

The Role of Prison Inmates' Socio-Economic Characteristics on Rehabilitation Outcomes

Queenter Ondigo^{1#}, Henry Rono²

^{1,2}Department of Sociology, Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844-00100, Nairobi, Kenya.

#corresponding author


Type of Work: Peer Reviewed.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v16.n4.p1>

How to cite this paper:

Ondigo, Q., Rono, H. (2020). The Role of Prison Inmates' Socio-Economic Characteristics on Rehabilitation Outcomes. *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences* (ISSN 2455-2267), 16(4), 121-138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v16.n4.p1>

© Institute of Research Advances.

 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License subject to a proper citation to the publication source of the work.

Disclaimer: The scholarly papers as reviewed and published by the Institute of Research Advances (IRA) are the views and opinions of their respective authors and are not the views or opinions of the IRA. The IRA disclaims of any harm or loss caused due to the published content to any party.

Institute of Research Advances is an institutional publisher member of *Publishers International Linking Association Inc. (PILA-CrossRef)*, USA. The institute is an institutional signatory to the *Budapest Open Access Initiative*, Hungary advocating the open-access of scientific and scholarly knowledge. The Institute is a registered content provider under *Open Access Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH)*.

The journal is indexed & included in *WorldCat Discovery Service (USA)*, *CrossRef Metadata Search (USA)*, *WorldCat (USA)*, *OCLC (USA)*, *Open J-Gate (India)*, *EZB (Germany)* *Scilit (Switzerland)*, *Airiti (China)*, *Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE) of Bielefeld University, Germany*, *PKP Index of Simon Fraser University, Canada*.

ABSTRACT

Studies continue to report minimal (or negligible) institutional rehabilitation outcomes among the prison inmates serving various offences; particularly in developing countries. Reports indicate that the rate of recidivism and re-conviction is even more acute in some of the regions, particularly Sub-Sahara Africa. The study examined rehabilitation outcomes of the prison inmates and the role of the socio-economic characteristics on those rehabilitation outcomes. The study employed Life course perspective and socio-economic vulnerability theory to identify phases of life typically associated with socio-economic vulnerabilities. The specific objectives of the study were 1) to identify rehabilitation outcomes of the prison inmates; 2) to examine their socio-economic characteristics; and 3) to examine the role (influence) of those characteristics on rehabilitation outcomes in respect to prerelease readiness to lawful livelihoods and community environment. The study was carried-out within three (3) selected correction institutions in Nairobi, Kenya, through a survey design. A sample of 286 subjects was used. Data was collected through key informants, focused group discussions (FGDs) and survey questionnaire. Results indicated that rehabilitation outcomes were substantially limited or inadequate in most of the indicators including compliance to institutional rules, participation of inmates in the design of their respective rehabilitation plans, access to apprenticeship, access to productive activities, exposure to employment experience, opportunity to engage with prospective employers, and opportunity to visit the family with a view to maintain support. Study results indicated that characteristics of the inmates had substantial influence on the rehabilitation outcomes. The study concluded that life course and socio-economic characteristics of the inmates needed to be taken into account in the institutional rehabilitation for the purposes of sustained rehabilitation outcomes.

Keywords: Correction institutions, Inmates, Offences, Post-release, Practices, Pre-release, Rehabilitation outcomes, Socio-economic Characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation has been considered an important and integral component of the institutional management of the convicted offenders. The primary objective of rehabilitation [57] has been to enable inmates to restore (or develop) their capacities to desist crime, sustain lawful livelihoods and to reintegrate into the community as productive citizens. It has also been assumed that those capacities were eroded (or depleted) by circumstances that can be addressed (or changed) to restore eroded capacities. Indeed, rehabilitation of inmates, sustainable release including lawful livelihoods and reintegration to the community environment continue to be key objectives of the correction institutions. A number of authorities [40] continue to emphasize institutional framework that encompasses reforms and rehabilitation of all convicted inmates. 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 livelihoods. Studies continue to report minimal (or negligible) institutional rehabilitation outcomes among the prison inmates serving various offences particularly in developing countries [16,38]. Further, reports indicate that the rate of recidivism and re-conviction has even been more acute in some of the regions, particularly Sub-Sahara Africa [11,15,33]. In view of this persistent challenge, this study examined rehabilitation outcomes of the prison inmates, particularly in respect to prerelease readiness to return to lawful livelihoods and community environment, and the role of the socio-economic characteristics on those rehabilitation outcomes. Indeed, studies reporting optimism indicated that 30% to 40% of rehabilitation had resulted to improved abilities and sustainable release in some areas [16,38,39,40,56,57]. Other studies 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 [15,26,27, 29].

