

**The observance of the elements of the prison subculture
among juvenile prisoners in the Republic of Moldova**

Liudmila ȘUBELIC

“Ștefan cel Mare” Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova
e-mail: ludmila.subelic@mai.gov.md

Abstract

This paper aims to determine the degree of compliance with the rules of the prison subculture among minors detained in the Republic of Moldova; to investigate the origins of the juvenile prison subculture and the factors contributing to its continued influence within the juvenile prisoner environment.

The methods used in the preparation of this work were: the logical method (based on the inductive and deductive analysis of doctrinal opinions regarding the penitentiary subculture of minors), the empirical method (the author carried out sociological research using the method of anonymous investigation of minor detainees and of the staff of the Detention center for minors and youth Goian), the prospective method (allowed estimation of the degree of compliance with the rules of the penitentiary subculture by minor detainees) and the statistical method.

Research has shown that the spread of the penitentiary subculture among minor prisoners is due to the detention of minors, until 2024, in adult detention institutions, where they were familiarised with elements of the adult prison subculture. In turn, the minor prisoners subsequently transferred to the DCMY Goian have initiated and continue to initiate the newly admitted minor prisoners into the rules and traditions of adult prisoners to date.

Keywords: prison subculture, minor detainees, targeting, criminal hierarchy, spread of subculture influence.

Introduction

Upon entering the penitentiary, the individual feels, to a greater or lesser extent, depending on their age, psychological structure, social development, and level of culture, the effects of deprivation of liberty and reacts individually during the period of adaptation to the regime and detention norms.

In such cases, the first psychologically motivated step will be the individual's effort to join the informal group of prisoners, to develop desirable behaviours prevalent in this group, among others, such as unconditional obedience to the informal leader, even if he risks being poorly regarded by the administration. He will form an alliance with the group of convicts

because they can sanction or reward him to a greater extent than the administration (Carp 2008, 40).

Materials and methods

Materials

To carry out the work, the works of authors from the Republic of Moldova (Середа *et al.*, 2002; Rusu, 2008; Carp, 2008; Carp, 2010; Pungă and Pareniuc, 2012; Saharneanu and Mărgărint, 2017; Mărgărint, 2020; Crudu, 2022; Russu and Hriplivii, 2022; Moraru and Samoilenco, 2023), the Russian Federation (Фролова, 1999; Разинкин, 1999; Денисов, 2002; Дубягин, 2008; Шпак, 2012; Хисамутдинов and Шалагин, 2015) and other sources (CoE Study, 2018; CPT Report, 2023), normative acts from the Republic of Moldova, official statistical data and empirical data obtained by the author following anonymous surveys conducted with prisoners and staff of the DCMY Goian (2023, 2025) were studied.

Methods

The methods used in the preparation of this work were: the logical method (based on the inductive and deductive analysis of doctrinal opinions regarding the penitentiary subculture of minors), the empirical method (the author carried out sociological research using the method of anonymous investigation of minor detainees and of the staff of the Detention center for minors and youth Goian), the prospective method (allowed estimation of the degree of compliance with the rules of the penitentiary subculture by minor detainees) and the statistical method.

Results and discussion

The roots of the prison subculture are considered, to the greatest extent, to be the deficiencies in providing essential means of subsistence for prisoners and the lack of trust between prisoners and staff, which produce a system of informal leadership that spreads from one institution to another due to freedom of movement and communication (CoE Study, 2018, p. 49).

Even though the quarantine sector, consisting of cells, prohibits visits by other detainees, the latter use various methods of communication with newly admitted detainees. In this context, when asked whether other detainees have access to newly arrived detainees, 20% of the staff of the Detention center for minors and youth (DCMY Goian) answered in the affirmative, completing their answer with the following statements: “only when they are given meals and during educational and sports activities”, compared to 76% of the staff, who gave a negative answer, 4% indicated that they did not know about this (survey conducted by the author, 2025).

The prohibition on knocking on the wall as a means of communication, imposed by the Status of execution of sentence by convicts, speaks of the presence and topicality of secret communication methods in the prisoners' environment, of the fact that they practice it, especially during their transportation: “prisoners in cells of special means of transport (car and wagon): are prohibited from smoking, singing, making noise, passing documents to each other, talking or knocking on the wall to communicate with prisoners in other cells, making inscriptions on the walls, shelves, floor and ceiling of the cells, playing board games or other games” (HG 583/2006).

