

OFFENDERS AND THEIR FAMILIES IN A DIGITAL ENVIRONMENT: A CASE STUDY OF PCI SREMSKA MITROVICA¹

Nikola VUJIČIĆ, MA²
Nikola DRNDAREVIĆ, MA³

The article provides a review of the developments and characteristics of video visitation in PCI Sremska Mitrovica, with a focus on the contact between offenders and their families and children. The study draws upon data from fieldwork interviews with the prison employees and aims to understand experiences of using video visitation and their importance in the offender behavior as well as the prison system. The study gives voice to field experts with the knowledge and skills to suggest how video visitation impacts the offender behavior and its relevancy in the context of familial relationships. Moreover, it reflects on the nature of digital technologies in prisons and considers how they are embraced and managed in Serbia. Special focus is on the legislative framework in the Republic of Serbia.

KEY WORDS: prisons / digital environment / video visitation / family contact / children

-
- ¹ This research was supported by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia, Grant No. 7750249, Project title: Assessment and possibilities for improving the quality of prison life of prisoners in the Republic of Serbia: Criminological-penological, psychological, sociological, legal and security aspects (PrisonLIFE).
- ² Research Associate, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research in Belgrade, nikola.vujcic.law@gmail.com
- ³ Research Assistant, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research in Belgrade, thanness@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Society today is inevitably shaped by digital technologies in which there is a rapid movement toward the digital environment. The accelerating shift from analog to digital, the digital revolution, is enabled by the continuing progress in the areas of technology, that is affecting and reshaping both the environment and the people.

The prominent impact of digital society is reflected on crime and criminal justice as well as in prisons, calling for a different perspective. Certain terms have begun replacing or supplementing the existing ones to accommodate such a shift. The most recent one amongst scholars is the area of digital criminology (Kubiček et al., 2020). However, there seems to be insufficiency at the level of engagement between the criminological institutions with digital criminology and its various aspects (e.g. digital justice, investigation and evidence, surveillance, education, video conferencing...). Implications of a changing landscape initiate new methodological and ethical challenges as well as the modifications to the structure of society and the approach toward the topic of digital environments in the criminological field (Kubiček et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2018). To these complex changes, the area of criminology would benefit from a multidisciplinary perspective encompassing, among others, a legal reflection, psychology and behavioral science, criminology, sociology, and digital sciences.

It should be borne in mind that the forced nature of the prison environment means that punishment affects many aspects of everyday life in prison. Looking beyond the prison walls, convicts' relationships with their families have fundamentally changed and severely limited (Coyle, 2008: 220). Precisely, this means that convicts should be enabled to maintain quality contact with their families, especially with children who may be particularly vulnerable due to separation from their parents. The use of video technologies is just one of the ways that should be used for these purposes.

The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) represent the most important document in this matter. In addition to a number of standards, Rule no. 58 provides that prisoners shall be allowed, under necessary supervision, to communicate with their family and friends at regular intervals: (a) By corresponding in writing and using, where available, telecommunication, electronic, digital and other means; and (b) By receiving visits. This Rule is important from the aspect of our analysis for two reasons: first, it clearly specifies that contact can be made through technical means and second, it is not an alternative, but an additional option in relation to receiv-

ing visits (face-to-face). In other words, the use of modern technologies is an addition to the already existing physical visits.

The prison systems have been affected by the digitization of society along with a broad range of aspects, some of which relate to digital criminality, offender education programs as well as the communication with outsiders, namely with the justice systems and with offenders' families. The prisons have been introducing digital technologies, within the limitations imposed by the law and financial and structural conditions of the institutions, intending to reduce the digital divide, improving digital inclusion, for the betterment of the resocialization processes (Järveläinen & Rantanen, 2020).

The structural characteristics of the prisons can accommodate the digital transformations at various levels, ranging from comprehensive solutions and concepts to incidental solutions concerning technology enabling communication as well as a dedicated space for video conferencing (Powell et al., 2018). Video conferencing for offenders has been used for various purposes such as attending the court hearings, reducing the transportation costs, medical examinations, and increasing and strengthening the offender-family contact and generally the contact to the outside world (Crabbe, 2002; Järveläinen & Rantanen, 2020).