It was noted that: 1) pessimism was confounded by discontent on various aspects of the criminal justice including controversies on sentencing, rehabilitation practices and ideological inclinations; 2) that Martinson had largely misinterpreted the various studies; and 3) subsequent studies provided evidence demonstrating that offender rehabilitation was effective i.e. changed offenders and reduced recidivism, depending on the methods and procedures used [13,19,38,49]. These observations shifted pessimism to optimism; from nothing worked to what worked; optimism on effectiveness of offender. Indeed, a survey of

over 200 studies on rehabilitation conducted from 1981-1987, many of which used data that were more reliable than those of 1970s concluded that offender rehabilitation worked [15,18]. More specifically, studies have reported that 30% to 40% of rehabilitation have been effective in some areas (or regions) and others have maintained that offender rehabilitation has been effective subject to the nature of the interventions and the cooperation of the inmates [16,38,40,47].

Influence of Characteristics of Inmates

Inmate characteristics consisting of age, gender, religion, education, occupation, environmental conditions, employability and work experience, and economic endowment are also considered as socio-economic characteristics [1,17,26,30]. According to these authors, the inmate characteristics influence three phases of crime-rehabilitation cycle 1) risk to commit crime, 2) rehabilitation practices, and 3) rehabilitation outcomes. Available data indicate that most of the female offenders have tended to be characterized by low socio-economic endowment, including low education and occupation, and from poor backgrounds [1,26,52]. A number of studies have reported that despite complex treatment needs, women have continued 1) to be vulnerable prior to conviction and incarceration 2) to be provided with limited services during rehabilitation; and 3) to be provided with limited support after release as compared with their male counterparts. Religiosity and religious affiliation have been considered to contribute to rehabilitation outcomes through a number of mechanisms including; repentance, redemption, collective prayers and collective business activities which effectively constitute social capital. It has also been acknowledged that religion is one of the oldest and the most common form of rehabilitation in the contemporary correctional institutions [14,39].

Assessment Phases in Rehabilitation

Inmate rehabilitation outcomes refer to changes of inmates toward desistance, crime free livelihoods and reintegration to the community environment. Indicators of positive rehabilitation outcomes include one or a combination of the following; compliance to institutional rules (or infractions); compliance to rehabilitation plan, exposure and response to rehabilitation interventions, engagement on productive activities; vocation skills acquired, career or occupational development; access to apprenticeship opportunities, sanctions and rewards, employment experience (employability) including ability, access and confidence to secure employment, and after release plans, early release as a result of outstanding performance (good conduct credit for accelerated release, GCCAR), and the rate of recidivism [16,47,56].

The outcome in each of these components may be negative, severely inadequate, inadequate, adequate, improved readiness, and post-release plans including sustained lawful livelihoods. It is expected as maintained by [43,44,45,49] that rehabilitation of inmates will have a positive outcome of enabling them to desist crime and to be productive citizens. Reference [45] observed that majority of prisoners were young, uneducated and in most cases had committed minor offences; and therefore institutional rehabilitation was intended to prepare them for release and ensure that they would avoid relapses and/or reconvictions.

Pre-release Rehabilitation Assessment

A study[57] emphasized that assessment may be conducted at various stages of imprisonment and rehabilitation including: a) at the time of sentencing; b) at the beginning of the supervision c) at the time of significant changes in the rehabilitation, and d) at key phases of the rehabilitation process including preparation for release or early release. Available evidence indicates that accumulated or overlapping risk factors increase the likelihood of crime tendencies. Accordingly, among the aspects that will need to be assessed at various stages of imprisonment and rehabilitation include basic skills, education, work experience and risk factors; defined as prior factors that increase the probability (risk) of reoffending [57].Accordingly, it has been recommended that in order to achieve required effectiveness, assessment would need to be carried-out at the admission to serve as the basis for a comprehensive rehabilitation intervention plan [15,16,57]. Reference [34,61] emphasizes that prison administrations need to classify prisoners as soon as possible upon admission and subsequently prepare sentence (rehabilitation) plan for each inmate matching their backgrounds and circumstances for the purposes of sustainable interventions, delivery of services to prisoners and to take into account diversity of risks and needs among the prison

population [15,38,39,40,56,57]. In view of the above, we adopted pre-release assessment to assess responses to rehabilitation practices and preparedness for lawful livelihoods [38,40,64]. A number of studies have reported a relation between in-prison infractions, post-release reoffending and limited reintegration to the community [8,16,19,47]. In this respect, Inmate Prerelease Assessment (IPASS) was developed specifically as a post-release risk measure for the institutional inmates [40] in which the objective has been to predict post-release risks towards reoffending, reintegration to the community and participation in lawful social-economic environment.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was carried-out in three selected prison institutions in Kenya namely; Nairobi Industrial Area Medium Prison, Nairobi West GK Prison and Langata Women Prison; all within Nairobi City County. 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 study adopted a survey design; combined with interview of the key informants and focus group discussion (FGD). The target population for the study consisted of 800 inmates that served their sentences in the three institutions; with the individual inmate as the unit of analysis. A sample size of 286 was determined through Yamane formula (1967); after which individual inmates were obtained through systematic sampling; i.e. every Kth case was picked from respective prison registers. Data were collected through interviews, focused group discussion (FGD) and the survey questionnaire.