The „targeting” is a rite of reception into the penitentiary community of the prisoner/convict who has come to a detention institution for the first time, the ultimate goal of which is hierarchical division, with the deprivation of previous social status and, which consists of games that include the infliction of physical pain and mockery, presenting a danger to physical and mental health. Each caste is established with informal norms of a permissive and prohibitive nature, which it is obliged to follow, as well as customs and traditions specific only to the members of the respective caste.

The “targeting” is organised in such conditions that the prison administration/staff cannot interfere and takes place in the form of a “conversation” between the novice and the informal leader, who alone decides on the prisoner’s admission to the criminal community of prisoners with or without his preventive submission to bad jokes (“*prikolʹ*”).

The authors Hisamutdinov F. and Șalaghin A. argue that the „targeting” is „typical for penitentiary institutions for minors and young people” (Хисамутдинов and Шалагин, 2015, 50).

The author Carp S. states that

None of the collectives in society are there such pronounced ranks of classification as there are in the environment of prisoners. The attribution to one of the castes of the criminal hierarchy is more often done in isolation rooms during criminal investigations and in penitentiaries. This classification is subdivided into four groups: „*blatnîe*” („black”); „*mujîchi*” („gray”); „*cozli*” („red”); „*opușcenîe*” („blue”).

1) „*Blatnîe*” („black”) is the upper caste in the hierarchical scale of the criminal world. They have the mission of supervising the behaviour of all members of the criminal community; they are in charge of completing the so-called “obsheak” (common fund), resolving conflicts, and attracting new members. Thus, we can say that this category plays the role of an informal “administration”, which has a special influence among the prisoners.

2) „*Mujîchi*” („grey”) is the most numerous caste. It includes convicts who do not refuse to be trained in labour, but, at the same time, avoid cooperating with the administration, and observe certain traditions of the criminal world. After release, they usually plan to return to a normal life in freedom;

3) „*Cozli*” („red”) are those who openly cooperate with the prison administration. They end up in this caste for various reasons. Some cooperate voluntarily, while others are forced. Because, according to the “ethical code” of the criminal world, relations between the prison administration and the prisoners must remain hostile, and those who cooperate with the administration are treated as “traitors”;

4) „*Opușcenîe*” („blue”) is the lowest rank on the hierarchical ladder. They fall into this category, as a rule, for serious violations of the rules and norms of the criminal world: theft from “one’s own”, unpaid debts for card games, violent (unjustified) actions towards other convicts, collaboration with the administration (especially the hidden one), homosexuality, committing crimes, such as: rape; raping or murder of children, etc. Usually, this category of convicts is responsible for carrying out the „dirtiest” work in the penitentiary (Carp, 2010, p. 109).

Some of the minors stated that there is a well-established hierarchy. People who are defamed or are low in the hierarchy are called „*objennyi*”, and those who work in the penitentiary are „*neputiovi*”. Others spoke only about the category of „*blatnîe*” and „*neputiovi*”. None of the interviewees admitted that they were „*neputiovi*” or „*objennyi*” or „*blatnîe*”. Other interviewees stated that there is no such thing in our penitentiary (Goian). Those who did not want to speak were among the last to be interviewed, citing the rule „not to talk about life here in penitentiary” (Saharneanu and Mărgărint, 2017, p. 10).

Asked to indicate the hierarchical castes of dividing minor detainees, 24% of the staff of the CDMT Goian indicated the following variants of hierarchies (from the highest to the lowest):

- 1) „blatnîe”; „poreadocinîe”; „neputiovîe”, „umiliți”;
- 2) „poreadocinîi”, „neputiovîi”, „obijenîi”;
- 3) „pufoși”, „muji” (neputiovîe), „umiliți”;
- 4) „pufoși”, „medii”, „umiliți”;
- 5) „poreadocinîi”; „neputiovîi”; „drac”; „obijenîi cinstit”; „obijenîi greaznîi”; „poponar”;
- 6) „om”, „drac”, „humilit” (survey conducted by the author, 2025).

