

Institutional Rehabilitation Of Inmates And Outcomes In Selected Prisons In Nairobi, Kenya

Queenter A. Ondigo

Dr. Henry Rono

Dr. Francis P. Kerre

Dr. Henry Rono

Kenyatta University, Kenya

Abstract: This study sought to examine rehabilitation outcomes of inmates with respect to their prerelease readiness to return to lawful livelihoods and community environment. Life course perspective and socio-economic vulnerability theory were used to identify phases of life typically associated with socio-economic vulnerabilities leading to increased crime risks, rehabilitation challenges and reoffending tendencies. The study adopted cross-sectional survey. Systematic sampling method was employed to draw a sample of 286 subjects from Nairobi Industrial Area Medium Prison, Nairobi West Prison and Langata Women Prison all based in Nairobi County was used for the study. The three institutions were considered better placed to provide the inmate with extensive rehabilitation including industrial attachment and experience because of their proximity to the largest industrial area.

Data was collected through key informants, focused group discussions (FGDs) and survey questionnaire. Study results indicated that rehabilitation outcomes were substantially limited or inadequate in all indicators including compliance to institutional rules, participation of inmates in the design of their respective rehabilitation plans, access to apprenticeship, engagement on productive activities, exposure to employment experience, opportunity to engage with prospective employers, opportunity to visit the family with a view to maintain support. The study concluded that rehabilitation practices should be guided by life course perspective, socio-economic vulnerability and desistance theory. The study recommended a review and expanded prison rehabilitation to: strengthen rehabilitation along the UN guidelines including 2015 minimum rules and the various roadmaps, ensure provision of adequate resources particularly in terms of personnel, facilities, equipment and budgetary allocations, adopt a rehabilitation plan for each inmate incorporating post-release support follow up; and incorporate risks and needs of the inmates into the rehabilitation plans.

Keywords: Informants, Institutional Capacity, Prerelease, Pretrial Detention, Principles, Rehabilitation Outcomes, Reintegration, Service Systems, Sustainability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation of inmates, sustainable release, lawful livelihoods and reintegration to the community environment have become part of the key objectives of the correction systems. Indeed, a number of authorities have emphasized an institutional framework that encompasses reforms and rehabilitation of all sentenced inmates (Rubin & Deflem 2019, Pollock 2010, UNHRC 1966, 1976, Conley 1992, Schneider

1979, Kraiem 1978, Lewis 1973). In addition, in the inevitability of rehabilitation, Rubin (2001) argued that rehabilitation of prisoners was part of the conceptualization and design of the prison system, Further, United Nations emphasized that institutional rehabilitation which would promote ability of the prisoners to lead productive, law-abiding and self-supporting lives upon release (UNSMRs 2015, UNODC 2015, 2010, 2007). Within this framework, expected rehabilitation outcomes include prerelease relevance

of the interventions, adequacy, response to those interventions and post-release indicators; cessation, or reduction, of crime tendencies (recidivism) as well as sustained participation in lawful social and economic wellbeing (UNODC 2018, PRI 2018, Ganapathy 2018, NIJ 2017, Griffiths et al 2007).

Studies reporting optimism indicated that 30% to 40% of rehabilitation had resulted to improved abilities and sustainable release in some areas (PRI 2018, Duwe 2017, Day et al 2017, Griffiths 2007). Others emphasized that rehabilitation had been effective subject to appropriate approach, assessment of risks and needs, relevant and adequate interventions and the capacity of the prison administration (Blakey 2017, Duwe 2017, Day et al 2017, Graham 2016 Laws & Ward, 2011, Ward & Maruna 2007, Ward 2002, Lin 2002). In spite of increasing conviction that rehabilitation can work (or would be effective), recidivism in some regions particularly Sub Sahara Africa remains in the range of over 60% within two years of release (Clarke 2019, Murhula & Singh 2019, Bello 2017, Bhuller et al 2016, Dissel 2008).

In addition, prerelease studies have reported that up to 72% of the inmates were not equipped adequately to overcome crime tendencies; 67% were not adequately equipped to lead law-abiding lives and 61% were not encouraged to plan for their release (Conti-Brown, 2017, Aghan, 2016, Papa, 2015, HOC 2004, SEU 2002). In turn high rates of recidivism have been associated with persistent overcrowding of the prison institutions, health and safety challenges and increased cost of imprisonment (Macdonald 2018, McLaughlin et al 2018). In view of such less promising outcomes, this study examined rehabilitation outcomes in terms of the prerelease readiness of the inmates towards release and sustained lawful livelihoods in three institutions, namely the Nairobi Industrial Area Medium, Nairobi West GK and Langata Women Prisons. The institutions were located in Nairobi County and closer to the largest industrial area; which provided opportunity for rehabilitation beyond the institutions, particularly to address employment experience and employability.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

The study adopted a theoretical framework consisting of life course theory, socio-economic vulnerability, and desistance theory to analyze, explain and to predict rehabilitation outcomes. This was because rehabilitation process and outcomes were largely dependent on the various phases of the chronological age of a person and/or the family and related socio-economic vulnerability. More specifically, life course theory (LCT) provided the foundation from actuarial science, developmental needs and risks. Accordingly, LCT emphasizes the role (contribution or effects) of life histories (chronological age of an individual or family unit) on crime tendency and also on rehabilitation or restoration of capacities to offset the crime tendencies. It is considered that periods of life such as childhood, adolescence, middle age and old age influence certain events and risks towards crime and ability to desist crime. It includes therefore the way events,

risks, have accumulated overtime to influence crime tendency and possibly restoration of capacities to offset the crime tendencies.

The theory of socio-economic vulnerability has been used to analyze, explain and to predict crime tendencies, rehabilitation of inmates and indicators of the rehabilitation outcomes (PRI 2018, Rabuy & Kopf 2015, Ashish 2014, Smith and Hopkins 2013, Freeman 1996; 1991; Grogger 1995). It consists of a theoretical view that certain components of socio economic characteristics, particularly poverty, education, unemployment, family background and inadequate social support promote crime tendencies, rehabilitation capabilities and responses as well as rehabilitation outcomes; including prerelease preparedness and post release reoffending, reconviction and return to prison (recidivism). Poverty in particular as a component of socio-economic vulnerability, and inability to meet basic needs, has been associated with increase in crime, imprisonment and re-offending (Duque & McKnight 2019, Rabuy & Kopf 2015, Ashish 2014, Wacquant 2009). These studies observed that releasing inmates with severely limited socio-economic capacity to the community was a sure way to increase the risk to the public, reoffending and reconviction. In addition, poverty is most prevalent in virtually all developing countries including Kenya and has been reported to drive incidences of crime, imprisonment and re-offending.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design; combined with interview of the key informants and focus group discussion (FGD). The study was carried-out in the three selected prison institutions namely; Nairobi Industrial Area Medium Prison, Nairobi West Government of Kenya (GK) Prison and Langata Women Prison. It was envisaged that the three institutions had better opportunity to enhance rehabilitation because of their proximity to one of the largest industrial areas. The target population for the study was the 800 inmates that served their sentences in the three institutions. The unit of analysis for the study was the individual inmates in each of the three institutions. With 800 inmates as the target population in the three institutions, a sample of 260 was determined through Krejcie and Morgan, 1970 table; which was adjusted upwards by 10% to address non-responses resulting to a total sample of 286.