STUDY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Prerelease Response indicators

To establish rehabilitation outcomes, prerelease responses to the rehabilitation practices the study analyzed 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. Responses of these outcomes were summarized in table 1 below.

Table 1: Prerelease rehabilitation outcomes

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

10	Experience of release preparation (planning)	42	41	10	7	0	100% (286)
11	Experience of inmates on after release risk reduction	44	43	13	0	0	100% (286)

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 [33,57]. 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 [16]. 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 [13,16,51] 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 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. 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 so as to be occupied. Key informants and FGDs reported that institutional authorities enforce some ad-hoc procedures to keep inmates occupied and not based on any assessment or negotiated plan. Such outcome appears to be a typical scenario in some regions, particularly in developing countries [14,16,19,33,55]. Reference [33] predicted that high rate of recidivism would continue in South Africa because of either negligible participation, discontent, non-existent or minimal type of rehabilitation of offenders in virtually all phases.

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. It was reported also through the key informant and FGDs that 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 [35].

We also 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 (table 3.1.4) 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 [33,34,42,47]. 82% of the respondents 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 [16,34]. 62% of the respondents 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 [56,64]. 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. We were informed through key informants and FGDs that those exposed to employment experience were through commercial productions.

We inquired further about 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. 87% of the respondents indicated that they were not given opportunity to engage prospective employers. Family preparedness has been considered as a critical component of rehabilitation, desistance and socio-economic vulnerability. Studies have demonstrated that existence and maintenance of strong family relation reduces the likelihood of re-offending and successful reintegration into the community [6,13,15]. Benefits beyond recidivism include improved level of social adjustment during imprisonment and after release [6]. 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. Key informants and FGDs indicated that visits to the prison by family members had been regularized and remained very useful. However, the visit by the inmates to their families had not been considered and would have been useful to assess a number of aspects including housing and available socio-economic support.

Preparation for release had 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 ([16,51,61]. Work release centers (WRC) are essentially a prison-to-community transition program. 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 responsibility of the individual inmates including in most initial transport, housing and basic needs. We 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 [16,38,39,40,56,62]. 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. Key informants and FGDs reported that such arrangements were very rare in the present correction institutions. After release, risk reduction remains the responsibility of an individual inmate and if they remained vulnerable the risk of reoffending (recidivism) increases [42,62].

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.

67% of the respondents 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 [52].

Characteristics of the Prison Inmates

The study also examined the characteristics of the prison inmates and related risks. Some of the key characteristics included age of the respondents, gender, religious affiliation, family stability and key socio-economic characteristics as well as the type of crime committed and the number of arrests. The age of the respondents ranged from 18 to 67 years, which was subsequently categorized into five (5) age brackets as summarized in table 3.5. The categorization was based on 10 years' interval envisaged to encompass fundamental milestones in the socio-economic development of a person. Majority (45%) of the inmates were between 26 to 35 years followed by the category of 18 to 25 years (21%), 36 to 45 years were 16%, 46 to 55 accounted for 12% while 56 to 67 were 6%. In essence this was a relatively young population given that 66% were between 18 and 35 and 82% were between 18 and 45; and potential candidates for rehabilitation into law-abiding citizens. Although there are some differences the results are comparable to those of the Judiciary report that more than 75 per cent of prisoners are aged between 18 and 35 [36]. It is important to note that life course theory is based on both chronological age of a family and of a person; outlining and predicting various phases of crime risks, vulnerabilities and rehabilitation approaches.

The study examined the gender of the prison inmates largely because its part of the critical dimensions in rehabilitation. 61.5% were male and 38.5% were female; largely because of the three institutions of the study, one of them was a female correctional institution. Otherwise, the proportion of women in prison has remained around 7% globally, 3% in Africa and 7.4% in Kenya [38,39,40]. Indeed, in South America women and girls make up 8% of the total prison population, 6% in USA, 6% in Europe, 7% in Asia and 7% in Oceania [29,43,44,45]. It is also instructive to note that other countries have witnessed the highest proportions of female prisoners include Hong Kong-China (21%), Laos (18%), Macau-China (15%), Qatar (15%), Kuwait (14%), Thailand (13%), Myanmar (12%), the United Arab Emirates (12%) and South Sudan (11%) [38,62]. Further, reports indicate that by the year 2000, the number of women and girls in prison increased worldwide by more than 50% in all regions [1,21,65]. The study examined the stability and support from the family of the prison inmates, largely because of the implications on issues of crime risks, vulnerabilities and rehabilitation.

