



On Penitentiary Crime in the Russian Federation: Analyzing Specifics of Crime Commission, Determinants and Problematic Aspects of Prevention

ANTON B. BAUMSHTEIN

Southwest State University, Kursk, Russia, 5068896@list.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1479-7850>

Abstract

Introduction: the article is devoted to the comprehensive analysis of penitentiary crime in the Russian Federation, identification of its features, causes and unresolved preventive problems in the context of modern reforms of the penal system. *Methods:* statistical, systemic, criminological, formal and logical, as well as the method of comparative legal comparison. The data of official statistics of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia for 2020-2024 are analyzed. The empirical base consisted of data on 3,829 registered crimes in penitentiary institutions and 612 disciplinary investigations against staff. *Results:* it has been established that the stability of penitentiary crime is determined by institutional factors (overload of institutions, staff shortage, closeness), criminal subculture, and psychological maladaptation of convicts. The analysis shows that convicts' violent acts account for 57% of crimes, and employees' corruption offenses account for 11%. Five typical risk profiles for target differentiation of control are identified. Individualized risk assessment, expansion of psychocorrective programs, development of re-socialization, open public control and betterment of personnel training are required. *Conclusion:* effective reduction of penitentiary crime requires humanization of the penal system, introduction of personalized preventive models, comprehensive psychological assistance, openness of institutions and interdepartmental interaction. The proposed set of measures can be integrated into the regulations of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia without significant costs, providing a measurable reduction in latency and recidivism by expanding public monitoring and improving organizational culture.

Keywords: crime; imprisonment; penitentiary system; penitentiary crime; crime prevention; penitentiary crime determinants.

5.1.4. Criminal law sciences.

For citation: Baumshtein A.B. On penitentiary crime in the Russian Federation: analyzing specifics of crime commission, determinants and problematic aspects of prevention. *Penitentiary Science*, 2026, vol. 20, no. 2 (74), pp. 142–151. doi 10.46741/2713-2811.2026.74.2.004.

Nowadays, penitentiary crime is a challenge for correctional institutions and the state to address. The fact that a person serving a sentence in a penitentiary institution commits an illegal act again indicates not only his/her

clearly disrespectful attitude to the norms of law and morality and unwillingness to correct him/herself, but also the existence of problems and shortcomings in the activities of the penal system.

In addition, the very existence of such a phenomenon as penitentiary crime has a negative impact on the achievement of criminal punishment goals, contributes to the destabilization of the operational situation and law and order in a correctional institution, and also has a negative impact on the image of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia.

Prevention of penitentiary crime is, along with ensuring the effective execution of punishment, one of the main functions of the penitentiary service. The stability of correctional institutions is inextricably linked to the state of law and order in correctional institutions as a whole.

Nowadays, domestic researchers and the media pay great attention to penitentiary crime, since crimes committed by convicts while serving their sentences in correctional institutions undermine the authority of the penal system, deteriorate the operational situation and have a negative impact on the achievement of criminal punishment goals.

The problem of counteracting crime in places of detention is a crucial one. Penitentiary crime not only violates the regime of execution of sentences, but also undermines the tasks of correcting convicts, discredits the authorities' activities, and promotes the reproduction of criminal attitudes and repeat criminality. At the same time, it remains the least studied in comparison with other types of crime, its determinants, structure, and prevention features need a comprehensive scientific understanding.

Despite constant reformation of the penal system, the penitentiary crime rate remains consistently high. The involvement of both convicts and employees of institutions of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia in criminal acts is alarming. Problems of professional deformation of staff, the spread of criminal subculture and the lack of a real system of re-socialization make the system vulnerable to repeated and intra-systemic crime.

Within the framework of this study, we propose to pay closer attention to the analysis of features and problematic aspects of crime in penitentiary institutions and its prevention. So, in general, crime in correctional institutions is a set of crimes committed in places of deprivation of liberty. At the same time, it should be understood that this category of crimes includes not only crimes committed by persons

serving sentences in correctional institutions, but also by employees of these institutions and employees of the penal system, as well as other persons located on the territory of such institutions. However, the largest proportion still belongs to crimes committed by persons serving their sentences.