The criminal community (both in places of confinement and outside them) strictly follows the execution of its “laws”. Anyone who violates the norms, customs and traditions in force is subject to punishment (Дубягин 2008, 61). The punishment consists of „degradation” and obtaining the status of „humiliated”, as well as torture.

Analysing the findings of international organisations with reference to the situation of penitentiaries in the Republic of Moldova, including Penitentiary No. 10 Goian, in conjunction with the data accumulated as a result of monitoring, the authors, Russu D. and Hriplivîi N., note that.

The model of prison management is maintained by using elements of criminal subculture. Thus, the established social order is formed by the institutional culture of penitentiary institutions and its coexistence with the criminal subculture of the penitentiary system. The monitoring results explicitly indicate that in most penitentiary institutions (less so in the Rusca penitentiary) the phenomenon of subculture and the division of prisoners into castes according to influence groups is observed. The prison administration is aware of the existence of informal influence in the institutions, and the current situation in the penitentiaries is tolerated. The data analysis revealed that these castes do not exist in the institution without the tacit consent or, moreover, with the support of the prison management (Russu, Hriplivîi, 2022, p. 30).

We consider it serious that the prison staff not only does not take measures that would exclude the possibility of observance the tradition regarding „targeting”, but also facilitates them by behaving as if this caste division is a natural and mandatory thing in places of detention, and does not apply punishments to the organizers, which undoubtedly contributes to strengthening the authority of the prisoners' leaders.

It is noteworthy that, although prison subculture is recognized in the specialized literature as a dangerous phenomenon, the norms for sanctioning prisoners do not include any punishment for enforcing compliance with prison rules and traditions.

Of course, the insufficiency of prison staff, along with the shortcomings of the technical and material base, are the main factors that diminish the independence and legal power of the administration in relation to the leaders of the prisoners.

Although 63% of the juvenile inmate respondents denied that all new inmates in the penitentiary go through „targeting” (22% confirmed, 15% indicated that they „don't know”), when asked whether the inmate leaders decide which caste each inmate belongs to, 55.5% of the respondents answered affirmatively (40.5% denied, 4% answered that they don't know about that) (survey conducted by the author, 2023). Therefore, we regret to note that „targeting” continues to be practiced in the environment of juvenile inmates, which is alarming.

The basic type established for penitentiary no. 10 - Goian is a Detention Center for Minors and Youth, for the detention of convicted minors and youth up to 23 years of age, male. And in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of Article 252 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Moldova, „convicts who have not reached the age of 18 may serve their sentence in separate sectors of adult penitentiaries, but under the conditions of the detention centre for minors and youth”.

Although paragraph (3) of the indicated article provides that „Minor convicts are detained separately from adult convicts”, we consider this dangerous due to the existence of various means of communication, including secret ones, through which it is possible to familiarize minors with the norms of the penitentiary subculture (including the attitude towards legal norms, rules of internal order etc.) or to transmit to them the methods of committing or concealing criminal acts in detention. (Nastas A. Cernomoreț S. 2024, 291).

The danger of the initiation of minor prisoners into the prison subculture by adult prisoners has been identified and reported by several authors, but also by European-level bodies, which have intervened as much as possible to change the situation.

Numerous studies regarding the serving of the prison sentence have indicated the widespread and strong influence that the prison subculture has, with a focus on the impact that it has on minor prisoners. Thus, for the sake of protecting minors from the prison subculture, „the CPT requested that minors from the Chisinau prison be transferred to the Goian juvenile prison” (CPT Report 2023, 4).

One of the signs of a subculture's stability is the continuity of its traditions. M. Mid argued that:

Continuity in each culture depends on the simultaneous cohabitation in that environment of representatives of at least three generations”. In the penitentiary system existing in our republic, we can easily identify these three generations. The stability of its existence is conditioned by the permanent replenishment of its “rows” due to a high percentage of recidivist crime, as well as due to the difference in terms of deprivation of liberty: minors, as a rule, with relatively short terms, adults, who serve their sentence in semi-closed prisons, and, finally, adults, who were sentenced to maximum terms in closed prisons (Rusu 2008, 107).