Respondents were requested to rate the level of family cohesion and support on a scale of one to five depicting low to high family cohesion respectively. Majority of the respondents (61%) had no family support, 26% rarely got family support, 9% sometimes got family support while 4% regularly got support from the family. In summary, the distribution was skewed towards weak support. More specifically, about 61% indicated limited family support and exclusion. A number of studies [5,19,29] have reported importance of family cohesion and support for the prison inmates, particularly in terms of the stability and securing employment. Miceli emphasized the importance of family support to women inmates who tend to be stigmatized even more than men, and re-entry into the family or community tend to be more difficult. A study [5] reported that ex-inmates living with parents, partners or close family, had employment or were studying; or had contact with and support from post-release agencies. Family plays an important role in fueling pro-social behavior and provides a strong foundation that enables an offender's desire to resist criminal or rather deviant behavior [6]. Most importantly, having a strong support system aids in transitional process of adjusting back to the community and work environments.

References[19,53] studied various aspects of prison reentry and established that ex-offenders desired a relationship with their family members immediately after release and majority counted on family members

for financial support and housing assistance. The study assessed the religious affiliations of the inmates again because of important role religion has had on crime risks, vulnerabilities and eventually in rehabilitation. Majority of the respondents (66.3%) were Protestants, followed by Catholics (22.7%) and Muslims (11%). Under-representation of the Catholics may be a reflection of the debate between religion and crime, notably assertions that practices of some religions have impact (or influence) to propensity for criminal behavior [14]. For example, studies focusing on the relationship between religion, self-control and crime have tended to converge in their reports that low levels of self-control significantly increased criminal/deviant tendencies. Reference [55] reported that where persons had more meaningful religious beliefs and more youth attending church services, there existed less likelihood of low self-control, thus the lower propensity for deviant/crime behavior.

Education has been associated with capacities to address crime risks, vulnerabilities and rehabilitation. The study assessed education of the inmates. 46% of the respondents had primary education and below, 37% had secondary education, 17% had college and university education. In principle, the education of the respondents was considerably limited and consistent with the reports that the levels of education for the prison inmates have been lower compared to the general population [26,30,48]. The direct implication is that such education will make efforts towards crime reduction and rehabilitation considerably difficult. Reference [26] emphasized education as a driver for Sustainable Development. Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (SISFCF) show that while 18 percent of the general population does not have a high school diploma or equivalent, over 40 per cent of the adult correctional population has not completed high school. It is instructive to note that various authors such as [35,41] emphasized education as a basis for employment; and which has been crucial because it allowed inmates to become self-sufficient and to avoid involvement in criminal activities. Education provides individuals basic skills to enter the labor market a fundamental tool for ensuring that inmates achieve sustainable livelihood. Over 40% of young Black men (i.e. 22–30 years of age) with less than a high school diploma witnessed regular incarceration in the USA and more than half of Black high school dropouts in their early 30s witnessed incarceration at some point in their lives. In addition, prisoners had lower than average income and average lower education before their incarceration [41]. The study examined the residence of the inmates prior to incarceration. Out of the 267 valid respondents, 63% were from peri urban and 18% were from the rural areas.

The study findings were similar to a report by [52] which indicated that incidences of crime were high in slum areas in Kenyan municipalities. Occupation of the inmate prior to incarceration was also assessed. In respect to occupation, 44% of the respondents were self-employed (petty traders), 33% were casual laborers while 23% were in formal employment. In principle, 77% consisted of self-employment and casual employment and constituted the most vulnerable to crime risks and reoffending. In contrast, a study [31] reflecting developed economies reported that about two-thirds (66 %) of the inmates were working prior to their incarceration, about half of them (49%) were employed full-time, with another 16% working part-time. The other 34% of incarcerated adults were not in the paid workforce: approximately 19% were unemployed, with the remaining 16% were either student, permanently disabled, looking after family members, in retirement, or in other unspecified situations. The study assessed the income of inmates prior to incarceration. Majority of the respondents (45%) earned less than one USD per day prior to imprisonment. 77% were earning below 20 USD a day and could be categorized as poor and had limited resources to support livelihood. These results are substantially similar to those from other research [34]. Reference [37] reported that the criminal justice system in Kenya tends to be biased towards the low socio-economic status thereby perpetuating poverty.

Various reports have maintained propositions that lower social and economic strata have been associated with crime, conviction and recidivism [1,56]. More specifically, reports have emphasized lower social and economic strata represented by low education and vocational achievements, unemployment, low income and limited access to productive resources [9]. Other reports have indicated that most of the prison inmates were from the lower socio-economic strata: lower occupational and income categories, and have low educational attainments [17]. Still other reports have emphasized that limited education; unemployment and

limited access to income increase the probability (propensity) of committing crimes, particularly among women [65].