The term "penitentiary crime" in Russian science is most often used to refer to the totality of crimes committed in the system of execution of criminal penalties. This refers to the actions of both convicts and employees of correctional institutions, as well as third parties involved in illegal activities in places of detention [1, p. 87].

Criminological literature highlights various approaches to the definition of penitentiary crime. Some authors consider it as "exclusively crimes committed by convicts, while others expand the concept to include actions of employees and other violations of the regime that have elements of criminal illegality" [2, p. 22].

According to E.N. Tkachenko, penitentiary crime is "a special type of institutional crime that occurs in conditions of isolation, in the interaction of convicts, employees and the external environment, characterized by high latency, stability and reproducibility" [3, p. 362].

Penitentiary crime includes the following groups of crimes:

- crimes committed by convicts in places of deprivation of liberty (violence, extortion, escapes);
- crimes committed by employees (abuse of authority, bribery, participation in shady schemes);
- crimes of the third parties aimed at organizing illegal activities in places of detention (smuggling of prohibited items, etc.).

At the same time, the specifics of "penitentiary crime is its high latency associated with the specifics of institutions, corporate staff, fear of reprisals from the administration and assets from convicts" [4, p. 136].

Three main groups can be distinguished among subjects of penitentiary crime:

1. Convicted persons in places of deprivation of liberty. This category makes up the bulk of violators. The crimes committed by them are diverse in nature: from interpersonal violence and extortion to escapes and illegal actions directed at the staff of the institution. The incentives for such actions are often associated

with internal hierarchy, “the need to maintain a certain status in a criminal subculture, fear of “omission”, as well as unsatisfied domestic and legal needs” [4, p. 94].

2. Employees of the penal system. In recent years, special attention has been paid to the analysis of crimes committed by employees of institutions. These can be:

- abuse of official authority;
- bribery;
- falsification of documents;
- participation in criminal schemes for the

supply of prohibited items to the correctional facility [5, p. 122].

The reasons for this behavior are not only personal qualities (greed, aggression, cynicism), but also “systemic factors, such as low wages, lack of rotation, chronic stress, as well as influence of the criminal environment” [6, p. 183].

3. Persons interacting with convicts. They are civilians, relatives of convicts, lawyers and other representatives involved in the illegal transfer of items, assistance in escapes or the dissemination of prohibited information. In some cases, such persons “become part of a criminal business related to extortion, supply of drugs, mobile phones, etc.” [7, p. 109].

All categories of subjects participate in the formation of a kind of criminal micro-community, which, in isolation, operates according to its own laws, autonomous from the outside society. A special role in this is played by the “informal hierarchy among convicts based on the traditions of the so-called thieves’ law” [8, p. 66]. The influence of this factor cannot be overestimated, as it forms norms of behavior, sanctions, and a system of rewards and punishments that are an alternative to official discipline.

Thus, the subject of penitentiary crime is not just an individual who violates criminal law, but part of a socio-criminal structure, where the personality, circumstances and culture of the place of imprisonment form a complex motivational complex that determines illegal behavior.

It should be noted that penitentiary crime is a specific type of criminal recidivism, which has a high degree of social threat, due to the commission of socially dangerous acts during the execution of punishment for a previous criminal act in conditions associated with the use of measures to prevent illegal actions. Such be-

havior of a person indicates his/her unwillingness to take the path of correction and active opposition to accepted moral norms and values in society.

Considering criminological characteristics of penitentiary crime, attention should be paid to the issue of motivation of criminal behavior. Thus, it is often conditioned by the convicts’ desire to maintain their authority in the criminal community, but often such aspirations are transformed into violent or selfish motivation. Some convicts commit crimes due to their negative attitude towards work or study, others want to evade punishment.

In addition, researchers identify the following signs characterizing the category of crimes under consideration:

- an integral part of the crime structure as a whole, with its own quantitative and qualitative characteristics;
- connection with the current state criminal and penal policy, as well as the conditions of serving sentences in places of deprivation of liberty;
- high latency;
- pronounced specificity of the subject of the crime;
- danger of spreading a criminal subculture in a correctional facility;
- threat to penitentiary, public, and personal security [9, p. 344].