The use of IT has penetrated so deeply into all aspects of private life, that it was quite to be expected that the IT revolution would also enter the criminal justice systems (Bugarski, 2021: 80). Precisely, the use of "online technologies" has led to a re-examination of how they affect the "right to access to justice", the "right to a fair trial" and the "fair administration of justice" (Miljuš, 2021: 229). In the domestic criminal law literature, the issue of the use of video links and other technical means is mainly considered from the aspect of criminal procedure legislation, and much less in the context of the execution of criminal sanctions, primarily imprisonment.

If the Law on Execution of Criminal Sanctions (*hereinafter: Law*)⁴ is considered as the basic law that regulates the treatment of persons sentenced to imprisonment, no provision provides for the explicit use of a video link, as a way of maintaining contact with family and / or other persons. It is interesting to mention here that the COVID-19 pandemic has contributed to the fact that under certain conditions, certain phases in criminal proceedings can be carried out using a video link. If the above is taken into account, a logical interpretation leads to the conclusion that there should be no obstacles for convicted persons to make contact with their families in a similar way. This attitude can be further justified by the fact that far greater practical and other problems are present during the main trial (*trial in the narrow sense*) than when maintaining contact with the

⁴ Law on Execution of Criminal Sanctions, Official Gazette RS, No. 55/14 & 35/19.

family, where we are not talking about court proceedings, but about exercising the rights of the convict.

A special form of maintaining contact with the family, which is not face to face, and which appears in our criminal executive legislation, is through telephone conversations. The provision of Article 88, paragraph 1 of the Law stipulates that the convicted person shall be entitled to telephone conversations in compliance with the provisions of the regulation governing the house rules of the penitentiary institution, at his/her own expense. In the next paragraph, a reference provision is provided for in Article 87 paragraph 2 of the Law, which introduces the possibility of supervision in closed and closed institutions with special security or in a closed ward of a penitentiary institution. So, the basic rule is that phone conversations are not monitored. The Rulebook of the house rules of penitentiary institutions and district prisons (*hereinafter: The House Rules*)⁵ stipulates that a convict who is classified in a closed ward may make telephone calls at least four times a week, and a convict who is classified in a semi-open and open ward may make daily calls, in accordance with the possibilities of the institution. The penitentiary institution should provide the required number of telephone booths; the call schedule is based on a pre-announced schedule and lasts up to fifteen minutes; the convicted person conducts the interview in the language of his choice and at his own expense. Telephony may be restricted only by a court, in accordance with the law (Article 38 of the House Rules).

As we often encounter the question of whether the virtual world of communication can be a substitute for seeing face to face, it is important to keep in mind how visits to convicts are regulated according to the provisions of the Law. First of all, the visits are regulated in the part of the Law that deals with the issue of the rights of a convicted person. The provision of Article 90 paragraph 1 of the Law, stipulates that convicted person shall have the right to visits by a spouse, children, parents, adopted children, adoptive parents and other lineal or collateral relatives up to the fourth degree of consanguinity or relatives by marriage up to the fourth degree of consanguinity, as well as of the foster parents, foster children and guardians once every two months. In the next paragraph, it is prescribed that the prison ward may approve visits to the convicted person by other persons as well. When it comes to the duration of visits, the provision of Article 93 of the Law stipulates that the minimum duration of a visit shall be one hour, where the time, duration, manner of visit and appearance of the visiting room are regulated by the House Rules.

⁵ Rulebook of the house rules of penitentiary institutions and district prisons, Official Gazette RS, No. 110/14 & 79/16.

The House Rules, among other things, stipulate that the visit to the convicted person is performed on Saturdays and Sundays and on non-working public holidays from 9:00 to 17:00. The duration of the visit longer than one hour must be approved by the prison ward. Also, the prison ward may approve visits on other days, if there are justified reasons for that (Article 45 of the House Rules).

Let's go back to the provisions of the Law. In addition to the right of the convict to make visits, which belongs to every convicted person, within the extended rights and privileges of the convicted person, the provision of Article 129 paragraph 1 point 2 of the Law, stipulates that the prison ward may grant an extended number of visits to a convicted person who behaves particularly well and tries hard and achieves progress against the sentence program. In the next point, the Law prescribes right to an extended circle of persons who may visit the convicted person (distant relatives, friends and others).

Rulebook on treatment, treatment program, classification and subsequent classification of convicted persons (*hereinafter*: The Rulebook of Treatment)⁶ provides that the extended right to a number of visits to a convict may be granted once a month, with no restrictions on treatment groups, when it comes to the extended right to a circle of persons who may visit a convict (Article 29 & Article 30 of the Rulebook of Treatment).