Thus, the transmission of subcultural norms occurs between the three generations of prisoners.

Statistical data shows us the number of convicted and remanded minors detained in 2020-2025 in various penitentiary institutions in the country:

- in 2020, 6 convicted minors were held in P 13, 1 in P 17, and 27 in P 10.

And remanded minors: in P 17 – 1, in P 11 – 6; in P 13 – 10.

- In 2021, in P 13 – 4, convicted minors, while in P 10 – 31.

And minors detained: in P 5 – 1, in P 11 – 5, in P 13 – 15, in P 16 – 1, in P 17 – 4.

- in 2022, in P 13 – 5, convicted minors, in P 17 – 2, and in P 10 – 28.

And minors detained: in P 5 – 1, in P 11 – 4, in P 13 – 14, in P 17 – 4.

- in 2023 in P 13 – 5 convicted minors, in P 10 – 29. Detained minors: in P13 - 13.

- in 2024 in P 11 – 5 convicted minors, in P 10 – 26.

Prevented minors: in P 5 – 1, in P 10 – 1, in P 11 – 1 (official statistical data).

Carrying out the visit in 2022, the CPT expressed its concerns regarding the placement of minors on remand in adult prisons. „In its opinion, all minor detainees, including those on

remand, should be held in detention centres specifically designed for persons of this age. This is considered particularly important given the prevalence of informal hierarchy of detainees in adult male prisons and the need to protect minors from exposure to this phenomenon” (CPT Report 2023, 24).

The danger of detaining minors in P no. 13 and the one in Bălți was also noted by the authors Saharneau E. and Mărgărint T., who stated the following:

In these penitentiaries, there is the possibility of communicating with mature prisoners from whom they take over their specific behaviour, those social strata, that slang, that way of giving nicknames, those informal rules, and knowledge related to the symbolism of tattoos. Moreover, with their transfer to the Goian penitentiary, they perpetuate and further fix this way of existence, this culture among the other minors (Saharneau and Mărgărint 2017, 42).

As a member of the prison staff reported, minors „take this language from adults, from the Isolator, there they have access to adults and from there they already come with a formed image: what a penitentiary means, what groups mean” (Saharneau, Mărgărint 2017, 28). Additionally, a report from a member of the prison staff regarding the categories within the penitentiary.

There are three layers: those who do nothing, everyone is afraid of them, and they form all the rules. Then there are children who work, and here it also depends on what character you have. If you know how to stand up for yourself, you will hold your position, and they will simply be left alone. No one touches them, they work, they are paid - I don't know what the rule is. Furthermore, the third category, who do all the dirty work, wash the corridors, the toilets, and offer sexual relations. (Saharneau, Mărgărint, 2017, p. 20).

The above confirms that minors who were detained in adult penitentiary institutions were initiated into the penitentiary subculture.

The CPT's findings following the December 2022 visit, one of the many visits carried out since 1998, serve as confirmation: „at Chisinau prison (this refers to Penitentiary No. 13, where minors were also held until 2023), the reception cells still had holes in the connecting walls (measuring approx. 10 cm in diameter) which served as communication channels to the neighboring cells, occupied by the “representatives” of the informal hierarchy (CPT Report 2023, 15).

Therefore, too little time has passed since the minors who were in custody in Penitentiary No. 13 (where they were familiarized with the elements of the penitentiary subculture) were transferred to the Goian Detention Center for Minors and Youth, to talk about neutralizing the influence of the penitentiary subculture among current minor detainees, especially if we take into account the results of a survey, according to which, „„obshchak” (common fund) is imposed on detainees more obviously in preventive detention centers than anywhere else” (CoE Study, 2018, p. 24).

In other words, requests for money and goods are submitted for the benefit of the „common fund”, in exchange for being assigned to a decent caste, which implies a relatively easy life in places of reclusion.

The above is confirmed by the staff of the DCMY Goian who participated in the survey (survey conducted by the author, 2025). When asked “where, as a rule, does the (hierarchical) distribution of newly arrived prisoners take place, by caste?”, 72% of the

respondents indicated the criminal investigation isolator, 20% indicated the penitentiary, and 8% responded “I don't know”. When asked whether „it is customary for newly arrived prisoners to subordinate themselves to the informal leaders of the prisoners”, 52% of the respondents answered „yes”, 24% „no”, 8% - „there are no leaders”, 8% - „sometimes”, 8% - „I don't know”.