Specific manifestations of criminal behavior in correctional institutions include the following:

1. Violent criminal behavior, which includes both direct physical violence, manifested in murders, injury to health of varying severity, and the like, and mental violence, including threats, insults, coercion to actions of various kinds, as well as slander. Such crimes are often committed in correctional institutions. The high registration rate of these crimes is due to their high degree of danger and difficulties in hiding traces [10, p. 207].

2. Mercenary criminal behavior, manifested in the commission of various types of theft of property and valuables from institutions of the penitentiary system and employees, on the one hand, and other convicts, on the other. This category of crimes has the greatest share in the overall structure of penitentiary crime. An essential feature of this category of crimes is their high degree of latency. Characterizing

mercenary crimes committed in correctional institutions, it should be noted that they are quite diverse. The most common types of theft in penitentiary institutions are theft and fraud, committed, as a rule, in residential areas and poorly visible areas. However, there are cases of theft committed by convicts while they are outside the institution's territory, for example, during the transfer, while in medical institutions, as well as during the exercise of the right to short-term departure on the grounds specified in the law. Such crimes are committed by convicted persons, as a rule, in the first years of their stay in places of deprivation of liberty by persons who already have experience in committing mercenary crimes.

3. Crimes related to the trafficking of narcotic drugs, other prohibited substances and objects in correctional institutions.

4. Criminal behavior related to evasion from serving the sentence imposed by the court. This category consists of crimes for which criminal liability is provided for in the norms of the Special Part of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation. These include escapes from prison and from custody, as well as evasion from serving a sentence in a penal settlement.

5. Obstruction of the lawful activities of penal correction institutions and their employees. Such actions are usually associated with the disruption of the activities of institutions, disobedience and resistance to the staff of the correctional institution administration, and similar actions.

6. Mass criminal behavior, which can be expressed, first, in the commission of crimes by a group of persons, which can also be carried out individually; second, in mass criminal behavior specific to correctional institutions, an example of which is mass riots; third, in mass excesses of convicts, such as mass refusal to work or eat, etc.

7. Sexual excesses of convicts, the manifestations of which are both sexual crimes and sexual perversions.

8. Criminal behavior of employees of the penal system: receiving bribes, abuse of official position, etc. [11, p. 564]. This behavior is motivated by the following reasons:

- loss of personal perspective in society;
- unfavorable material and housing conditions that give rise to crimes;

- unreliable environment;
- frivolous behavior of individuals that has served as a reason for a crime;
- uncomplicated relationships in the family, with neighbors and others;
- connivance of law enforcement agencies in the fight against crime prevention;
- other circumstances contributing to the formation of antisocial attitudes.

In addition, the reasons include negative personality traits, alcoholism, drug addiction, etc.

Among specific manifestations of criminal behavior in correctional institutions, researchers include a wide range of socially dangerous acts: from murders and causing serious harm to health to escapes, disorganization of activities and drug trafficking. So, A.P. Nekrasov and V.P. Karlov note that grave and especially grave acts are committed in places of detention, such as murder, causing serious harm to health, disrupting activities of correctional institutions, hooligan acts, as well as acts specific to places of detention, such as evading punishment, obstructing activities of correctional institutions, handling substances prohibited for convicts, mass criminal behavior, and riots [12, p. 210].

In general, the analysis of penitentiary crime allows us to establish that each type of criminal behavior in correctional institutions is characterized by its own criminological parameters, causes and conditions. This should be taken into account when developing preventive measures. Penitentiary crime, as a rule, is the result of a complex of reactions developing in places of detention. In most cases, criminal activity in correctional institutions is associated with the presence of personality anomalies of convicts, as well as mental pathologies. In this regard, preventive activities should be aimed at early detection of mental deviations, dynamic monitoring of prisoners with deviant behavior, as well as conducting socio-psychiatric measures.

This study should also focus on issues related to the causes and conditions of crime in places of detention. Thus, the circumstances that determine penitentiary crime in general are a system of negative, criminogenic nature, formed among persons serving sentences in correctional institutions and posing a threat to public interests [10, p. 279].

Most causes of crimes committed in correctional institutions are related to the very essence

of this type of punishment, such as imprisonment, which places a person in an environment formed by the society members, most of whom adhere to antisocial attitudes and live by criminal rules, unwillingness to follow which can lead to extremely negative consequences, including deprivation of life. In such circumstances, committing a crime becomes one of the few ways to resolve conflict situations. Thus, psychologists point to the fact that the feelings and fears experienced by a person as a result of the hostility of the prison environment make him/her be always ready to repel an attack [13, p. 63].

