneleri boşaltıp alternatif infaz yöntemleri aramak yerine yeni hapishaneler açmakta görüyoruz. Mahpus sayısı giderek artar, yeniden suç işleme oranları da düşmezken 'topluma kazandırma'nın ne derece gerçek bir hedef olduğu tartışmalıdır. Kriminal olarak damgalanmış mahpuslar hapishane ortamında daha da olumsuz şeyler yaşamakta, bu durum hem kendilerinin hem de ailelerinin toplumsal konumlarına zarar vererek topluma dönmelerini zorlaştırmaktadır. Foucault (1992)'nın da belirttiği üzere hapishaneler; suçluluk oranını düşürmez arttırırken, tutuklulara yaşattığı hayat tarzıyla suçlu imal ederken, dayanışma içinde, hiyerarşik bir suçlular ortamını mümkün kılarken, tutuklunun ailesini sefaletle iterek dolaylı yoldan suçlu imal ederken aslında "başarısız" bir imaj çizmektedir. Peki, içinde bulunan kişilerin değil kendisinin patolojik bir yapısı olup, gerek mahpusları daha çok suçun içine çeken, gerekse infaz koruma memurlarını da hiç davranmadıkları ve gelecekte de davranmayacakları, karakteristik olmayan davranışlar sergilemeye itebilen bu "total kurumlar"ın yerine ne gelebilir? Mevcut sistemin yakın bir zamanda değişebileceğini iddia etmek oldukça güç, peki bu durumda hiçbir şey yapılamaz mı? Hapishane reformuna da hapishanenin daha insani ve etkili bir yer olması için çaba göstermek söz konusu olduğunda genelde hep şu değişimler bağlamında düşünülmektedir: çalışanların işe alımı, eğitimi gibi konularda reforma gidilmesi ve böylece belli prensiplere bağlı kişilerin hapishanelerde çalışması; hapishanelerin fiziksel, sosyal, psikolojik, ahlaki/etik yapısının geliştirilmesi sayesinde bireylerin sadece 'yaşamaya' değil

‘hayatını değiştirmeye’ de çalışmasının sağlanması; kanıta dayalı rehabilitasyon programlarının kullanılması vb (Pollock vd., 2011). Geliştirilmesi ve önem verilmesi gereken bu öğelerin yanında onarıcı adalet prensiplerine bağlılığın sağlanmasına daha çok vurgu yapılabilir. Ayrıca hapishanelerin geliştirilmesi için çalışırken bazı engellerin (‘hapishane endüstriyel kompleksi’nden kar sağlayıcı, kurumsal olarak oturmuş çıkarların olması, kamu görüşü ve kısıtlayıcı bütçe gibi) varlığını da unutmamak gerekmektedir. Denetimli serbestliğin bütün kurumlarla işbirliği içinde işleyip rehberlik sunma hizmetinin her aşamada gerçekleştiği oturmuş bir sistem olarak yaygınlığı sağlanabilirse hapishane nüfusu da azalacaktır. Norveç örneğindeki gibi ‘kapatma’yı değil sosyalleşmeyi önceleyen yapıların gerek mahpuslar gerekse çalışanlar açısından daha olumlu sonuçlar vermesi olasıdır. Roma’da da cezasının son dönemine gelmiş mahpuslar için belediye tarafından finanse edilen ve mahpusa kalacak yer bulması, iş bursu, çalışma hayatına dahil olması, ulusal sağlık hizmetlerinden yararlanması, toksik madde bağımlıları için tedavi merkezi bulma gibi konularda kolaylık sağlama temel amacıyla işleyen ‘yarıyol evleri’ gibi alternatif sistemler –her ne kadar daha çok az kişi bu hizmetlerden yararlansa da- uygulanmaya başlamıştır. Ülkelerin farklılaşan ekonomik ve sosyal yapısına bağlı olarak farklı alternatifler üretilebilir. Stanford Hapishane Deneyi ve Milgram Deneyi gibi örnekler bize otorite dağılımının patolojik yapısını anlayabilmemizi ve bir ortamdaki ‘iyi’ otoritenin ‘iyiliği’, ‘kötü’ otoritenin ise ‘kötülüğü’ arttıracağını görmemizi sağladığı için önemlidir. Hapishanelerde uygulanabilecek “iyi otorite” hapishane idaresinin üzerinde kurulacak, mahpusların haklarını savunabilecek ve hapishane idaresini denetleyebilecek bir otoritedir. Bu kapsamda kurulacak İzleme Kurulları bu yapının bileşenlerinin demokratik kitle örgütü temsilcileri, alanda çalışan STK’lar, mahpus yakınları ve hatta mahpusların temsilcilerini kapsayacak şekilde düzenlenmelidir. Böylece ‘hasta’, ‘anormal’ konumuna indirgenen mahpusların kendi yaşamları üzerinde tasarruf hakkı olduğu görüşü hakim kılınabilir. Baskı karşıtı uygulamanın temel öğelerinin sosyal hizmet uygulamasında benimsenmesiyle ceza infazında çalışacak uzmanların, mahpusların kendi yaşamları üzerinde tasarruf hakkı olduğu görüşünü benimsemeleri ve mahpus-infaz koruma memuru ilişkisindeki ezen-ezilen ayrımının farkına varmaları sağlanabilir. Baskı karşıtı uygulamanın teori ve pratik özü, ceza infazı politikası ve araştırmalarına yedirilmelidir.