In the opinion of authors Moraru V. and Samoilenco V.,

The criminal subculture in the detention environment did not spread as a result of the law's imperfection. However, as a result of its non-compliance by employees over a long period of time, as a result of the companionship of law enforcement officers with representatives of the criminal elite, in order to create an apparent stability in the penitentiary without making any effort, or we are even talking about an companionship that bears the emblem of corruption, which has become so typical of our country that we have become accustomed to it. It seems to us to be normal (Moraru and Samoilenco 2023, 123).

The findings of the CPT's December 2022 visit to penitentiary institutions in the Republic of Moldova

suggest that there continues to be a tacit acceptance of the informal hierarchy by prison staff and even a tacit „agreement” between staff and informal leaders of detainees when it comes to ensuring „order” among detainees. As already observed during previous visits, informal leaders of prisoners had a say in the initial „classification” and placement in cells/dormitories of newly admitted persons in prisons (CPT Report 2023, 15).

Being extremely entrenched, the criminal subculture in the Republic of Moldova dictates to the penitentiary staff the rules of informal separation of convicts. The latter accept this separation in order to create the appearance of control over the entire penitentiary; in other words, the collaboration of the penitentiary staff with the leaders of the criminal subculture does nothing but further strengthen the role of the latter among all convicts (Crudu 2022, 141).

The author Șpac S. states that, „although a certain ideology and value system are present in the criminal world of any state, only in the Soviet Union, and later, in the post-Soviet countries, including Russia, did criminal ideology reach the peak of perfection, similarly, as did the criminal subculture. „Thieves in law” represent a purely Soviet phenomenon, not being known in other states (Шпак 2012, 273).

„Thieves in law” overcrowded in the most severe prisons in the Russian Federation, „crown” new people, appoint supervisors in the territories of Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Italy, Spain, the USA, Greece, the United Arab Emirates, etc. (Pungă, Pareniuc 2012, 37- 38). The goal is to expand the sphere of influence, that is, criminal activities, in order to obtain fabulous profits that are paid into the common fund called „*obshcheak*” (common fund).

Razinkin states that,

Modern „thieves in law” and other ideologists of the criminal lifestyle and morality skillfully combine the social features of criminal leaders and commercial businessmen, which allows them to develop criminally, having criminal protection, and recently, also criminal law protection on a criminogenic-economic basis. Only they have preserved such a habit of professional criminals of tsarist Russia, as the propaganda of the customs and traditions of the criminal environment, and in particular, of the so-called thieves”. This encompasses the spread of both illegal and legal customs, negative norms, and a social lifestyle and morality (Разинкин 1999, 108).

The basic functions of „thieves in law” include the normative one (they establish the criminal ideology, the rules), the organisational one, the control one (in order to prevent the establishment of contacts with the personnel of the operative services within the penitentiary institutions), the decision-making one, the consolidation one, etc. These can be carried out through the „supervisors” appointed in the detention institutions.

One of the functional obligations of „thieves in law” is the propaganda of the criminal way of life (for which any possibilities are used – from blackmail and „bribe” to „awarding” with huge sums of money, cars, trips abroad, etc. (Середа *et al.* 2002, 18).

Often, minors are involved in illegal actions by persuasion (they are shown the benefits), by making requests, by awakening antisocial interests and inclinations, both in detention and in free society. An important role here is played by the increased suggestibility characteristic of minors.

The spread of the influence of the penitentiary subculture on minors and young people is carried out through socialisation mechanisms, such as imitation of behavioural models and contamination. All of them are directly related to communication as a specific system of interpersonal interaction.

It should be borne in mind that the coordinates of life and conduct demonstrated by the criminal subculture spread spontaneously in the practice of interpersonal communication and are acquired through unconscious mechanisms of contamination and imitation (Фролова 1999, 41).