What is more, penitentiary crime, being a kind of type of recidivism, is an integral part of general crime, which suggests the possibility of a methodological solution to the issue of circumstances contributing to the commission of crimes by convicted persons and causing such crime in general. At the same time, these circumstances represent a set of causes, conditions and reasons for the commission of penitentiary crime, as well as the motives of specific criminal behavior [14, p. 86].

Thus, S.V. Bondarenko points out "division of determinants into social (external) and penitentiary (internal) factors" [15, p. 74]. E.V. Patrushev also draws attention to the fact that "perpetrator's actions depend not only on his/her personal characteristics, but also on victim's behavior who by his/her actions can facilitate the occurrence of a criminal result", which actually confirms the relationship between objective and subjective conditions [16, p. 76].

In general, the circumstances that determine crime commission in correctional institutions are divided into external and internal; sometimes they are also called objective and subjective.

External factors include the following:

1. Injustice when resolving conflicts that arise among persons serving sentences in correctional institutions.

2. Inability, which in many cases is superimposed on the unwillingness of the correctional institution administration to protect convicts whose rights are clearly infringed by other prisoners, which gives rise to a sense of impunity among representatives of the criminal world in this regard.

3. Convicts' frequent concealment of the facts of crimes from representatives of the cor-

rectional institution administration and their accounting.

4. Facts of the use of violence against convicts by representatives of the administrations, expressed in both verbal insults and physical assaults.

5. Unsatisfactory level of organization of protection and supervision of convicts, as well as control over their behavior [10].

6. Detention of a large number of convicts together in a squad system, which facilitates the mutual exchange of criminal experience, as well as mutual incitement to illegal behavior.

Special attention is paid to internal factors that directly determine penitentiary crime. These include a criminal subculture, personality deformations of convicts, shortcomings in the regime and organization of correctional institutions. Thus, A.M. Smirnov emphasizes that in conditions of imprisonment, "internal factors include convicts' personal characteristics, nature of the crime committed, psychological climate among prisoners, level of law and order maintenance in the institution [17, p. 280].

V.V. Luneev identifies the following internal factors of penitentiary crime:

1. Low educational level of convicts, primitive system of values and needs.

2. Presence of neurotic abnormalities in the majority of convicts.

3. Specifics of convicts' life experience of persons.

4. Specifics of convicts' personality traits, in particular, emotional instability, short temper, limited ability to manage their actions in extreme conditions, and clear predominance of emotions over reason.

5. Convicts' inability to change the external environment at their own discretion in the event of a conflict situation, which causes a situation in which the comfort of a person directly depends on the behavior of other convicts [18, p. 523].

We also note convicts' desire to gain recognition in conditions of being in a correctional facility, almost the only way to achieve this is to evade duties and show malevolence towards the administration.

As for causes (determinants) of penitentiary crime, they are usually divided into socio-economic, institutional, psychological and criminological.

genic that influence the formation of criminal behavior in places of detention [1, p. 122].

The system of execution of punishments in Russia is characterized by hierarchy, formality, and limited resource provision, which creates the ground for conflicts, abuse, and a formal attitude to educational work. Staff overload, a high number of convicts per employee, as well as a shortage of professionally trained personnel, lead to the degradation of the penitentiary environment [6, p. 214].

Of particular importance is the problem of employee-convict relations built not on trust, but on fear and coercion. This provokes a reaction of resistance, including in the form of illegal actions.

In conditions of imprisonment, a specific criminal subculture develops, forming an alternative system of values, norms and sanctions. Such phenomena as “language of the underworld”, “zones of influence”, “cell hierarchy”, etc., become an integral part of prison life [4, p. 183]. It is often these norms that have a greater impact on convicts’ behavior than requirements of the official regime.

A criminal subculture is strengthened through social isolation, isolation of the penitentiary environment and weakness of institutions of re-socialization. Over time, the convict increasingly identifies him/herself not as a citizen, but as a representative of a subculture where criminal behavior is becoming the norm.