In this respect, the goal was to obtain representative samples in which the sample research data corresponded to the particulars, characteristics and experiences of the entire population (Smith, 2013; Groves, 2010; Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). In view of the required total sample of 286, a proportional sample size of 67 was obtained from the Nairobi Industrial Area (Medium) prison, 109 from Nairobi West Prison and 110 from Langata Women Prison to reflect the proportion of the inmates in the three institutions.

Gender	Population	Sample Proportion	Sample
Nairobi Medium Prison	150	23.4%	67
Langata Women's prison	350	38.5%	110
Nairobi West men's prison	300	38.1%	109
Total	800	100%	286

Table 1: Sample Distribution

A. SAMPLING

The study used systematic sampling to identify the respondents from each prison institution. Systematic sampling is a statistical method involving selection of elements from an ordered sampling frame, which in this study is the prison register. The sampling starts by selecting an element in the list at random and then every k^{th} element in the frame is selected, where k , the sampling interval is calculated as;

$k = N/n$ (Where n is the sample size, and N is the population size)

Systematic sampling procedure was used to draw the respective samples from the prison register of the three institutions; Nairobi Industrial Area Medium prison at an interval of two, Nairobi West Prison at an interval of three and Langata Women Prison at an interval of three. The aim was to maintain efficiency in carrying out the research, to maintain greater precision, reliability, correct conclusions and generalization (Smith, 2013; Groves, 2010).

B. DATA COLLECTION, METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

Interviews were carried-out with targeted key informants (15) using a key informant interview guide to solicit strategic qualitative information necessary to facilitate greater understanding of the issues being examined. The key informants were identified officers/ senior administrators from the three prison institutions. In addition, three focus group discussions (FGD) were carried-out with a sub-sample of the prison warders with a view of establishing their exposure to the rehabilitation, the institutions programmes, capability, sustainability and related challenges. Use of FGD has various advantages that include eliminating perceptions related to intrusion and/or threat to respondents (Krueger & Casey, 2000). A survey questionnaire was administered to the identified sample of the prison inmates from Nairobi Industrial Area (Medium) Prison, Nairobi West Prison and the Langata Women Prison to obtain data on their exposure to the rehabilitation programme, their characteristics, and expectations after release and related challenges. The questionnaire had both open-ended and structured questions intended to generate data, which was subjected to statistical analysis.

IV. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. KEY REHABILITATION OUTCOMES

The study sought to examine prerelease rehabilitation outcomes; towards reduction of re-offending risks and preparedness for reintegration to the community environment. Accordingly, the study assessed outcomes of key prerelease indicators that included; compliance to institutional rules, participation of inmates in the design of their respective rehabilitation plan, rehabilitation response to key challenges underlying commission of crime and subsequent conviction, key knowledge and skills acquired during rehabilitation which were necessary in addressing the underlying challenges, access to apprenticeship, engagement on productive activities, exposure to employment experience, opportunity to engage with prospective employers, opportunity to visit the family with a view to maintain support, the level in which the inmates were prepared for release and whether the inmates made after release plans. Study results are shown in table 2 below.

Prerelease Indicators	Low/limited compliance knowledge or access		Moderate/partial compliance knowledge or access	Substantial agreement knowledge or access		
Witnessed reduction on rules breaking	35	32	20	10	3	100% (286)
Participation on rehabilitation plan	38	35	18	5	4	100% (286)
Rehabilitation response to key challenges	41	40	11	5	3	100% (286)
Key knowledge /skills developed	30	32	18	12	8	100% (286)
Experience of access to apprenticeship	40	43	10	5	2	100% (286)
Engaged on productive activities	32	30	21	10	7	100% (286)
Exposed to employment experience	33	30	21	9	7	100% (286)
Engaged with prospective employers	42	45	8	3	2	100% (286)
Opportunity to visit family	45	43	12	0	0	100% (286)
Experience of release preparation (planning)	42	41	10	7	0	100% (286)
Experience of inmates on after release risk reduction	44	43	13	0	0	100% (286)

Table 2: Prerelease Rehabilitation Outcomes

In line with the foregoing, we examined reduction of the tendency towards rule breaking (institutional infractions, deviance) as an indicator of effective rehabilitation and a useful indicator of post release outcome (Cochran & Mears 2020, Auty & Alison Liebling 2017, UNODC 2017, Crewe 2013, Miceli 2009, Camp et al., 2003; Gillian 1985). This was also consistent with the perspectives of life course and desistance perspectives in which good conduct during rehabilitation has been considered necessary as part of the

preparation for life after release (Colby 2012, Warren 2007, Camp et al., 2003). In this study, 67% of the respondents indicated that they experienced limited (or low) reduction of the tendency to rule breaking; or compliance to the institutional rules. In other words, they reported increased tendency to rule breakings, infractions, deviance to the rules or conflicts with the rules. The remaining 33% indicated that they experienced moderate to substantial compliance to the institutional rules. Although rule compliance was associated primarily with safety and order at the institution, it was also considered important for learning, rehabilitation and also prediction of the rehabilitation outcomes. These observations were consistent with previous studies; particularly compliance of inmates to institutional rules in developing countries (De Claire and Dixon 2015, Steiner & Wooldredge 2018, Crewe 2013). Steiner & Wooldredge observed that perceived legitimacy of the institution and guards reduced infractions. Further, we examined participation of inmates in the design of their respective rehabilitation plan. It will be recalled that the perspectives of Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR), desistance and socio-economic vulnerability envisage classification, analysis and determination of the challenges that pushed inmates to committing crime and to encourage inmates to participate in the design of their respective rehabilitation plans. However, out of 286 respondents 76% reported low participation in design of the rehabilitation plan; and included those who did not agree with the rehabilitation plan, and those who were not consulted.

In essence, most of the rehabilitation measures were quasi-mandatory; inmate had to participate in something to be occupied. Such outcome appears to be a typical scenario in some regions, particularly in developing countries (Murhula & Singh 2019, Duwe 2017, Seigafo 2017, UNODC 2017, Baffour 2016, SSanyu 2014, Miceli 2009, Dissel 2008). In making similar observation, Dissel reported that the high rate of recidivism will continue in South Africa because of either negligible participation, discontent, non-existent or minimal type of rehabilitation of offenders in virtually all phases (Dissel 2008).