In maintaining the connection to the outside world and the family members, video visitation has become an important mechanism in the digital era. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, face-to-face contact has been prohibited in many prisons, which has advanced video visitation into the foreground (Dallaire, 2021; Stickel et al., 2021). Face-to-face visitation also makes high demands on the families of offenders. Most prominently, prisons tend to be significantly distant from home, therefore incurring traveling costs for the family members during face-to-face visitation (Christian et al., 2006; McKay, 2016). Moreover, difficulties are present in navigating the prison system and institutional bureaucracies (Christian et al., 2006). The absence of the parent at home potentially entails losing another source of income at home, putting them under further financial strain (Christian et al., 2006; Marković, 2020).

In contrast to face-to-face visitation, video visitation removes the geographical distance, reduces spending and alleviates safety concerns, and simultaneously strengthens familial connections and preserves the family units (Fulcher, 2013; McKay, 2016; Stickel, et al., 2021). Concerning parent-children contact, video visitation may be especially relevant and optimal in providing a supportive and safe environment for relationship growth and psychological well-being (Cramer et al.,

⁶ Rulebook on treatment, treatment program, classification and subsequent classification of convicted persons, Official Gazette RS, No. 66/15.

2017; Stickel, et al., 2021). Some of the reasons may be that face-to-face visitation can aggravate the stress, shame and incompetence of the parent, as well as (re) traumatize the children, e.g. enduring invasive search procedures or prohibiting the physical contact (Cramer et al. 2017; Poehlmann-Tynan & Pritzl, 2019). Although not all factors have been researched, it has been suggested that video visitation allows greater control of the conditions of contact for offenders (Christian et al., 2006; Stickel, et al., 2021).

Furthermore, from the perspective of the prison employees, participation in video visitation could be used as an effective inmate management tool, since it produced better behavior from inmates, fewer disciplinary infractions in prisons and better outcomes after being released from prison (Crabbe, 2002). Video visitation has the added benefit of preventing one of the main ways that drugs and other contraband items enter the prisons (Christian et al., 2006). It has been suggested that some factors may include support, place to live, and jobs reflecting the social capital aspect (Christian et al., 2006), and that the interaction with the technology can affect dependency and lead to self-responsibility and personal control (McDougall et al., 2017).

From the offender perspective, maintaining family contact provides them with emotional support (e.g. bonding with family and children), as well as material support (e.g. money and packages). Moreover, family remains an important link bridging the inside with the outside world and acting as a safe haven after being released (Christian, 2006).

However, maintaining video visitation contact has its limitations. Some authors point to privacy and confidentiality issues, equipment (audio or video) failure, shorter average visiting time and reduction in personal visits to prisons by family, restrictions of video visitation rights (e.g. sex offenders) and the funding of such venture (Crabbe, 2002; Cramer et al., 2017; McKay, 2016; Stickel et al., 2021). Moreover, overcoming the physical distance and financial hardships and improving the permeability to the outside world tends to produce a certain degree of disconnection in some individuals (McKay, 2016), and it is advised against the elimination of physical visitation since it removes certain human contact with the family members (Fulcher, 2013).

2. GOAL AND QUESTIONS

The present study aimed to elucidate the process of contact between incarcerated people and their families and children in the digital environment as seen from the perspective of the prison employees of the PCI Sremska Mitrovica. The study used a qualitative approach that was focused on examining the verbal descrip-

tions provided by the prison employees on the topic of the digital environment in the prison. Specifically, the questions targeted the process of requesting the video conferencing in the prison, when it was introduced, what are the benefits and/or the negative side effects, as well as the effects such digital contact with the family and children has on the treatment and postpenal resocialization of the offenders.

3. METHOD

3.1. Context of the study

The study focused on the characteristics of the digital environment, as well as the contact between the offenders and their families and children, in the PCI Sremska Mitrovica. The study was conducted within the aims of international conference in Palić called “Children and the challenges of digital environment”. In particular, we focused on exploring the capacities of modern technologies in the context of improving living conditions and treatment content in penitentiary institutions, but also in the context of maintaining and improving the quality of family ties, whether the separation of family members is caused by deprivation of liberty of parents and/or children.