Limited external stimuli, constant control, suppression of initiative, violence and humiliation contribute to the psychological maladaptation of convicts. “Depression, aggression, cynicism, and a loss of empathy develop, especially among people in strict and special regime correctional facilities” [19, p. 98].

Psychologists record “a high prevalence of psychological defenses, such as projection, rationalization, and withdrawal into fantasy, which reduces the level of self-reflection and promotes mechanisms for self-justification of one’s crimes and subsequent recidivism” [8, p. 144].

Formalism in law enforcement, abuse of disciplinary penalties, and the use of isolation as a universal means of influence contribute to the destruction of motivation for lawful behavior. In addition, a low level of legal literacy of convicts makes them vulnerable to arbitrariness and

draws them into criminal schemes under the pretext of protection or assistance.

Despite constant efforts of the penal system and other state agencies, the crime rate in places of detention remains consistently high. This is due to a number of systemic, organizational and conceptual problems that significantly reduce the effectiveness of preventive activities.

The main problem is the formalized nature of preventive measures, which boils down to plans, lectures, individual conversations and memos. This model does not meet real tasks of prevention, since it:

- does not take into account individual characteristics of convicts;
- ignores the real level of their social and legal maladaptation;
- does not affect the underlying causes of deviant behavior [20, p. 22].

Educational work is often replaced by disciplinary practice, which is perceived by convicts not as a fair impact, but as repression.

Effective prevention is impossible without professionally trained personnel. However, as practice shows, “employees of educational departments, as a rule, do not have psychological or pedagogical education, are overloaded with reporting and do not undergo regular professional development” [5, p. 87].

In addition, low wages and a lack of career prospects lead to staff turnover and demotivation of employees responsible for preventive work.

One of the central tasks of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia is to prepare convicts for life after release, but in reality the system of re-socialization remains extremely weak, since convicts do not have the opportunity to get a sought-after profession, do not participate in socially significant projects, rarely interact with external institutions (volunteers, psychologists, religious organizations, etc.) [7, p. 171].

As a result, according to the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia, up to 40% of those released commit a crime again within two years [21].

In the current model of penitentiary control, there is no mechanism for personal risk assessment, which would allow focusing efforts on the convicts most prone to illegal behavior. This approach is actively used abroad (risk-based as-

assessment), but it has not yet been put into practice in Russia.

The penitentiary system largely retains the inertia of a closed institution, which makes it difficult to introduce innovations and public control. Forms of interaction with the scientific and civil society remain limited. This creates a feedback deficit, without which it is impossible to adapt the prevention strategy to real conditions.

Given the scale and sustainability of penitentiary crime, as well as the complexity of its determination, prevention measures should not be targeted and formal, but systematic, comprehensive and scientifically based.

One of the most important directions is the transition from a mass approach to prevention to an individualized one. This requires “development of a criminal risk assessment system to identify convicts prone to committing crimes; to identify high-risk areas within the institution; to adjust impact strategies taking into account the psychotype, history of crime, and behavior in a correctional institution” [22, p. 40].

Most modern prevention methods are based on administrative and formal legal mechanisms, while real work with motivation, self-esteem, aggression and frustration requires the involvement of professional psychologists. “Psychodiagnostics upon admission to a correctional institution, regular psychocorrection programs, stress control and burnout prevention for both convicts and staff” are crucial [19, p. 133]. It is also important to use elements of a cognitive behavioral therapy that have proven effective in reducing relapse.

The concept of re-socialization as a central element of prevention should be reconsidered, expanding the range of tools:

- prison education (including online courses and vocational training);
 - participation in volunteer and labor initiatives;
 - religious and cultural support;
 - interaction with employers before release
- [7, p. 209].

Re-socialization should begin not one month before the end of the term, but from the first day of detention.

The effectiveness of prevention increases with the involvement of external institutions: non-profit organizations, human rights orga-

nizations, religious associations, and the scientific community. Practice has shown that “participation of the “third sector” contributes to reducing the level of violence in correctional facilities, building trust between the administration and convicts, and improving conditions for serving sentences” [23].

It is necessary to institutionalize this dialogue – to conclude agreements, organize joint projects, and provide guarantees of access.