From the perspective of the RNR, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability, response of the rehabilitation to key challenges that pushed inmates to committing crime and subsequent conviction would be an important outcome. In this study, 81% of the respondents reported that rehabilitation process did not address the key (underlying) challenges associated with committing crime, conviction and finally ending up at the correction institution. The study established that the duration of the sentence, registration and assessment during admission were used for general classification, operation and assignment of duties. Indeed, sentence duration was more instrumental in allocation of duties.

However, these three procedures were not used to identify the key challenge (issue) that had led the inmates to commit the crime, to be convicted and eventually ending up at the correction institution. It was emphasized through key informant and FGDs that no instrument was used to support allocation of inmates to the intervention sessions. According to the FGDs, the interest of the inmate was more fundamental in choosing rehabilitation sessions. It was also noted that the interests of the inmates kept changing (or shifting) between

the sessions. This outcome had been reported to be common in most of the developing countries, particularly those in Sub Sahara Africa (Ngozwana 2017, SSanyu 2014, Dissel 2008). The study examined new knowledge and skills as emphasized in the RNR, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability perspectives and considered as important outcomes of incarceration and rehabilitation. Out of the 286 respondents, 62% reported that they experienced limited new knowledge or skills that they would use to address some of the challenges that they had faced leading to association with the crime, conviction and ending up at the correction institution. We were informed by the key informants and FGDs that structured learning were extremely limited. Intervention sessions were broad and general. Conversely, 38% reported experiencing modest to substantial new knowledge or skills that would help them address the challenges that they had faced leading to association with the crime, conviction and ending up at the correction institution. Again, this outcome has been reported to be common in most of the developing countries (Murhula & Singh 2019, Ngozwana 2017, SSanyu 2014, Muteti 2008). Exceptions have been reported on rehabilitation model in Nordic Countries where a higher percentage of inmates are reported to acquire substantial new knowledge and skills to address their life challenges (Coates 2016, Gumi 2014, Diseth et al 2009).

From the perspective of the desistance and socio-economic vulnerability, access to apprenticeship is an important outcome of the rehabilitation. It provides inmates with three key components 1) valuable skills 2) on the job training and 3) some payments to meet basic needs. It has been emphasized that apprenticeships provide incarcerated population the opportunity to gain valuable skills, credential that could be marketable in the broader labor market, and opportunity to connect with potential employers. In this study, 82% of the respondent indicated that they had no access to any apprenticeship during the period of serving their sentences and rehabilitation sessions. Key informants and FGDs indicated that it was rare and almost impossible to see any arrangement or provision for inmates to access apprenticeship. Although such outcome is a common feature in developing countries, particularly those in Africa, it is a situation that is opposite to prevailing practices and outcomes in some of the developed countries particularly USA, Britain, Germany and virtually all the Nordic countries (Coates 2016, McGrew & Hanks 2017, SSanyu 2014, Gumi 2014, Diseth et al 2009, Muteti 2008). However, the key challenge of the apprenticeship in the developed countries is the issue of severely low payment per hour or day (McGrew & Hanks, 2017).

The principle of productive activities has been important to incarceration and to the theories of rehabilitation particularly life course, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability. In this study while 62% reported that they were not engaged in productive activities, 38% reported that they were engaged in productive activities. Key informants and FGDs reported that activities in the correction institutions fall in three categories 1) maintenance of the institution 2) community services and 3) commercial productions (industries). Inmates were distributed to these activities on a rotational basis. The 3rd set of activities were considered and reported by inmates as productive because in some cases they

include a token percentage awarded to inmates. Accordingly, the situation of a token percentage of the product proceeds may have accounted for those reporting productive activities. According to the key informants and the FGDs, part of the challenge on the commercial productions (or industries) was that the arrangement was informal less standardized and remained negligible. The principle of employment experience is central to the theory of desistance and socio-economic vulnerability. More specifically, a number of studies have demonstrated positive relation between employment and desistance from crime (Pager & Western 2009, Visher et al 2008, Vigne et al 2008, Uggen, 2000). In this study 63% of the respondents indicated that they were not exposed to employment experience and 37% reported that they were exposed to varied forms of employment experience.

Key informants and FGDs revealed that those exposed to employment experience were through commercial productions. The study sought to determine the extent to which inmates were able to have opportunity to engage prospective employers. It will be recalled that such opportunity is an important part of the social capital, which in turn is an important part of the desistance theory and socio-economic vulnerability. In response, 87% of the respondents indicated that they were not given opportunity to engage prospective employers. A survey in USA showed that between 60% to 75% of the released inmates remained without employment for more than three (3) years and contributed to reoffending (Pager & Western 2009, Travis 2005, Petersilia 2003). In addition, family preparedness has been considered as a critical component of rehabilitation, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability.

More specifically, research studies have demonstrated that existence and maintenance of strong family relation reduces the likelihood of re-offending and successful reintegration into the community (De Claire & Dixon 2015, Niven & Stewart 2005, Hairston 1988). Benefits beyond recidivism include improved level of social adjustment during imprisonment and after release (Casey-Avecedo & Bakken, 2002). However, in this study up to 88% of the respondents indicated that they were not given opportunity to visit their respective families in preparation to their release. Preparation for release has been considered as a critical aspect of rehabilitation, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability. In view of such importance, other jurisdictions and institutions have adopted work release centers as part of pre-release rehabilitation, apprenticeship, work experience and family preparedness (Duwe 2017, Bales et al 2016, Visher et al 2008, Vigne et al 2008, Griffiths 2007, Solomon 2004). Work release centers (WRC) are essentially a prison-to-community transition programme. However, in this study 83% of the respondents indicated that they had not experienced any preparation towards their release. Key informants and FGDs indicated that preparation for release is considered as a responsibility of the individual inmates including initial transport, housing and basic needs. The study examined experience of inmates with respect to after release risk reduction as envisaged in desistance and socio-economic vulnerability perspectives. The modern concept of rehabilitation envisages support to the inmate beyond the corridors of the correction institutions. It includes provisions

for a phased release, and follow-up assistance to support transport, housing, access to basic needs, healthcare, continuity in education, business development and/or access to durable employment (PRI 2018, Duwe 2017, Chikadzi 2017, James 2015, Rocha 2012, Davis et al 2012, Vigne et al 2008, Borzycki 2005, Gaynes 2005).

Out of the 286 respondents (table 4.1.11), 87% indicated that they had limited experience on after release risk reduction, to support their re-entry to the community and to sustain their release. Indeed, various reports indicate that although reintegration has been embraced as a vital component of a comprehensive rehabilitation, ex-offenders continue to encounter a wide range of challenges that weaken reduction of reoffending risks and predispose ex-offenders to recidivism (Chikadzi 2017, James 2015, Vigne et al 2008, Borzycki 2005).