A case study research design was used to explore the communication between offenders and their families. The case study method allows the respondents to answer in an open-ended manner, using their own terminology and to discuss their perceptions more fully. The qualitative method of research is particularly appropriate when ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are being asked of a real-life situation, with the aim of exploration (Bogdanović, 1993).

PCI Sremska Mitrovica was chosen as the largest, most equipped penitentiary, where it was assumed that the research phenomenon has been most represented. Permission to conduct the interviews was granted by the PCI Sremska Mitrovica, and was conducted as one instance within the broader frame of the PrisonLIFE project funded by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia.

3.2. Sample and data collection

The invitation to participate was sent to PCI Sremska Mitrovica. The invitation consisted of the aim of the study together with the request for the prison employees to act in the capacity of participants. The sample consisted of three prison employees, with the positions of Deputy Warden, Head of Treatment Services as well as a Treatment Officer. The choice of the participants was guided by the dif-

ferent levels occupied in the workplace and the tasks they perform within their jobs, making them the most relevant informants in the context of video visitation.

All of the interviews occurred on the prison premises, and were conducted in person in the April of 2022. The interviews lasted on average 42 minutes. Informed consent was obtained from all of the participants. Participation was on a voluntary basis, with the right to withdraw from the interview at any time. The participants were also informed about the research aims and the study's content.

3.3. Instrument

The study utilized qualitative in-depth, semi-structured, interviews. The choice of the interview method was guided by the need for detailed information from the field as well as the exploration of new issues in-depth, while simultaneously remaining flexible for the participants and allowing for open-ended discussion. Each participant was asked a total of 9 questions about the contact between offenders and their families and children in the digital environment. The questions related to the following groups: the process of requesting the video link in the prison, both positive and negative sides of the digital environment for the offenders, employees and the institution, and the effects of employing the digital technology with the aim to connect the offenders with their family and children. The prison employees were asked about their experiences and expectations relating to the digital environments program, the thoughts they were having on the process and the outcomes as well as some positive and negative byproducts of using video visitation.

3.4. Analysis

The data, consisting of the statements and commentaries, were analyzed following the qualitative research practices (Bogdanović, 1993). The participants offered their perceptions of the digital environment in prisons from their perspective and of the institutions, as well as those thought held by the offenders.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study aimed at exploring the video visitation processes in the context of offender-family relationship, with a special focus on children, in PCI Sremska Mitrovica, as seen from the prison employees. The focus was placed on the processes surrounding video visitation as well as on the factors participating in a successful

adjustment in prisons as well as in the reintegration into the community upon release and preventing recidivism.

4.1. The process surrounding digital communication

The procedure requires several steps to be taken before the video visitation could be approved. The first step requires the offender to apply for the visitation to their correctional official, while the final step in the approval process is completed by the Prison Warden. To establish contact with the family through digital means, a specific report is drawn up for the offender who applies.

This report contains the following data about offender: the duration of the sentence; expiration of the sentence; treatment group; extended rights they enjoy; work engagement within the institution; information on the last disciplinary punishment (if any); does he use visits; who comes to visit him; information on whether the person they want to contact is entered in the visit card; as well as information on whether the offender has already made video visitation in the month for which he is seeking approval. The report is then signed by the treatment officer, after which the five-member commission (treatment service, security service, health service, training and employment service and legal affairs service) decides on the submitted application. The decision on the submitted request is signed by the prison warden. Although the deadline for making a decision is 5 days from the day of applying, in practice the decision is usually made within two days. The request can be made by all offenders, regardless of the type of ward and the treatment group in which they are assigned.

The form of the report is not prescribed by the law or any relevant regulations, but was designed in the PCI Sremska Mitrovica. The interviewed employees felt that the invention and introduction of the report form was an indispensable tool in the process of approving requests for video visitation. Such transitional solutions point to examples of good practices and offer a sustainable alternative, until the possibility of the (similar) report is introduced by law, after which this form could be standardized at the level of all prison systems in the country.

Duration of the particular video visitation is limited to 15 minutes per individual offender, once a month. The priority is given to those offenders who are in a difficult position to be physically visited by their family and relatives (e.g. due to the great distance between the prison and the family's place of residence; if the convict's family lives abroad, etc.). Primarily, this type of communication was first introduced for this group of convicts.

Compared to the possibilities currently provided by the Law, in terms of duration, it could be said that video calls are limited in time in the same way as tele-

phone conversations. However, a big difference is noticeable in terms of the frequency of using this type of communication. Thus, telephone calls can be made four times a week (in the case of persons classified in the closed ward) or every day (in the case of persons classified in the semi-open and open ward).