The transition to modern prevention models is impossible without high-quality retraining of personnel. It is necessary to “introduce modules on psychology, ethics, and conflictology into the programs of departmental higher education institutions, develop internships and exchange experience with foreign systems, and introduce e-courses and case studies” [5, p. 151].

The essence of the system can be changed only through a personnel revolution.

It is important to understand that crime prevention is not only a set of actions aimed at identifying and eliminating negative phenomena that determine crime in correctional institutions, but also actions aimed at compensating for them, that is, replacing these phenomena and circumstances with others that cause lawful behavior [24, p. 65].

According to S.V. Legostaev, prevention of penitentiary crime is carried out at general social, special criminological and individual levels [25]. A similar position is developed by Yu.Yu. Tishchenko, emphasizing the need for an integrated approach to identifying, eliminating and neutralizing the causes of criminal behavior [26]. General social prevention of penitentiary crime includes a fairly wide range of economic, political, ideological, cultural, domestic and other measures aimed at the implementation of tasks related to the elimination of the causes and conditions that determine this category of crimes. At the same time, legal prevention of offenses of various types, including a set of administrative, civil, and other types of prevention, acts as an integral part of general social prevention. General social prevention is an activity aimed at identifying and eliminating objective external causes that collectively generate crime, as well as conditions conducive to its development and the commission of individual crimes. This type of prevention is implemented

through the active use of social, economic, political, legal and other anti-criminal factors [27, p. 124].

Special criminological measures for the prevention of penitentiary crime, unlike general social ones, are carried out purposefully in the interests of a group. They act as the main form of ensuring the security of individuals, society and the state, as well as the penal system, from criminal threats. In addition, this type of prevention includes a set of measures aimed at eliminating, compensating, and minimizing deficiencies and inconsistencies that arise during the process of serving and executing a custodial sentence and determine the nature of penitentiary crime in general [28, p. 35].

Individual prevention is a basic direction for the prevention of penitentiary crime. It includes a set of measures against specific individuals who carry out actions contrary to the norms of law, who come into conflict with the administration of the correctional institution and other convicts. This type of prevention, in accordance with the order of the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation No. 72 of May 20, 2013 "On approval of the Instructions for the prevention of offenses among persons held in institutions of the penal system", involves working with persons on preventive registration, taking into account the specifics of their psychological state, the nature and degree of public danger of the acts committed by them, and as well as other circumstances that have a direct impact on determining optimal educational influence.

When discussing the improvement of crime prevention activities in correctional institutions, it should be pointed out that for the development of any criminal processes in correctional institutions, the impact of a whole set of factors having a direct causal relationship with public and state processes acts as a necessary condition [29, p. 86]

Among these processes, various kinds of social contradictions and crises in various areas of government and society are most often identified. In addition, it is important to understand that penitentiary crime is influenced by criminogenic factors, among which the very fact of being in a correctional institution.

Crime prevention in correctional institutions is understood as a purposeful activity of competent state authorities, public associa-

tions and organizations in order to prevent the spread of criminal behavior among convicts in correctional institutions serving sentences of imprisonment [30, p. 136]. Yu.Yu. Tishchenko notes that "prevention of penitentiary crime in correctional institutions includes a set of measures that primarily involve the placement of convicts in accordance with the personality deformation degree, control over them and timely preventive action" [26, p. 229].

In order to achieve the goals of preventing penitentiary crime, it is necessary to implement a number of general and individual preventive measures and involve forces and means of the correctional institution.

In most cases, the problems of crime prevention in correctional institutions are connected with:

- a crime situation in correctional facilities;
- an antisocial worldview of criminals who commit penitentiary crimes;
- unfavorable conditions for moral transformation of a person while serving a custodial sentence;
- social contradictions that take place in correctional institutions and have a direct impact on the aggravation of conflict situations.

According to a number of authors, the following can be considered as key directions for enhancing crime prevention in correctional institutions:

1. Professional development of the staff of correctional institutions. Violation of prisoners' rights, which is one of the causes of penitentiary crime, is often committed due to insufficient competence of correctional officers. In addition, the lack of professional skills among employees prevents them from effective performance of activities to prevent penitentiary crime and even becomes a determinant of it [31, p. 104].