B. VALUES DEVELOPED IN PRISON

In addition to the foregoing key rehabilitation outcomes, we examined values as aspects of core interest that inmates developed while in prison. Rehabilitation is a process that involves in part instilling new values (key core interests) to inmates including those related to respect for the law, respect for others, self-respect and capacity for crime free livelihoods (Cullen 2013, Dissel 2012, Day & Ward 2009, Blakely 2007, Ward & Maruna, 2007, Conley 1992). According to these authors, usually, it is considered important for inmates to make a living beyond mere subsistence. In this respect, it is expected that such capability enable inmates to pursue meaningful and sustainable reforms. This study sought to find out the key values the inmates had developed while in prison, the responses were presented in table 3 below.

Values	Frequency	Percent
Moral responsibility to others	87	37
Self-respect, esteem & confidence	67	28
Religious values	54	23
Interpersonal skills	30	13
Subtotal	238	100
Missing	48	
Total	286	

Table 3: Key Values Developed in Prison

Out of 238 valid respondents, majority (37%) reported developing moral responsibility to others, 28% self-respect, and confidence, 23% religious values and 13% interpersonal skills. It was promising that majority indicated that they had developed conviction for moral responsibility to others and probably which also included respect for the law. It was also promising that a considerable proportion reported self-respect which could include crime free livelihoods. Key informants and FGDs reported that other values included anger management, tolerance, and knowledge of being more careful in the society. In addition, they reported that the challenge was not so much on the values but the capability for self-independence and ability for crime free livelihoods.

C. COMPETENCIES DEVELOPED IN PRISON

In order to have further understanding of the new knowledge /skills developed, we also examined specific

competencies considered to have been developed by inmates while serving in prison. It was envisaged and predicted that it would include life support competencies necessary for sustainable livelihood and development (Costelloe, 2014, Rampey & Keiper, 2016). Results were presented in table 4 below.

Competencies	Frequency	Percent
Entrepreneurship skills and practices	83	40
Welding, Carpentry & Construction	36	18
Teaching , preaching & Counseling	32	16
Clothing and textile	23	11
Farming, and agro-business	21	10
Formal education	10	05
Sub-total	205	100
Missing	81	
Total	286	

Table 4: Competencies developed in prison

From the valid respondents of 205, 40% reported entrepreneurship skills, 18% reported welding, carpentry and construction, 16% reported teaching and counseling skills, 11% reported competencies on clothing and textile, and 10% reported skills on farming, and agro-business while 5% reported formal education. FGD in the three prison institutions reported that among the competencies developed include masonry, joinery and carpentry, welding, and upholstery. It appears that these skill sets could have provided a way for further rehabilitation including transitional rehabilitation and after release support services. Rampey and Keiper (2016) reported development of competencies that included, among others, highest level of education completed by incarcerated adults during their incarceration, enrollment in academic classes and job skills or job training programme.

D. PLANS TO SUSTAIN LIVELIHOOD AFTER RELEASE

The study also examined the post release plans that inmates had developed while serving in prison. The results were summarized in table 5 below.

Plan	Frequency	Percent
Start business	105	38
Teaching & Counseling	60	22
Building, Carpentry, welding & related careers	51	19
Dressmaking/tailoring	25	09
Farming	23	08
Formal education	6	02
Find employment	3	01
Sub-total	273	100
Missing	13	
Total	286	

Table 5: Expected plans to sustain livelihood after release

Accordingly, the study found out that plans included starting a business (38%), engaging in teaching and counseling (22%), carpentry and welding (19%), dressmaking and tailoring (9%), farming (8%) among others. In essence these inmates were aware and had plans on what they could do after release from the correction institution. Key informants and FGDs reported that the key challenge was capability to

actually put in place and sustain the plan that could support them and their families; and at the same time keep them away from conflicts with the law.

E. EXPECTED SUSTAINABILITY OF AFTER RELEASE PLANS

The study examined the confidence of inmates on the sustainability of the after release plans, their confidence on reoffending risk reduction and crime free livelihoods. Responses were presented in table 6.

Percent rating of confidence on after release plan	Frequency	Percent
Less than 30%	118	41
Between 30-49%	75	26
Between 50-69%	55	19
Over 70%	43	14
Total	286	100

Table 6: Rating of confidence on Sustainability of after Release Plans

Out of 286 respondents, majority (67%) did not have confidence that their after release plans would be sustained, 19% had modest confidence and only 14% had confidence that their after release plans would be sustained. These results indicate that while inmates had some hope, they also had doubts on their capability to put in place and sustain their after release plans, Key informants and FGD indicated that most of the inmates came from poor background with limited capability to execute plans towards modern business.

F. CHALLENGES TO IMPROVED REHABILITATION OUTCOMES

The study sought to identify key challenges to effective rehabilitation and necessary intervention measures. In order to address this objective, respondents were requested to identify key challenges (barriers) to achieving or improving their reform efforts. Key responses were summarized in Table 7 below.

Key challenges/barriers	Frequencies	Percent
Congestions and Poor Sanitation	88	31
Limited facilities and Personnel	68	24
Poor health, Stress and homesickness	47	17
Inadequate time devoted to rehabilitation	35	12
Corporal Punishment	27	10
Discrimination/Corruption	10	04
Other (Language, Lack of information & beliefs)	7	02
Total	283	100.0
Missing	3	

Table 7: Barriers to improved Rehabilitation Outcomes

Key barriers reported by the respondents included congestion and poor sanitation (31%), limited facilities and personnel (24%), poor health, stress and homesickness (17%), inadequate time devoted to rehabilitation (12%), corporal punishment (10%), discrimination/corruption (04%) and other challenges accounted for 2%. This study finding is similar to

other research findings (Hawley & Murphy, 2013; Abrifor et al., 2012; Soyombo, 2009; Wilson, 2008; Sarkin, 2008) which indicated that under funding, high prison population and overcrowding; particularly in developing countries continue to be among the key barriers to effective rehabilitation outcomes. Further to the need to identify the challenges, respondents were requested to rate the extent to which congestion and poor sanitation obstructed their efforts to reform as shown in table 8.

Rating of Congestion	Frequencies	Percent
High obstruction	197	70
Low obstruction	52	18
No obstruction	34	12
Total	283	100.0
Missing	3	

Table 8: Congestion and Poor Sanitation

Majority (70%) of the respondents indicated that congestion and poor sanitation had a high obstruction to rehabilitation outcomes, 18% indicated low obstruction while 12% indicated no obstruction. This study finding is similar to other research findings (Musyoka 2013, Omboto 2013 and Amanda, 2006) which observed that overcrowding and congestion, poor diet, poor sanitation, degrading clothing and beddings, lack of clean water, inadequate availability of resources and inadequate professional skills by prison officers among others largely affect rehabilitation outcomes. Similarly, respondents were requested to rate the extent to which limited facilities and personnel obstructed their efforts to reform and responses were presented in table 9.