Familiarisation of minors with the elements of the penitentiary subculture during the process of moral formation of the personality represents the accumulation of negative experience that may be undetectable externally or may manifest itself with considerable delays. The earlier the age of the minor who adheres to criminal values, norms and visions, the more stable and intense they will become in the future.

The Russian author Denisov N. classifies the ways of initiation of minors into the criminal subculture into three types: voluntary, compelled and forced.

The voluntary approach focuses on minors' desire to become genuine members of the criminal world according to their own will and preferences, or at least in the eyes of some people. Often, at an early stage, such a tendency is rooted in self-affirmation, seeking protection, and similar reasons.

The compelled path is not the path chosen by the minor. However, the one imposed by the microenvironment in which he is formed, for example, at the place of residence, within educational and cultural institutions, friends, high school classmates, etc. Through the elements of the criminal subculture, the stereotype of criminal behaviour is imposed on minors. It is possible to influence the minor despite their legal illiteracy, intellectual and psychological immaturity, moral conscience, and inability to make the right choice.

Detention of minors presents itself as a forced familiarisation with the harsh norms of the criminal subculture. Consequently, minors released from detention end up with a low level of culture and education, become more desocialised, have antisocial views and thinking (because society placed them in detention), therefore, they present a greater social danger and a greater risk of recidivism. Society “loses” these minors and places them at the disposal of the criminal environment (Денисов 2002, 81-83).

The deprivation of liberty aims to isolate socially dangerous criminals from other members of society, adapt prisoners to social norms for the further development of personality, and

correct the behaviour of prisoners. However, under the conditions of the supremacy of criminal norms in the prison environment, the proposed goals are unlikely to succeed. Getting into places of detention, minors continue to accumulate experience in terms of elements of the penitentiary subculture.

Once they join such groups, juveniles begin to form antisocial behavioural directives and motivations. Juveniles conform to other members in terms of knowledge and strict observance of the norms of the penitentiary subculture (here the hierarchical structure convenient for the leader of a group with an antisocial orientation is present), learning and using criminal slang, the way of interrelating with those in the group and those outside it, the way of spending free time (types of entertainment), that is, they learn an antisocial way of life. The most sensitive age, characterised by high conformism, readiness to accept group norms, modification of beliefs and behaviour in accordance with the opinion of peers who have greater authority or adults, manifests itself approximately at 14-15 years.

According to statistical data for the years 2020 – 2024 (official statistical data), juvenile convicts with the youngest age of 15 – 16 years constituted in 2020 out of a total of 37 – 10; in 2021 out of 36 – 15; in 2022 out of 36 – 7; in 2023 out of 35 – 1; in 2024 out of 33 – 6. We note that the number of juvenile convicts with an age sensitive to conformity tends to decrease.

The authors Saharneau E. and Mărgărint T. exposed the method of initiation with the rules of the penitentiary subculture of newly arrived minor prisoners:

The relationship of the respondents with their colleagues is based on understanding and observance of the informal norms established by the members of the detained group. These norms are, in fact, elements of initiation, which mark the entry and acceptance of an individual into a certain social group, in this case, that of minors from the Goian penitentiary. Moreover, from the respondents' answers, it was found that the norms and necessary conduct of the newly arrived convict in the penitentiary are established through group meetings, where they get to know and share the rules of the group. ... Also, during this gathering, but also during detention, the place of the convict is „secured”, depending on the criminal's past (it should be noted that some crimes are not tolerated by the members of the group, and therefore, neither the individual criminal; such crimes, such as rape, according to some interviewees). Also, this event marks the first phase of initiation, pre-coding because the order of acts, things is established by other people (perceived as already having a status recognized by all the other members), before their fulfillment by all the other actors”. „Those social categories existing in the penitentiary are learned by minors from prisoners in other penitentiaries such as Penitentiary 13, or the one in Bălți, etc. ... This life model is imposed through physical, emotional, verbal violence. The strongest survives”. - At the penitentiary in Balti and at penitentiary no. 13, was there a special place just for minors or was it possible to communicate with adults? - We could communicate, we could even meet, but the rooms are separate for minors. There is no problem communicating with adults (released young man) (Saharneau and Mărgărint 2017, 20-22).