The Influence of Inmate Characteristics on Rehabilitation Outcomes

The third objective of the study was to examine the influence of inmate characteristics on the rehabilitation outcomes. This was based on a theoretical framework that provided a perspective that a number of the inmate characteristics influenced rehabilitation. A review of the operational manuals, and discussions with the key informants indicated that a number of characteristics influenced the rehabilitation in prisons particularly in Kenya and included characteristics identified earlier in this chapter such as the gender, religious affiliation, occupation and residence. Other key characteristics included age of the inmates, education and income of the inmates. In this section, we examine the influence of these characteristics to the rehabilitation. In view of the fact that gender was a discrete variable, cross tabulation procedure was used to examine the influence of gender on the rehabilitation outcomes. Accordingly, cross-tabulation was used to analyze the influence of gender of the inmates on various components of rehabilitation. Results of the cross-tabulation analysis involved the degree of freedom (Df) of rows and columns in a table, generated Chi-Square (X^2), the probability of error (P) and the measures of association namely the Cramer’s V and summarized in table 2 below.

Table 2: Influence of Gender on Rehabilitation Components

	Df	Chi Square	Probability of error	Cramer’s V
Commercial and Mentorship	2	21.6	.001	.43
Formal Education	2	17.5	.001	.36
Vocational Rehabilitation	2	15.9	.001	.35
Peer Counseling	2	10.6	.005	.21
Expected success after release plans	4	11.7	.025	.30
Expected sustainability after release	4	9.5	.025	.28
Individual counseling	2	3.4	.189	.11
Religious Rehabilitation	2	2.1	.353	.08

In view of the above results, significant impact of gender on rehabilitation outcomes were; commercial and mentorship (df=2, $X^2=21.6$, $P<.001$), formal education (df=2, $X^2=17.5$, $P<.001$), vocational rehabilitation (df=2, $X^2=15.9$, $P<.001$), the expected success after release (df=4, $X^2=11.7$, $P<.025$, the rate of expected sustainability after release (df=4, $X^2=9.5$, $P<.025$), and peer counseling (df=2, $X^2=10.7$, $P<.005$).Of the chi-square based measures of association (or influence), Cramer’s V was used to examine influence of gender on rehabilitation outcomes. The key advantage over the conventional Pearson C is that it is adjusted to reach zero when the relation does not exist; and to reach 1.00 (or 100%) when the relation (influence or impact) is at maximum [24,25,50]. The strength of influence of gender on commercial and mentorship was Cramer’s V=.43 to be interpreted as equivalent to 43% of the influence, followed by the influence of gender on formal education, Cramer’s V=.36, again followed closely by the influence of gender on vocational rehabilitation, Cramer’s V=.35, the effects of gender on expected success after release plans Cramer’s V=.30, the effects of gender on expected sustainability of plans, Cramer’s V=.28; and the effects of gender on peer counseling Cramer’s V=.21.

As indicated, commercial and mentorship had some form of compensation and attracted greater and regular participation. Education and vocational training were associated with greater rewards both within and outside the prison. Principally, through cross-tabulation gender was associated with varied components of the rehabilitation. A number of studies have reported special needs and consideration in management of women prisoners and their rehabilitation process [22,33,35,65]. From interviews and FGDs, the sexual characteristic of the inmate was reported to influence the nature of the rehabilitation (or areas of rehabilitation). While Nairobi West Prison specialized in woodwork and furniture, Langata Women’s Prison specialized in textile, clothing and dressmaking. In comparison with males in Nairobi West Prison, female inmates in Langata Women’s Prison tended to adopt different occupation specialization, skill-sets and competencies in their rehabilitation programs. Differences in gender has been associated with different

rehabilitation outcomes, and throughout the rehabilitation process from admission to re-entry to the community environment. Studies have reported that women offenders have been characterized largely by the life experiences and circumstances [10,15,19,38,40].

These studies maintained a view that as compared to men, most of the women inmates have been characterized by relatively severe limited access to resources to support livelihoods including limited education, skills, poor background, unstable families or single parenthood, and the tendency to come from impoverished environments among others[19,38,40]. Accordingly, rehabilitation will need to give special attention to risks and needs of women inmates with a view to improve the rehabilitation outcomes. In view of the above observations, and the risk-needs-responsivity (RNR) framework, socio-economic vulnerability and desistance theory, women inmates will need greater assessment of their risks, needs, provision of appropriate education, technical education, employment and business experience among others in order to improve the rehabilitation outcomes. It includes enabling them to re-establish stable and sustainable human and social capital.

In view of the fact that religious affiliation was a discrete variable, cross tabulation procedure was used to examine the influence of religious affiliation on the rehabilitation outcomes. Cross-tabulation was carried-out between religious affiliations of the inmates and the various components of the rehabilitation. Results of the cross-tabulation analysis involved the degree of freedom (Df) of rows and columns in a table, generated Chi-Square (X^2), the probability of error (P) and the measures of association namely the Cramer's V and summarized in table 3.