Compared to the right to receive visits, there is uniformity in that both face-to-face visits and video calls are provided only once a month (except in the case of granting extended rights and privileges to receive visits, when the convicted person acquires the opportunity to receive one more visit). However, here is the difference in duration, where face-to-face visits last four times longer than a video call.

Prison infrastructure and architecture. During our fieldwork, we had the opportunity to observe the physical space where the video visitations are taking place. There exists a separate conversation room equipped with a modern system for video communication. The room is located within the new facility in the prison, with a space that allows the privacy of the offender who in this way makes contact with the family. This room is also used in parole proceedings that the PCI Sremska Mitrovica realizes with the Higher Court in Sremska Mitrovica, and recently with the higher court in the Novi Sad. Additionally, the OSCE mission in Serbia donated three tablets, which the correctional officers in the prison system offer to convicts on the basis of approval. These tablets are primarily used in the closed ward of the prison.

It may be noteworthy to indicate the dignified ambience which allows for both privacy and confidentiality. The room also features the modernized equipment reducing the chances for equipment failure. Such ambience prevents or reduces the issues raised with this mode of visitation in previous research (Crabbe, 2002; Cramer et al., 2017; McKay, 2016; Stickel et al., 2021).

4.2. The effect on the offender behavior and the prison employees

Making contact with family and children had become especially important in situations when it was impossible to achieve physical presence. COVID-19 pandemic temporarily prevented the right to face-to-face visits. The digitized type of connection, video visitation, enabled the convicts to make some contact with their families, and especially with their children (Dallaire, 2021; Stickel et al., 2021). The pandemic did not only expose the limiting factors for moving forward, but also presented a viable opportunity. This unprecedented change seemed to have been welcomed by the PCI Sremska Mitrovica. As far as the participants report, they were the first institution to move in this direction, even after the lifting of COVID-19 restrictions. According to their information, the same practice was started

in the PCI for women in Požarevac. Upravo, COVID-19 pandemics je dovela do toga da se video pozivi omoguće i onoj grupi osuđenih lica koja inače ostvaruju pravo na prijem poseta face to face.

From the perspective of the prison employees, all three participants strongly felt that video visitation has been an effective management tool. Since this is at the moment a privilege, it encourages the offender to accept the rules of treatment. The participants also add that there are further positive effects on the relationship between prison employees and offenders. This is in accordance with previous research findings on better behavior from offenders in treatment with fewer disciplinary infractions in prisons and better outcomes after being released from prison (Crabbe, 2002). Two participants further agreed that video visitation improves self-responsibility and personal control (Mcdougall et al., 2017). And although shorter visitation time in video communication was used (McKay, 2016; Stickel et al., 2021), participants feel that exactly is what makes it a privilege and an effective management tool.

Most importantly, all participants strongly felt that the maintenance of strong ties to the families and children is one of the key factors contributing to successful resocialization and post-penal acceptance. Video visitation allows the removal of the geographical distance and builds a more sustaining and lasting image of the parent. This not only allows for a more supportive and safe environment, but also for the possibility to nurture psychological trust as the prerequisite for stable relating (Drndarević & Protić, 2020). This was especially true in the case of children. Elimination of the potential shame and discomfort (Cramer et al., 2017), while enabling the connection was singled out by the majority of the participants. The practical experience of the participants agreed with the previous studies on the importance and usefulness of video visitation in connecting the families (Fulcher, 2013; McKay, 2016; Stickel, et al., 2021).

Concerning the negatives sides, none were perceived and reported by the prison employees in the interviews. Nonetheless, it should be taken into account that the video visitation should not be a complete replacement for the face-to-face visitation, but rather used as a complementary channel (Fulcher, 2013).

4.3. Limitations and future directions

There were limitations to these findings which were mostly due to sampling method and interview approach. The first limitation concerns proneness to bias inherent in the interviewing method, and especially in the sample consisting of the employees of the prison. To minimize the bias and gain a more complete picture, this issue should be examined from the perspective of the offenders. Moreo-

ver, offender perspective would offer the chance to illuminate the potential factors contributing to stronger familial ties – e.g. who is visiting, type of crime, criminal history and so on (Christian et al., 2006). The second limitation relates to non generalizability, once more inherent in the small samples and the absence of random sampling. Considering that the researched topic was not too complex, the same themes were repeatedly uncovered in all three respondents on various institutional levels, indicating that the sufficient sample was reached. Future research would benefit from extending the method to more quantitative methods.