2. Development of the system of engineering and technical support of correctional institutions. This area is very promising in the field of combating crime, as it greatly simplifies the work of the security service. Engineering and technical means of protection and supervision introduced into activities of penitentiary institutions today demonstrate their effectiveness, which necessitates their further improvement.

3. Carrying out measures to organize individual and collective psychological work with convicts, regardless of whether they have tenden-

cies to commit socially dangerous acts. The importance of this area is associated with the significant amount of educational work in crime prevention in general. The current state of affairs indicates quite frequent facts of a formal attitude to this work, which is unacceptable.

V.Yu. Golubovskii points out that “improving the system of re-socialization should include individual programs, expanding the institution of probation, and involving public and religious organizations in the process” [32, p. 35]. S.V. Legostaev also suggests strengthening operational investigative prevention and improving

the effectiveness of individual work with convicts [25, p. 81].

Thus, today the penitentiary system faces certain challenges associated with prevention of penitentiary crimes that can be solved with proper organization of work and systematic implementation of a set of measures with convicts. The recommendations proposed above for improving crime prevention in correctional institutions are not able to solve all the problems, but they may lead to a decrease in the number of such crimes and create the ground for further work in this direction.

REFERENCES

1. Kudryavtsev V.N. *Obshchaya teoriya kvalifikatsii prestupnosti* [General theory of crime qualification]. Moscow, 1995. 352 p.
2. Dolgova A.I. *Kriminologicheskaya kharakteristika prestuplenii v ispravitel'nykh uchrezhdeniyakh* [Criminological characteristics of crimes in correctional institutions]. Moscow, 2014. 572 p.
3. Tkachenko E.N. *Penitentsiarnaya prestupnost': struktura, dinamika, profilaktika* [Penitentiary crime: structure, dynamics, prevention]. Saint Petersburg, 2012. 362 p.
4. Eminov V.E. *Prestupnost' v mestakh lisheniya svobody: kriminologicheskii analiz* [Crime in places of detention: criminological analysis]. Moscow, 2006. 416 p.
5. Morozova T.G. *Professional'naya deformatsiya sotrudnikov FSIN: sotsiologicheskii aspekt* [Professional deformation of penal system employees: sociological aspect]. Moscow, 2017. 270 p.
6. Reshetnikov A.P. *Problemy penitentsiarnoi reformy: pravovye i sotsiologicheskie aspekty* [Rehabilitation and re-socialization of convicts: problems and solutions]. Moscow, 2018. 412 p.
7. Orekhov V.N. *Reabilitatsiya i resotsializatsiya osuzhdennykh: problemy i puti resheniya* [Rehabilitation and re-socialization of convicts: problems and solutions]. Moscow, 2021. 284 p.
8. Bryzgalin L.V. *Lichnostnye deformatsii v usloviyakh lisheniya svobody* [Personal deformations in conditions of imprisonment]. Ekaterinburg, 2015. 253 p.
9. Kleimenov M.P. *Kriminologiya: ucheb.* [Criminology: textbook]. Moscow, 2023. 570 p.
10. *Kriminologiya i preduprezhdenie prestuplenii: ucheb.* [Criminology and crime prevention: textbook]. Ed. by Avdiiskii V.I., Bukalerova L.A. Moscow, 2023. 486 p.
11. *Kriminologiya: ucheb.* [Criminology: textbook]. Ed. by Kudryavtsev V.N., Eminov V.E. Moscow, 2022. 670 p.
12. Nekrasov A.P., Karlov V.P. Criminogenicity in places of detention. *Vestnik Volzhskogo universiteta imeni V.N. Tatishcheva = Bulletin of the V. N. Tatishchev Volga State University*, 2019, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 208–215. (In Russ.).
13. Epifanov S.S. Technical means in countering penitentiary crime: system requirements. *Yuridicheskaya nauka i pravookhranitel'naya praktika = Legal Science and Law Enforcement Practice*, 2014, no. 3 (29), pp. 58–65. (In Russ.).
14. Akchurin A.V. Typical penitentiary criminal: from criminology to criminalistics. *Yuridicheskaya nauka i pravookhranitel'naya praktika = Legal Science and Law Enforcement Practice*, 2015, no. 1 (31), pp. 80–87. (In Russ.).
15. Bondarenko S.V. *Kriminologicheskaya kharakteristika gruppovoi prestupnosti v penitentsiarnykh uchrezhdeniyakh i mery protivodeistviya ei: dis. ... yurid. nauk* [Criminological characteristics of group criminality in penitentiary institutions and measures to counter it : Candidate of Sciences (Law) dissertation]. Samara, 2016. 235 p.
16. Patrushev E.V. Victimogenic factors. *Yuridicheskaya nauka = Legal Science*, 2018, no. 6, pp. 68–80. (In Russ.).
17. Smirnov A.M. Victimological security. *Vserossiiskii krimilogicheskii zhurnal = Russian Journal of Criminology*, 2020, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 277–289. (In Russ.).
18. Luneev V.V. *Kriminologiya: ucheb.* [Criminology: textbook]. Moscow, 2016. 686 p.
19. Trunov I.M. *Psikhologicheskie aspekty resotsializatsii osuzhdennykh* [Psychological aspects of the resocialization of convict]. Saint Petersburg, 2019. 158 p.