Table 3: Influence of Religious Affiliation on Rehabilitation Components

	Df	Chi square	Probability of error	Cramer's V
Religious Rehabilitation	4	17.4	.001	.67
Commercial and Mentorship	4	15.7	.001	.36
Formal Education	4	15.5	.001	.34
Vocational Rehabilitation	4	13.4	.001	.34
Expected sustainability after release	8	17.7	.001	.32
Expected success after release	8	15.7	.005	.25
Peer counseling	4	7.8	.010	.21
Individual counseling	4	1.5	.186	.12

Religious affiliation had significant influence on religious rehabilitation (df=4, $X^2=17.35$, $P<.001$), commercial and mentorship (df=4, $X^2=13.7$, $P<.001$), formal education (df=4, $X^2=21.5$, $P<.001$), vocational training (df=4, $X^2=9.7$, $P<.05$), expected success after release (df=8, $X^2=15.7$, $P<.025$) and expected sustainability after release (df=8, $X^2=17.7$, $P<.025$). The effects of religious affiliation on the religious rehabilitation was substantial i.e Cramer's V=0.67 to be interpreted as equivalent to 67%. However, the two variables were essentially the same; and as would be expected, religious affiliation would influence participation and appreciation of the religious sessions.

The substantive effects of religious affiliation on the commercial and mentorship was Cramer's V=.36, followed by the formal education, Cramer's V=.34, followed by the vocational training, Cramer's V=.29, the expected success after release plans Cramer's V=.25, and the confidence on expected sustainability after release, Cramer's V=.25. These findings are consistent to those of a study [21]reported that religious rehabilitation tends to be most attractive because inmates are able to realign interventions with their values and belief system; and subsequently become less likely to reoffend. In addition, in a longitudinal study on the influence of religion on rehabilitation reported that inmates with religious convictions were characterized by reduction of re-arrest by 17% and re-incarceration by 20% after two years' release [9]. Other studies have concluded that people who have religious convictions would be less likely to participate in criminal activity or reoffend because of advanced moral development, concern that they will face the consequences from a divine power, close connections with family and other relationships, and the ability to handle unexpected stressful situations [9, 21,55]. In view of the above observations, we can conclude that religious values and convictions continue to be useful to rehabilitation practices. Prison inmates [14]

participated in religious sessions and rehabilitation as a way to redeem their thoughts, work and self-conception. Reference [14] emphasized that Lack of a positive self-concept was a common problem with correctional inmates who have suffered from guilt related to failures in life, remorse from criminal acts, or, from the pain of a dysfunctional family background.

Still other studies have reported an inverse relation between intensity of religious involvement and the presence or absence of in-prison infractions, coping and avoiding trouble. As religious involvement increased the number of inmates with infractions decreased. The findings of the study provide greater insight into the nature of religion in prison setting and support the view that religion can be an important factor in the process of offender rehabilitation [14,39]. Other reports indicated that after controlling the level of involvement in PF-sponsored programs, inmates who were most active in Bible studies were significantly less likely to be rearrested during the follow-up period [9]. In view of the fact that occupation was a discrete variable, cross tabulation procedure was used to examine the influence of occupation on the rehabilitation outcomes. Accordingly, cross-tabulation was carried-out between occupation of the inmates and the various components of the rehabilitation. Results of the cross-tabulation analysis involved the degree of freedom (Df) of rows and columns in a table, generated Chi-Square (X^2), the probability of error (P) and the measures of association namely the Cramer's V as shown in table 4.

Table 4: The influence of Occupation on Rehabilitation Components

	Df	Chi square	Probability of error	Cramer's V
Commercial and mentorship	4	17.6	.001	.47
Expected sustainability after release	8	21.7	.005	.37
Formal education	4	15.5	.001	.36
Expected success of plans after release	8	19.2	.005	.33
Vocational Rehabilitation	4	13.5	.001	.33
Individual counseling	4	1.5	.186	.12
Peer counseling	4	7.8	.010	.21
Religious sessions	4	1.0	.353	.09

Occupation had significant effects on commercial and mentorship ($df=4$, $X^2=17.6$, $P<.001$), expected sustainability after release ($df=8$, $X^2=21.7$, $P<.005$), formal education ($df=4$, $X^2=15.50$, $P<.001$), expected success of plans after release plans ($df=8$, $X^2=19.2$, $P<.005$) and vocational rehabilitation programme ($df=4$, $X^2=13.5$, $P<.001$).

The influence of occupation on commercial and mentorship was Cramer's $V=.47$, to be interpreted as 47% of influence, followed by expected sustainability after release Cramer's $V=.37$, followed by formal education Cramer's $V=.36$, then expected success after release plans Cramer's $V=.33$ and finally, vocational rehabilitation, Cramer's $V=.33$; to be interpreted as 33% of the influence.