5. CONCLUSION

Introducing the digital technology in a security-tight and highly controlled environment poses new challenges for both the prison systems and the individual rights. But it is justified if the security measures can be met and empirical findings of recidivism rates are favorable. Relevancy of the findings point to good practices examples of introducing video visitation. To the best knowledge of the authors, this was one of the first studies to examine video visitation in Serbian prison systems.

Maintaining contact with the family is undoubtedly one of the most important elements in terms of preparation for the release of a convicted person from serving a prison sentence. The digital environment could be exploited in a similar way as it was decades ago when the possibility of using telephones for similar purposes was introduced, where it seems that greater benefits can come from video calls, since at the same time the convict can not only hear, but also can see his family members. This problem is especially pronounced among those persons who have been sentenced to many years in prison, and who have small children. It is very important that children maintain contact with a parent who is serving a prison sentence, and video technology can be an adequate addition to standard visits.

Our research has shown that video technology in a prison environment gives positive results. The practice carried out by the PCI Sremska Mitrovica is an example of good treatment, i.e. a practice that is increasingly present in modern systems of execution of criminal sanctions, but also a standard established by Mandela's rules. For this reason, this type of treatment should be supported, but further developed, bearing in mind that this matter needs to be included in the legal framework, in order to enable video calls to be made by all convicted person, not just those who support sentence in the PCI Sremska Mitrovica.

It is our opinion that the use of video technologies can't be a substitute, but only a supplement to the already existing rights and / or extended rights and

privileges of the convicted person. An analogy with telephone calls would imply that this is a general right that belongs to every convicted person, while the question remains to what extent it would be possible, i.e. how many times a week / month, as well as its duration. An analogy with extended rights and privileges would mean that convicted persons must first fulfill an appropriate program of treatment, that is, a video call would be a benefit rather than a right that belongs to every convict. At this moment, the second option seems to be a better solution, as it could influence the convict to accept the treatment program. Since we see this as a benefit granted and used within the prison, it could be obtained by all convicted persons who behave particularly well and tries hard and achieves progress against the sentence program (regardless of the prison ward and treatment group). Amendments of the Law must be accompanied by amendments of secondary regulations, primarily the House Rules and the Rulebook of Treatment. It should be borne in mind that the introduction of this possibility must be accompanied by good information systems within the prisons, i.e. the provision of a sufficient number of computers, tablets or other similar devices, which necessarily requires additional funding. Finally, we emphasize once again that video technologies cannot be a substitute for receiving visits, but only their supplement, which is also the case with phone calls.

REFERENCES

1. Bogdanović, M (1993) *Metodološke studije*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
2. Bugarski, T. (2021) Preduzimanje procesnih radnji putem tehničkih sredstava u krivičnim stvarima. In: Bejatović, S. (ed.) *Videolink i druga tehnička sredstva kao načini preduzimanja procesnih radnji u kaznenom postupku (norma, praksa i poželjni slučajevi širenja mogućnosti primene)*. Beograd: Misija OEBS-a u Srbiji, pp. 79-94.
3. Christian, J., Mellow, J., & Thomas, S. (2006). Social and economic implications of family connections to prisoners. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(4), pp. 443-452.
4. Coyle, A. (2008) The treatment of prisoners: International standards and case law, *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 13, pp. 219-230.
5. Crabbe, M. (2002) Virtual visitation program uses video conferencing to strengthen prisoner contacts with families and children. *Offender Programs Report*, 6(3), pp. 35-47.