20. Gracheva N.Yu. On the issue of the crisis of the educational function of the penitentiary system. *Ugolovno-ispolnitel'naya sistema: pravo, ekonomika, upravlenie = Penal System: Law, Economics, Management*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 15–23. (In Russ.).
21. *Federal'naya sluzhba ispolneniya nakazanii. Statisticheskie dannye o sostoyanii prestupnosti v ispravitel'nykh uchrezhdeniyakh za 2020–2022 gg.* [Federal Penitentiary Service. Statistical data on the state of crime in correctional institutions for 2020–2022]. Available at: <http://fsin.gov.ru/statistics/> (accessed September 15, 2025).
22. Fedorov S.V. Models for assessing criminogenic risk in the penitentiary system. *Kriminologiya: teoriya i praktika = Criminology: Theory and Practice*, 2020, no. 2, p. 40. (In Russ.).
23. Ivanova A.P. Public control in the system of execution of punishments. *Gosudarstvo i pravo = State and Law*, 2021, no. 9, pp. 45–50. (In Russ.).
24. Vaganov A.B. Features of preventive impact on penitentiary crime. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta = Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*, 2011, no. 35, pp. 63–65. (In Russ.).
25. Legostaev S.V. Penitentiary crime: state, main trends and problems of prevention. *Yuridicheskaya nauka i pravookhranitel'naya praktika = Legal Science and Law Enforcement Practice*, 2014, no. 2 (28), pp. 77–83. (In Russ.).
26. Tishchenko Yu.Yu. Some features of preventive impact on penitentiary crime. *Ugolovno-ispolnitel'noe pravo = Penal Law*, 2019, vol. 14 (1–4), no. 3, pp. 228–232. (In Russ.).
27. Khokhrin S.A. Prevention of penitentiary crime: problems and solutions. *Zhurnal rossiiskogo prava = Journal of Russian Law*, 2016, no. 3, pp. 122–128. (In Russ.).
28. Popova M.A. Special criminological measures to prevent torture. *Otechestvennaya yurisprudentsiya = Russian Jurisprudence*, 2015, no. 1 (1), pp. 35–41. (In Russ.).
29. Drozdova E.A., Kudryashov O.V. Problems of preventing recidivism among convicted foreign citizens and stateless persons. *Probely v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve = Gaps in Russian Legislation*, 2018, no. 2, pp. 84–86. (In Russ.).
30. Fakov A.M. Improving crime prevention in correctional institutions. *Probely v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve = Gaps in Russian Legislation*, 2020, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 135–139. (In Russ.).
31. Manukyan A.R. Recidivism as an indicator of the inefficiency of the penal system. *Probely v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve = Gaps in Russian Legislation*, 2020, no. 2, pp. 104–106. (In Russ.).
32. Golubovskii V.Yu. On resocialization of recidivists. *Penitentsiarnaya nauka = Penitentiary Science*, 2025, vol. 19, no. 1 (69), pp. 32–38. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

ANTON B. BAUMSHTEIN – Doctor of Sciences (Law), Associate Professor, professor at the Department of Criminal Law of the Southwest State University, Kursk, Russia, 5068896@list.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1479-7850>

Received December 16, 2025