Further, members of the FGD in Nairobi Medium Prison also indicated that inmates who were working (or employed) before the conviction were useful to both the institution and to the rehabilitation. More specifically, they tended to show substantial interest on their areas of specialization and preparedness to support other inmates in enhancing their skills and competencies. It is well acknowledged that occupation and employment are integral aspect of the socio-economic vulnerability theory which can be eroded during conviction and incarceration and at the same time can be rebuild during institutional and in post release rehabilitation to support livelihoods and sustainability after release [16,38,39,40,56,57,61]. These studies reported that those who had stable occupations contributed easily to both pre and post release rehabilitation outcomes. More importantly some of them were able to improve their trade during rehabilitation, and were subsequently able to regain their occupation (or employment) upon release and were able to sustain their release beyond nine years [16,64]. In addition to the role occupation and employment play in prior, during and after institutional rehabilitation, there has also been increasing interest on the link and the point of link of the two interrelated components to desistance to crime [31,38,51]

In view of the fact that residence was a discrete variable, cross tabulation procedure was used to examine the influence of residence on the rehabilitation outcomes. Accordingly, cross-tabulation was carried-out between residence of the inmates and the various components of the rehabilitation. Results of the cross-tabulation analysis involved the degree of freedom (Df) of rows and columns in a table, generated Chi-Square (X^2), the probability of error (P) and the measures of association namely the Cramer's V as presented in table 5.

Table 5: The influence of Residence on Rehabilitation Components

	Df	Chi square	Probability of error	Cramer's V
Commercial and Mentorship	6	27.6	.001	.43
Formal education	6	25.4	.001	.37
Vocational Rehabilitation	6	21.1	.001	.35
Expected success of plans after release	10	23.2	.032	.28
Expected sustainability after release	10	21.9	.035	.24
Peer counseling	6	14.8	.005	.21
Individual counseling	6	14.0	.186	.12
Religious Rehabilitation	6	3.3	.353	.09

Residence had significant effects on commercial and mentorship (df=6, $X^2=27.6$, $P<.001$), followed by formal education (df=6, $X^2=25.4$, $P<.001$), vocational rehabilitation (df=6, $X^2=21.1$, $P<.001$), expected success after release plans (df=10, $X^2=23.2$, $P<.023$), and the expected sustainability of livelihood after release (df=10, $X^2=21.3$, $P<.032$).The influence (effects) of residence was Cramer's V=.43 for commercial and mentorship program; interpreted as 43%, followed by the formal education Cramer's V=.37, vocational rehabilitation Cramer's V=.35, expected success after release plans Cramer's V=.28, expected sustainability after release Cramer's V=.24.Residence of the inmates prior and after correctional rehabilitation has been considered an important aspect of the socio-economic vulnerability theory, which may be a barrier to rehabilitation, and/or sustainability of release [19,40,42].

More specifically, impoverished urban or peri-urban residence have been associated with cases of increased crime vulnerability, distorted rehabilitation outcomes and increased risks toward reoffending [52,62].It will be recalled that data for age was continuous and therefore interval classification and subsequently the analysis of influence on rehabilitation outcomes of the various components was based on regression procedure. The key aspects of the regression analysis include F ratio, the ration within and between variance, probability of error (P), regression correlation (R) and Regression squared (R^2) indicating the strength of relation as well as the percentage of variation explained. Table 6 is a summary of the outcomes of the analysis.

Table 6: The influence of Age on Rehabilitation Components

Components of Rehabilitation	N	F	P	R	R²
Formal education	243	27.8	.001	.55	.30
Vocational Rehabilitation	242	21.6	.001	.52	.27
Commercial and Mentorship	252	1.1	.31	.07	.00
Religious Rehabilitation	263	1.2	.28	.07	.00
Individual counseling	246	.01	.91	.01	.00
Peer counseling	239	.03	.86	.01	.00
Expected success after release	246	15.7	.001	.35	.12
Expected sustainability after release	243	17.3	.001	.37	.14

In principle, significant influence of age was on the vocational rehabilitation, formal education, and expected success after release plans as well as expected sustainability after release. More specifically, the influence of age on formal education to $F = 27.8$ with probability of error (P) less than 0.001. Further, R

=0.55; and $R^2 = 0.30$ as measure of degree of influence, explained variance, and reflected that age accounted for 30% of variation on the formal education. Similarly, vocational rehabilitation resulted to $F = 21.6$ with probability of error (P) less than 0.001. Further, $R = 0.52$; and $R^2 = 0.27$ as measure of degree of influence, explained variance, and reflected that age accounted for 27% of variation on the vocational rehabilitation program. In summary, age was a principle determinant of formal education and vocational rehabilitation. This was consistent with the theory of life course that specify capabilities of inmates along the chronological age and the principle that rehabilitation would be improved taking into account the age of inmates. The influence of age on expected success after release plans resulted to $F = 15.7$ and a P value of less than 0.001. The degree of influence was $R = 0.35$; $R^2 = 0.12$, indicating that age explained 12% of the variation in expected success after release plans. In view of the fact that this relation was positive, we concluded that age of the inmates influenced the expectation to succeed after release.