6. Cramer, L., Goff, M., Peterson, B., & Sandstrom, H. (2017) Parent-child visiting practices in prisons and jails. Washington: Urban Institute.
7. Dallaire, D. H., Shlafer, R. J., Goshin, L. S., Hollihan, A., Poehlmann-Tynan, J., Eddy, J. M., & Adalist-Estrin, A. (2021) COVID-19 and prison policies related to communication with family members. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 27(2), pp. 231-241.
8. Drndarević, N. & Protić, S. (2020) Analysis of Trust in Serbia: Psychological and Sociological Implications. *Zbornik instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja*, 39(1), pp. 7-25.
9. Fulcher, P. A. (2013) The double-edged sword of prison video visitation: Claiming to keep families together while furthering the aims of the prison industrial complex. *Fla. A & M UL Rev.*, 9(1), pp. 83-112.
10. Järveläinen, E., & Rantanen, T. (2021) Incarcerated people's challenges for digital inclusion in Finnish prisons. *Nordic Journal of Criminology*, 22(2), pp. 240-259.
11. Kubiček, A., Batrićević, A., & Paraušić, A. (2020) Prison Based Educational Programs as a Means to Promote Ex-prisoners' Right to Labour. In: Ilik, G. & Stojanoska, A. (ed.) *Towards a Better Future: Human Rights, Organized Crime and Digital Society*. Bitola: Center for Scientific Research at the Faculty of Law.
12. Law on Execution of Criminal Sanctions, Official Gazette RS, No. 55/14 & 35/19.
13. Marković, A. (2020) Prekarijat i neka pitanja društvene strukture i društvenih nejednakosti. *Zbornik instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja*, 39(2-3), pp. 109-126.
14. McDougall, C., Pearson, D. A., Torgerson, D. J., & Garcia-Reyes, M. (2017) The effect of digital technology on prisoner behavior and reoffending: a natural stepped-wedge design. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13(4), 455-482.
15. McKay, C. (2016) Video links from prison: Permeability and the carceral world. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 5(1), pp. 21-37.
16. Miljuš, I. (2021) Upotreba tehničkih sredstava za prenos slike i zvuka i pravo na pravično suđenje. In: Bejatović, S. (ed.) *Videolink i druga tehnička sredstva kao načini preduzimanja procesnih radnji u kaznenom postupku (norma, praksa i poželjni slučajevi širenja mogućnosti primene)*. Beograd: Misija OEBS-a u Srbiji, pp. 227-248.

17. Poehlmann-Tynan, J., & Pritzl, K. (2019) Parent–child visits when parents are incarcerated in prison or jail. In: *Handbook on children with incarcerated parents*. Cham: Springer, pp. 131-147.
18. Powell, A., Stratton, G., & Cameron, R. (2018) *Digital criminology: Crime and justice in digital society*. Abingdon: Routledge.
19. Rulebook of the house rules of penitentiary institutions and district prisons, Official Gazette RS, No. 110/14 & 79/16.
20. Rulebook on treatment, treatment program, classification and subsequent classification of convicted persons, Official Gazette RS, No. 66/15.
21. Stickel, T., Prins, E., & Kaiper-Marquez, A. (2021) ‘The video is an upgrade from them all’: how incarcerated fathers view the affordances of video in a family literacy programme. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 46(2), pp. 174-189.

Nikola Vujičić, MA

Istraživač saradnik, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja u Beogradu

Nikola Drndarević, MA

Istraživač pripravnik, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja u Beogradu

OSUĐENICI I NJIHOVE PORODICE U DIGITALNOM OKRUŽENJU: STUDIJA SLUČAJA U KPZ SREMSKA MITROVICA⁷

U radu je dat prikaz razvoja i osnovnih karakteristika “video poseta” u Kazneno-popravnom zavodu u Sremskoj Mitrovici, sa posebnim fokusom na kontakt između osuđenika i njihovih porodica. Studija je zasnovana na podacima koji su dobijeni na osnovu intervjua sprovedenih sa zaposlenima u navedenom zavodu, sa ciljem da se sagledaju iskustva upotrebe video linka kao načina ostvarivanja poseta, te njihov značaj na ponašanje osuđenika tokom izdržavanja kazne zatvora. Takođe, u radu su analizirani stavovi stručnjaka, odnosno onih lica koja direktno rade sa osuđenima, u kontekstu uticaja video poziva na održavanje kontakta sa porodicama. Priroda digitalnog okruženja u zatvorskom sistemu, posebno je sagledana i sa aspekta norme, odnosno zakonodavnog okvira u Republici Srbiji.

KLJUČNE REČI: zatvori / digitalno okruženje / video posete / kontakt sa porodicom / deca

⁷ Istraživanje je sprovedeno uz podršku Fonda za nauku, broj Projekta: 7750249, naziv: Assessment and possibilities for improving the quality of prison life of prisoners in the Republic of Serbia: Criminological-Penological, Psychological, Sociological, Legal and Security Aspects (PrisonLIFE)