Rating of facilitators	Frequencies	Percent
High obstruction	163	58
Low obstruction	73	25
No obstruction	47	17
Total	283	100.0
Missing	3	

Table 9: Limited Facilities and Personnel

Majority of the respondents (58%) indicated that limited facilities and personnel had high obstruction to rehabilitation outcomes, 25% indicated low obstruction while 17% indicated no obstruction. The findings of this study is similar to a study carried out by Omboto (2013) which reported that inadequate professional personnel is a barrier to effective rehabilitation outcomes. He observed that both junior and senior prison officers are not people of integrity and are not well educated and specifically trained to handle rehabilitation. Rehabilitation requires in-depth understanding of human behavior, human growth and human destiny. In addition, respondents were requested to rate the extent to which poor health, stress and homesickness obstructed their efforts to reform and responses were presented in table 10.

Rating of facilitators	Frequencies	Percent
High obstruction	138	49
Low obstruction	91	33
No obstruction	52	18
Total	283	100
Missing	3	

Table 10: Poor Health, Stress and Homesickness

Majority (49%) of the respondents indicated that poor health, stress and homesickness had high obstruction to effective rehabilitation outcomes, 33% indicated low obstruction while 18% indicated no obstruction. Respondents were also requested to rate the extent to which time allocated to rehabilitation programmes obstructed their efforts to reform and responses were presented in table 11.

Rating of time allocation	Frequencies	Percent
High obstruction	146	52
Low obstruction	80	28
No obstruction	55	20
Total	281	100.0
Missing	5	

Table 11: Time Allocation

In view of the above data, majority (52%) of the respondents indicated that time allocated to rehabilitation programmes had high obstruction to rehabilitation outcomes, 28% indicated low obstruction while 20% indicated no obstruction. The findings were supported by key informants and focused group discussions who indicated that rehabilitation exist largely in paper but in practice given limited attention because of a wide range of challenges. Respondents were also requested to rate the extent to which corporal punishment obstructed their efforts to reform and responses were presented in table 12.

Rating of facilitators	Frequencies	Percent
High obstruction	88	31.1
Low obstruction	143	50.5
No obstruction	52	18.4
Total	283	100
Missing	3	

Table 12: Corporal punishment

Majority (50.5%) of the respondents indicated that corporal punishment had low obstruction to effective rehabilitation outcomes, 31.1% indicated high obstruction while 18.4% had no obstruction. Part of the sub-objectives of the objective six was to identify necessary interventions to improve rehabilitation outcomes. In view of this sub-objective, respondents were requested to propose immediate intervention measures to improve rehabilitation and responses were represented in Table 13.

Intervention Measures	Frequencies	Percent
Improve facilities and personnel	135	48
Expand rehabilitation measures (including short courses & options)	70	25
Improve welfare of prison wardens	36	13
Address decongestion	20	07
Allocate enough funds for rehabilitation measures	15	05
Develop after release follow-up	7	02
Total	283	100
Missing	3	

Table 13: Proposed Intervention Measures

Majority (48%) of the respondents proposed improved facilities and personnel, 25% proposed expansion of rehabilitation programmes, 13% improve welfare of prison warders, 7% proposed decongestion of prison facilities, 5%

increased funding for rehabilitation while 2% proposed developing after release follow up. The findings are consisted with the UNODC (2017) report, which indicated that for rehabilitation to be successful a comprehensive and a truly rehabilitative regime needs to be put in place. Meeting the basic needs of prisoners, providing decent living conditions, addressing healthcare needs, ensuring constructive relationship between prison staff and prisoners and ensuring the provision of post release support and supervision are fundamental requirements for successful rehabilitation.

Further, measures proposed to improve rehabilitation outcomes by the FGDs carried out in the three prison institutions were found to: 1) To incorporate inmate characteristics and interests in the rehabilitation policy framework, procedures and expected outcomes; with a view to tap talent, enhance specialization, minimize conflicts and/or contradictions, 2) Women facilities including Langata will need to be given special attention in rehabilitation practices because of unique needs for the women inmates, 3) To document and to implement policies on rehabilitation, procedures and required outcomes, 4) To incorporate the role of the donors on the rehabilitation policy framework, operations and expected outcomes; with a view to enhance resources towards rehabilitation, 5) To put in place measures to modernize prison institutions, expand programmes, facilities, rehabilitation resources and personnel, 6) To put in place measures to improve capacity of the personnel, training, remuneration and standards corresponding to a given number of inmates and; 7) To put in place mechanisms to enforce follow up programme after release on a regular and sustainable ways. Although the importance and the virtues of rehabilitation were recognized, implementation went against many odds including lack of rehabilitation policy, inadequate infrastructure and resources, inadequate funding and inadequate personnel.

Records, interviews and the discussions indicated that officers in charge of the institution determines the nature of the rehabilitation programmes offered and mobilizes necessary resources for the programmes. Records, interviews and the FGDs indicated the need to classify rehabilitation programmes based on age and any other relevant criteria. A policy framework with such classification would address a number of issues including relevance and matching rehabilitation with the characteristics of the inmates. It will also address the challenge of the remandees that have been in custody for more than three (3) months.

V. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that rehabilitation outcomes were substantially limited or inadequate in all indicators including compliance to institutional rules, participation of inmates in the design of their respective rehabilitation plans, rehabilitation response to key challenges underlying commission of crime and subsequent conviction, key knowledge and skills acquired during rehabilitation which were necessary in addressing the underlying challenges, access to apprenticeship, engagement on productive activities, exposure to employment experience, opportunity to engage

with prospective employers, opportunity to visit the family with a view to maintain support, the level in which the inmates were prepared for release and whether the inmates made after release plans.

Although they had after release plans, most of the inmates did not have confidence on either their success or sustainability. These characteristics were consistent with those of the life course perspective and socio-economic vulnerability theory; where the early phases of life have typically been associated with socio-economic risks leading to increased crime risks, rehabilitation challenges and reoffending tendencies. Socio economic vulnerability maintains a view that certain characteristics that include limited education, vocational skills, seasonal occupation or unemployment, poverty, unstable family background and inadequate social support promote crime tendencies, limited responses to rehabilitation and outcomes; including prerelease preparedness and post release reoffending, reconviction and return to incarceration (recidivism). More specifically, poverty as a component of socio-economic vulnerability and as inability to meet basic needs has been associated with increased crime rate, imprisonment inadequate rehabilitation and subsequent reoffending. The types of rehabilitation practices in the study institutions included; individual counseling service, peer counseling service, religious counseling service, formal education, vocational rehabilitation and commercial and mentorship. The leading practices (above average) on daily participation included Commercial and mentorship, vocational rehabilitation and religious rehabilitation; participation in the rest were minimal (below average). Similarly, the leading practices (above average) in respect of usefulness included; religious rehabilitation, commercial and mentorship, and vocational rehabilitation; and usefulness in the rest was minimal (below average). The study also concluded that some of the key challenges included congestions and poor sanitation, limited facilities and personnel, poor health, stress and homesickness, inadequate time allocated to rehabilitation, corporal punishment and discrimination/corruption.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ENHANCED REHABILITATION POLICY