Mărgărint T. presented excerpts from individual interviews conducted with minor inmates from the DCMY Goian. „When a new inmate came, the boys in the room (in penitentiary No. 13 there were 5-6 people in each room) had a „obșenie” (communication), where the „poneatii” (norms of conduct) were set, which is the „zapret” (prohibitions), and the „sposul” (requests, material values). If the person understands and breaks the rules, then he is beaten.” (Mărgărint 2020, 119).

A widely used method by inmate promoters of the prison subculture to attract newly admitted inmates to their group is extortion, namely, offering goods, personal items or

money, etc., made as gestures of goodwill, after which the person in question is informed of a debt equivalent in money to the criminal fund „common fund”, from the account of which the respective objects were purchased, or a much larger amount than that received, usually being set a short payment term. In case of impossibility of payment, the „debtor” is proposed to commit a criminal act to extinguish the debt. Even after paying the alleged debts, people are presented with the permanent obligation to contribute monthly to the „common fund” under the threat of violence or other types of problems.

There are other frequently used methods: demanding payment for protection (against physical and sexual violence, and respectively, against placing the individual in the lower caste of the prison subculture hierarchy), for certain services (making available items prohibited in the private environment, such as alcohol, cigarettes, sharp objects, etc., good quality personal hygiene items, making calls or even providing the use of a mobile phone, etc.) ... (Šubelic 2022, 110).

Conclusions

The prisoners of the CDMT Goian respect the rules and traditions of the penitentiary subculture to a considerable extent, which they pass on from one generation of prisoners to another. The penitentiary subculture of minors comes from the penitentiary subculture of adults, with which they were familiarised during their detention in adult penitentiary institutions. Among the factors contributing to the persistence of the penitentiary subculture's influence in the environment of minor prisoners are the tacit acceptance of this phenomenon by the prison administration and staff, as well as the lack of legal regulation for imposing compliance with the rules of the penitentiary subculture.

References

- Baseline Study into Criminal Subculture in Prisons in the Republic of Moldova*. Council of Europe Project „Support to Criminal Justice Reforms in the Republic of Moldova” financed by the Government of Denmark, 2018, **281** p., available at: <https://rm.coe.int/criminal-subculture-md-en-/1680796111> (29.09.2019).
- Carp, S. 2008. Criminalitatea penitenciară. Chișinău: Tipografia Academiei „Ștefan cel Mare” a MAI. **190** p. ISBN: 978-9975-930-67-3
- Carp, S. 2010. Drept execuțional-penal. Chișinău: Tipografia „Bons Offices”. **344** p. ISBN: 978-975-935-38-8
- Crudu, A. 2022. Clasificarea și repartizarea condamnaților în cadrul unui sistem progresiv de executare a pedepsei. *Revista Națională de Drept*, nr. 1(247). Chișinău, pp. **136-144**. ISSN 1811-0770
- Nastas A., Cernomoreț S. Criminologie: Tratat. București: ProUniversitaria, 2024. 291 p. ISBN 978-606-26-1562-8
- Mărgărint, T. 2020. Viața în detenție. Antropologia cotidianului. *Revista de etnologie și culturologie*. Volumul XXVII, Chișinău, p. **117-123**. E-ISSN: 2537-6152
- Moraru, V., Samoilenco, V. 2023. Rolul infrastructurii penitenciare și a cadrului legal în diminuarea efectelor produse de subcultura criminală a persoanelor private de libertate, *Revista științifică a Universității de Stat din Moldova*, nr. 3(163), Seria „Științe sociale”, Științe juridice ISSN 1814-3199, p. **115-125**, available at : https://social.studiamsu.md/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/15_V_Moraru_V_Samoilenco.pdf (22.10.2024)