In view of limited rehabilitation outcomes, limited institutional capacity and increased vulnerabilities of the inmates, the study recommended that the rehabilitation policy should be reviewed and enhanced to 1) strengthen rehabilitation along the UN guidelines including 2015 minimum rules and the various roadmaps; 2) ensure provision of adequate resources particularly in terms of personnel, facilities, equipment and budgetary allocations, 3) incorporate and expand prison industries in order to expand apprenticeship, work experience and to generate revenue which can be shared with the inmate, 4) encourage collaboration with development partners to supplement technical capacity and the budget; 5) adopt a rehabilitation plan for each inmate incorporating post-release support follow up; and 6) incorporate risks and needs of the inmates into the rehabilitation plans.

B. REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT

In addition, it was recommended that department of rehabilitation be strength in ways that 1) each institution will have adequate core and qualified staff that would be responsible for the entire process of rehabilitation; i.e. from admission to post-release support, 2) they have a budget line in the overall prison budget to support the operations, and 3) ability to coordinate resources from the development partners. In view of persistently limited allocation and increasing needs, a mechanism could be established towards sustainable financing of prisons. In keeping with the international practices and standards, a mechanism will need to be established towards direct financing of rehabilitation programmes. In order to enhance capacity to upgrade (or scale up) rehabilitation, the prison department needs to promote, adapt and engage collaboration or partnerships with development or humanitarian agencies. This will be necessary to enhance financial and technical capacity towards design, development, execution and evaluation of the rehabilitation programmes. In addition, the Kenya Prison Service (KPS) should consider collaborating with private industries to offer employment opportunities to inmates while still in incarceration and after release. Taking into consideration the conditions of labour and minimum wages. This will ensure that the prison inmates are able to take care of their responsibilities while in prison and sustainable livelihood after release.

C. EXPANSION OF PRISON INDUSTRIES

Accordingly, it was recommended that prison industries be expanded and commercialized with a view to expand apprenticeship, work experience and to generate revenue which can be shared with the inmate, Example include expanding commercial and mentorship which exist in Langata Women Prison. Besides providing apprenticeship and work experience to the inmates, they will enhance resources available to the institutions. The prison authorities should also come up with a mechanism to enable prisoners to have a personal account in which to save money for their release.

These requirements form part of the principle of normalization of prison life, which should underpin all working arrangements in prisons, including normal working hours, health and safety considerations, adequate remuneration and inclusion of prisoners in the national social security system. It will hosting open days and employers' fairs to showcase the training and work that they provide. This will help in marketing inmates who receive vocational training in prisons and encourage employers in the community to employ people with a criminal history is to ensure successful employment outcomes and prevent recidivism.

D. THE PROCESS OF RISKS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

In view of the fact that the prevailing practices do not take into account the risks, vulnerabilities and needs of the inmates, it was recommended that the process of assessing the risks and needs of the inmates be streamlined and strengthened with a

view to enable institutions to understand the nature of the socio-economic vulnerabilities, and to link those risks and needs with the rehabilitation plan and practices; and eventually to improve rehabilitation outcomes.

E. REHABILITATION PLAN AND SUPPORT

The study also recommended the need to establish a rehabilitation plan for each inmate, which will be used to guide rehabilitation, to build required support and post-release follow-up. Such plan and support should be able to guide pre and post-release rehabilitation, provide inmates with start capacity and to offset vulnerabilities that could cause relapse into reoffending.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abrifor, C. A., Atere, A. A. & Muoghalu, C. O. (2012). Gender differences, trends and patterns of recidivism among inmates in selected Nigerian prisons. *European Scientific Journal*, 8 (24), 25, doi.org/10.19044/esj.2012.v8n24p%25p
- [2] Achode, M.M. (2012). The socio-economic characteristics of women offenders at Lang'ata Women's Prison, Nairobi. (Unpublished Thesis), University of Nairobi, Nairobi.
- [3] Agasa, E. O. (2011). The effects of imprisonment on inmates in Kenya: The case of industrial area remand and Langata women's prison.
- [4] Aghan, P.L. (2016). The association between custodial rehabilitation and recidivism of male prisoners in Kenya: The Case of Nairobi Remand Home.
- [5] Akers, R. L. & Sellers, C. S. (2004). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application* (4th ed)
- [6] Akers, R. L. (1973). *Deviant Behaviour: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont: Wadsworth. Anderson Publishing.
- [7] Allen, R. (2010). *Current situation of prison overcrowding: International centre for prison studies*. London, UK.
- [8] Altschuler, D., & Bilchik, S. (2014, April 21). *Critical Elements of Juvenile Reentry in Research and Practice*. Retrieved October 11, 2016, from Justice Center: The Council of State Governments. Retrieved from <http://csgjusticecenter.org/youth/posts/critical-elements-of-juvenile-reentry-inresearch-and-practice>.
- [9] Andrews, D. A. & Dowden, C. (2007). The risk-need-responsivity model of assessment and human service in prevention and corrections: Crime-prevention jurisprudence. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
- [10] Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J. & Wormith, S.J. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime and Delinquency*.
- [11] Austin, J., Wendy, N., & Tony, F. (2007). *The 2006 national prison population forecast*. Report of the JFA Institute. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trust.

- [12] Awilly, C.A. (2015) Factors in Prison Classification & Risk Assessment. Washington DC: National Institute of Correction
- [13] Awuor, C.A. (2015). Factors Influencing Recidivism of Offenders: The Case of Kingongo Prison Nyeri County. (Unpublished MA Thesis); University of Nairobi, Nairobi.
- [14] Ayuk A.A. (2012). Security Parody: A paper presented on the inauguration of the Executive of National Social Work Student of Calabar. Unpublished
- [15] Baldry, E., & Maplestone, P. (2003) "Prisoners' post-release homelessness and lack of social integration." *Current Issues in Criminology* 15(2), 155-169.
- [16] Bailey, D.K. (2008). *Methods of Social Research*. Fourth Ed. Free Press
- [17] Baldry, E., (2003). The effect of post-release housing on prisoner re-integration into the community. In S. O'Toole, Eyland, S., Ed (2005). *Correctional Criminology* (p. 180 – 186), Sydney: Hawkins Press.
- [18] Bales, W.D. & Mears, D.P. (2008). "Inmate social ties and the transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism?" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. Sage Publishers. USA
- [19] Benda, B.B. (2005). Gender differences in life-course theory of recidivism: A survival analysis. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49, (3), 325-342.
- [20] Brennan Centre for Justice (2017). *Crime trends 1990-2016*. New York.
- [21] Bureau of Justice Statistic (2016). *Crime trends*. New York.
- [22] Johnson, B.R., Larson, D.B., & Pitts, T. C. (1997). Religious Programs, Institutional Adjustment, and Recidivism among Former Inmates in Prison Fellowship Programs. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(1)
- [23] Campbell, A. (2002). *A mind of her own: The evolutionary psychology of women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [24] Carlen, P. (1989). Review of women, crime, and poverty. *Journal of Law and Society*, 16, (4), 521-524.
- [25] Champion, D.J. (2001). *Introduction to corrections: philosophy, goals, and history: A contemporary perspective*, (3rd Edition).
- [26] Cohen, B.H., & Lea, B. R. (2004). *Essentials for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons; Hoboken. New Jersey.
- [27] Costelloe, A. (2014). "Learning for liberation, teaching for transformation: can education in prison prepare prisoners for active citizenship?" *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies*: 14.
- [28] Cullen, F.T. (2013). Rehabilitation: Beyond Nothing Works". *Crime and Justice*, 42:299-376
- [29] Cullen, F.T. & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation policy, practice, and prospects. *Criminal Justice*, 32 109-175.
- [30] Cullen, F.T., & Newsome, J. (2017). The Risk Need-Responsivity Model Revisited: Using Biosocial Criminology to Enhance Offender Rehabilitation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44:8, 1030-1049.
- [31] Dammer, H.R. (2000). *Religion in Corrections*. Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- [32] Dammer, H.R. (2002). *Religion in Corrections*. The University of Scranton.
- [33] Dennison, R. (2013). Sentence length and recidivism: Are longer incarcerations the solution to high rates of reoffending?
- [34] Durkheim, (E. 1961). *The Elementary form of religion life*. New York. Macmillan Books
- [35] Fine, M., Torre, E.M., & Boudin, K. (2001). *Changing: The impact of college in a maximum-security prison*. New York: The Graduate Research Centre of the City University of New York.
- [36] Fleisher, B. M., (1966). The effect of income in delinquency. *American Economic Review*; 13, 56-79.
- [37] Gaes, G. (2008). The impact of prison education on post-release outcomes. New York: John Jay College of Criminal Justice. <http://www.urban.org/projects/reentry-roundtable/upload/Gaes.pdf>.
- [38] Gani, A. & Jean-Philippe, P. (2014). Religion, culture, and development: *Handbook of Economics Art and Culture*. Vol 2, ISSN 1574-0676, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53776-8.00021-0>
- [39] Gathu, J. (2012). Three thousand march for CBI in Kenya. Retrieved from <http://www.cbi.fm/wp.content>
- [40] Gideon, L., & Sung, H.-E. (2011). *Rethinking Corrections: Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Reintegration*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc
- [41] Government of Kenya (1977). *Prison Act CAP 90*. Revised Edition 1977. Nairobi: Government Printing Press.
- [42] Government of Kenya, (2008). *The high level committee report on prisons crisis*. Nairobi: Government Printing Press.
- [43] Grella, C.E., L. Rodriguez. (2011). Motivation for treatment among women offenders in prison-based treatment and longitudinal outcomes among those who participate in community aftercare. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, Supplement 7:58-67*
- [44] Hall, L.L. (2015). *Correctional Education & Recidivism: Towards a Tool Reduction*, *Journal of correctional education* 66(2) 4
- [45] *Handbook on Women and Imprisonment* (2014). Criminal justice handbook series United Nations office on drugs and crime. Vienna.
- [46] Hans-Joerg, A. (2012). Prison overcrowding – Finding effective solutions strategies and best practices against overcrowding in correctional facilities. Max Planck Institute For Foreign and International Criminal Law.
- [47] Harlow, C. (2003). "Education and Correctional Populations." U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. USA.
- [48] Hawley, J & Murphy, I. (2013). *Prison education and training in Europe: Current state-of-play and challenges*. A summary report authored for the European Commission: GHK Consulting.
- [49] Hesse, C.A., & Ofosu, J.B. (2018). *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. Akrong Publishers, Accra, Ghana.
- [50] Hoyles, J. (1955). *Religion in Prison: Zimbabwe*: Epworth Publishers.