- Pungă, A., Pareniuc A. 2012. Hoții în lege. Criminalitatea organizată în Republica Moldova – mituri și realitate, Editura Academiei „Ștefan cel Mare” a MAI, Chișinău, **106** p. ISBN: 978-9975-4334-9-5
- Report to the Moldovan Government on the ad hoc visit to the Republic of Moldova carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 5 to 13 December 2022, published in Strasbourg, 13.09.2023, **69** p.
- Rusu, O. 2008. Subcultura criminală și influența ei asupra resocializării condamnaților. *Anale științifice ale Academiei „Ștefan cel Mare” a MAI al RM*, Ediția a VIII-a, Chișinău, p. **106-110**. ISBN 978-9975-930-03-1. ISSN 1857-0976.
- Russu, D., Hriplivii, N. 2022. Promo-LEX, Raport Evaluarea mecanismului de prevenire și combatere a rețelilor tratamente în sistemul penitenciar din Republica Moldova, Chișinău, **69** p., available at: <https://promolex.md/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Raport-Evaluarea-Mecanismului-de-Prevenire-%C8%99i-Combatere-a-Relelor-Tratamente-%C3%AEn-Sistemul-Penitenciar-din-Republica-Moldova-1.pdf> (24.09.2023)
- Saharneanu, E., Mărgărint, T. 2017. Tabuuri și rituri de trecere prezente în penitenciarul pentru minori - Goian, Raport, septembrie 2014, Centrul de Cercetări Calitative în Antropologie, Chișinău, **44** p. ISBN 978-9975-87-216-4, available at: <http://norlam.md/lib.php?l=ro&idc=289>
- Statutul executării pedepsei de către condamnați, aprobat prin Hotărârea Guvernului nr. 583 din 26.05.2006. *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova* nr. 91-94 art. 676
- Șubelic L. 2022. „Punga comună” și rolul său în atragerea minorilor la activități infracționale, *Revista științifico-practică „Legea și viața”*, ediție specială, Chișinău, p. **109-112**. ISSN 1810-309X
- Денисов, Н. 2002. Влияние криминальной субкультуры на становление личности несовершеннолетнего преступника (дисс.канд.юрид.наук), Москва, **194** с. Fondul electronic al Bibliotecii Naționale a Moldovei
- Дубягин, О. Нормы, обычаи и средства коммуникации криминальной среды, Москва, Российская криминологическая ассоциация, 2008
- Разинкин В., 1999. О пропаганде криминальных обычаев и традиций. *Преступность и культура* публикация Криминологической Ассоциации «Научно-исследовательский институт проблем укрепления законности и правопорядка», Москва, **149** с.
- Середа, В., Тонкоглаз В., Плохотнюк, В., Болух, Л. 2002. *Криминальная субкультура*, Изд. Музеум, Кишинэу, **163** с. ISBN: 9975-906-64-8
- Фролова, Л. 1999. Социально-психологические механизмы экспансии криминальной субкультуры. *Преступность и культура*. - Москва.: Криминолог. Асоц., с. **39-42**
- Хисамутдинов, Ф., Шалагин, А. 2015. Криминальная субкультура и её предупреждение. *Вестник Казанского юридического института МВД России* № 2(20), p. **46-52**
- Шпак, С. 2012. Криминальная субкультура как социальный феномен, *Общество и право*, № 2 (39), Вопросы социологии, с. **271-275**, available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kriminalnaya-subkultura-kak-sotsialnyy-fenomen.pdf> (05.04.2024).
- Official statistical data:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/18XDx7sIXYPKnOHkk4l55LUGLh6638u8q/view>
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-Es4Dmw2Fq6gBCCidLiQVOPw_DpElmR/view
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/14A6YF7UQLqJTUcewraEKkmzKyRp-mhVP/view>
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sjkA19rvPIB1UC1RF379Cff6OJ-wp0TM/view>
[https://www.anp.gov.md/sites/default/files/Statistica/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D0%BF%D0%B8%D1%8F%20Minori%20\(5\).pdf](https://www.anp.gov.md/sites/default/files/Statistica/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D0%BF%D0%B8%D1%8F%20Minori%20(5).pdf)
- Sondaj anonim realizat de autor cu deținuții și preveniții minori și tineri din Penitenciarul nr. 10-Goian, la 23.11.2023. (Anonymous survey conducted by the author (Șubelic L.) with minor and young prisoners from DCMY Goian, on November, 23, 2023)

Sondaj anonim realizat de autor cu personalul CDMT Goian, în perioada 03-07 martie 2025.
(Anonymous survey conducted by the author (Șubelic L.) with the staff of the DCMY Goian,
between March 3-7, 2025).