- [51]Hucklesby, A. A., (2004). Sentencing and court processes in Munice J. Wilson D (eds). Student Handbook of Criminal Justice and Criminology.
- [52]Ikunda, A. (2016). Factors influencing dismissal of criminal cases in Kenyan courts: A case study of Mavoko law courts, Machakos.
- [53]Israel G.D. (2004). Determining Sample Size: IFAS Extension. University of Florida, USA.
- [54]Jacobson, J., Heard, C. & Fair, H. 2017). Prison; Evidence of its use and over-use from around the world. Institute for Criminal Policy Research (ICPR).
- [55]Jolley, M. (2017). Rehabilitating Prisoners: the place of basic life skills programmes. Safer communities 17: 1, 1-10
- [56]Kajstura, A. (2018). State of Women's Incarceration: The Global Context. Prison Policy Initiative. USA.
- [57]Katz, M.H. (2016). Multivariate Analysis – A practical Gide for Clinicians. 2nd ED. Cambridge University Press. USA
- [58]Kenya prisons (2009). Needs assessment for developing educational and vocational training programs for inmates in Kenya, 2009. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- [59]Kenya Prisons Service, (2005). Strategic Plan 2005-2009. Government Press, Nairobi, Kenya
- [60]Kim, S., (2003). Incarcerated Women in life context. Journal of women's studies; international forum, 26,1,95-100
- [61]Klare, H.J. (1966). Changing concept of crime and its treatment. London: Pergamon Press Ltd. London.
- [62]Kling, J.TR. (1999). The effects of prison sentence length on the subsequent employment and earnings of criminal defendants. Discussion paper in Economics No. 208, Woodrow Wilson School. New Jersey: Princeton University
- [63]Kowalski, B.R. & Bellai, P.E. (2011). Low-skill employment opportunity and African American-white difference in recidivism". Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.
- [64]Krejcie, R & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. New York Free Press.
- [65]La Vigne, N.G, Shollenberg, T., & Debus, S.A (2009). One year out: Tracking the experience of male prisoners returning to Hauston, Texas: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Centre.
- [66]Lance, L. & Moretti, E. (2004). "The effect of education on crime: evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports." American Economic Review, 94,155-189.
- [67]Langan, P.A., & Levin, D.J. (2002). Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- [68]Langan P.A. & Levin, D.J. (2002). Recidivism of Prisoners in 1994: USA Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- [69]Lewis, M.V. (1973) Prison education and rehabilitation: Illusion or reality? A Case Study of an Experimental Program. Institute for Research on Human Resources.
- [70]Lin, N. (2001). Social Capital: A theory of social structure and action. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- [71]MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). Evidence- based corrections: Identifying what works. Crime & Delinquency, 46, 457-471
- [72]Madoka. (2008). Report of the high level committee on the prison crisis. Government Press: Nairobi, Kenya.
- [73]McNeeley, (2017). The effect of neighborhood context on recidivism: Differences based on gender, race, and post-release housing type.
- [74]Miceli, V. (2009). Analyzing the Effectiveness of Rehabilitation Programmes. University of Rhode Island.
- [75]Milkman, H., & Wanberg, K. (2007, May). Cognitive Beahvioral Treatment. Retrieved October 11, 2016, from U.S. Darpetment of Justice: National Institute of Correction: <http://static.nicic.gov/Library/021657.pdf>
- [76]Mutui, P. M. (2017). An Analysis of Challenges facing Kenya Prisoners during their Rehabilitation. University of Strathmore: Nairobi, Kenya.
- [77]Murphy, J. (1995). Punishment and rehabilitation, 3rd ed. Belmont, CA.
- [78]Mwanthi, P.M. (2013). Challenges Associated With Crime Measurement By Police Officers: A Case Study of Nairobi County. University of Nairobi: Nairobi, Kenya.
- [79]National Council on Administration of Justice (NCAJ) (2017). Legal resources foundation trust; criminal justice system in Kenya: An Audit. . National Council on Administration of Justice.
- [80]National Council on the Administration of Justice (NCAJ 2016). Criminal justice system in Kenya: an audit. National Council on Administration of Justice.
- [81]Ndombi, C.S. (2014). Impact of prison rehabilitation programs on recidivists: A case of prisons in the North Rift Region of Kenya. MA, Unpublished
- [82]Nicholson, J. & Higgins, G.E. (2017). Social structure social learning theory: Preventing crime and violence
- [83]O'Connor, T.P., & Perreyclear, M. (2002). Prison religion in action and its influence on offender rehabilitation
- [84]Okanga, G, H. (2014). Effects of prison rehabilitation programs on reformation. Kisumu County.
- [85]Oluyemi, K. & Etannibi, O.A. (2011). An examination of some socio-economic characteristics of inmates of a Nigerian Prison.
- [86]Omboto, J.O. (2013). The challenges facing rehabilitation of prisoners in Kenya and the mitigation strategies: International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
- [87]Ongek M., & Otieno, S.O. (2017). Education for prisoners as a driver for sustainable development in Kenya: International Journal for Innovative Research and Development
- [88]Oruta, E.M. (2016). Socio-Economic factors that influence recidivism in Kakamega County, Kenya: Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization, 47, 2224-3240
- [89]Penal Reform International (PRI 2017). The Global Prison Trends 2017 report. Penal Reform International.
- [90]Pearson, F.S., &Liptin, D.S. (1999). A meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of corrections-based treatment for drug abuse. The Prison Journal, 79, 384-410
- [91]PollocK, J.M. (2003). The rationale for imprisonment
- [92]Rampey, B.D. & Keiper, S. (2016). program for the international assessment of adult competencies: 2014' Highlights from the U.S. PIAAC Survey of Incarcerated

- Adults: Their Skills, Work Experience, Education, and Training.
- [93] Research Brief (2008). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of releases in three states; urban institute. Justice Policy Center.
- [94] Ritzer, G. & Jeffrey, S. (2017). Emile Durkheim. In *Sociological Theory*, (10th ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- [95] Richard, J.S. (1988). *Statistical Reasoning for the Behavioral Sciences*: Needham Heights, MA; Allyn and Bacon.
- [96] Rubin, L. E. (2001). The inevitability of rehabilitation: Law and Inequality: *A Journal of Theory and Practice*. Vol 19, 2. Libraries Publishing, University of Minnesota. USA
- [97] Rusche, G. & Kirchheimer, O. (1939). *Punishment and Social Structure*. New York
- [98] Rutere, S.K. (2003). Factors precipitating recidivistic behavior among the Kenyan prisoners: A sociological interpretation. (M.A Thesis), University of Nairobi, Nairobi.
- [99] Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D. & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology*
- [100] Sarkin, J. (2008). Prisons in Africa: An evaluation from a Human Rights Perspective. *International Human Rights Journal*, 9, (1), 22-49
- [101] Schmitt, J., Warner, K. and Gupta, S. (2010). The high budgetary cost of incarceration: Center for Economic and Policy Research
- [102] Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC) (2014). A study of crime in urban slums in Kenya. SRIC.
- [103] Signe, H. A., Lars, H.A., & Peer, E.S. (2015). Effect of marriage and spousal criminality on recidivism.
- [104] Sikasa, M. N. (2015). Factors Influencing Recidivism Among Convicted Prisoners: A Case Of Langata Women Prison In Nairobi County, Kenya
- [105] Solomon, A. L., Johnson, K. D., Travis, J. & McBride, E. C. (2004). From prison to work: The employment dimensions of prisoner re-entry. A report of the Re-entry Roundtable. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- [106] Soyombo, O. (2009). *Sociology and crime control: That we may live in peace*. An Inaugural lecture delivered at The University of Lagos Press.
- [107] Stahler, G.J., Mennis, J., Belenko, S., & Hiller, M.L.(2013). Predicting Recidivism for Released State Prison Offenders: Examining the Influence of Individual and Neighborhood Characteristics and Spatial Contagion on the Likelihood of Reincarceration.
- [108] Stevens, R., & Cloete, M.G (2010). *Introduction to Criminology*. Oxford University Press, South Africa
- [109] Sumter, M., Wood, F., Whitaker, I. & Berger-Hill, D. (2018). Religion and crime studies: assessing what has been learned. *Religions*, 9(6), 193; <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9060193>
- [110] Tripodi, S.J., Kim, J.S., & Bender, K. (2010). Is employment associated with reduced recidivism? The complex relationship between employment and crime. *International Journal of offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54 (5), 706-720.
- [111] UNHR (1990). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for non-custodial measures (The Tokyo Rules)*. Office of the Higher Commissioner, Geneva.
- [112] UNODC (2011). *Prison Reform and Alternatives to Imprisonment: Concept Note*. Justice Section, Division of Operations. United Nations, Geneva
- [113] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC 2015). *Global Crime Trends*. UNODC
- [114] UNODC (2015). *Addressing the global prison crisis; Strategy 2015/2017*. UNODC.
- [115] UNODC (2018). *Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Integration of Offenders*. United Nations, Vienna.
- [116] UNSMR, (2015). *The Mandela Rules*. E/CN.15/2015/L.6/Rev.1.Durban:South Africa
- [117] Visher, C., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2008). *Employment after Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- [118] Wilson, W., (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- [119] World Prison Brief (2017, 2016 and 2015). *World Female Imprisonment List*. 4th ed. Institute for Criminal Policy Research: Birbeck, University of London. UK