Further, the influence of age on expected sustainability after release resulted to $F = 17.3$ and a P less than 0.001. The magnitude of the relation was $R = 0.37$; $R^2 = 0.14$ indicating that age explained 14% of the variation in expected sustainability after release. In view of the fact that this relation was positive, we concluded also that the age of the inmates influenced the expectation to maintain sustainable plans after release. As in the case of the Nairobi West Prison, records, interviews and the FGD indicated that younger inmates tended to embrace various rehabilitation approaches, and older inmates tended to be reluctant to certain approaches to rehabilitation. The older inmates were not able to relate to formal education and vocational rehabilitation because of the view that they could not see immediate benefits. In addition, data for education was continuous and therefore, interval classification and subsequently the analysis of influence on rehabilitation outcomes of the various components was based on regression procedure as presented in Table 7. The influence of the education of the inmates on educational rehabilitation outcome was considerable; resulting to $F = 41.4$ with a P value of less than 0.001.

Table 7: The influence of Education on rehabilitation components

Components of Rehabilitation	N	F	P	R	R^2
Formal education	244	41.4	.00	.78	.61
Vocational Rehabilitation	242	32.3	.00	.58	.34
Commercial and Mentorship	253	1.6	.31	.07	.01
Religious Rehabilitation	263	3.3	.07	.11	.01
Individual counseling	246	.16	.69	.03	.00
Peer counseling	240	.67	.41	.05	.00
Expected success after release plans	246	21.5	.00	.32	.10
Expected sustainability after release	234	27.7	.00	.47	.22

The degree of influence was $R = 0.78$; $R^2 = 0.61$; indicating that education of the inmates explained 61% of the variation in embracing formal education in prison. The influence of education on vocational program in prison was still considerable; where $F = 32.3$ at a P value less than 0.001. The intensity of the relation was $R = 0.58$; $R^2 = 0.34$; indicating that education of the inmates explained 34% of the variation in embracing vocational rehabilitation in prison. In view of the fact that this relation was also positive, we concluded that education of the inmate promoted or influenced practices towards vocational program in prison. The influence of education of the inmate on expected success after release plans resulted to $F = 21.5$ and P was less than 0.001. The magnitude of the relation was $R = 0.32$; $R^2 = 0.10$; indicating that education explained 10% of the variation in expected success after release. Similarly, in view of the fact that this relation was positive, it was therefore, concluded that education of the inmates influenced the expectation or even commitment to succeed after release. In addition, the effects of education sustainability after release resulted to $F = 27.7$ with a P value of less than 0.001. The magnitude of the relation was $R = 0.47$; $R^2 = 0.22$; indicating that education explained 22% of the variation in expected sustainability after release. In view of the fact that this relation was positive, as a result education of the inmates influenced the expectation for sustainable plans after release.

In view of these results, education of the inmate was the principle determinant of formal education, vocational rehabilitation, expected success after release plans and sustainability after release. This was consistent with the importance of education and the theory of socio-economic vulnerability where education has been expected to provide capacities to support rehabilitation and to reduce risks related to crimes and reoffending. Further reports from Nairobi west Prison indicated that while advance education was useful to the rehabilitation, low education was a major barrier to rehabilitation. Members of the FGD reported experiences where inmates with advanced education (college or technical education) demonstrated greater propensity to embrace rehabilitation, reformed and minimal come back to prison compared to those that had limited education. In addition, education was the most critical challenge because most of the inmates 44% had primary education and below. The most convincing evidence that education for prisoners has a positive effect on post-release behavior of prisoners in the United States was provided by the three-state recidivism study [54]. This notable study, conducted in the states of Maryland, Minnesota and Ohio, compared two groups of offenders, those who had participated in correctional education while in prison and those who had not (referred to as non-participants). The study was designed to assess not only the impact of correctional education on recidivism but also on employment outcomes after release from prison. This study concluded that education for prisoners enhances employment opportunities, decreases criminal behavior and, in so doing, reduces the overall cost of crime to the community.

Various scholars have maintained two broad views on function of education in prison. One is that the primary function of education is to mitigate devastating effects of imprisonment [12] and the other view is to nurture (or facilitate) development of skills necessary for employment after release [23]. More specifically a study [23] emphasized on education directed at minimizing propensity to crime and enhancing employment, social cohesion and integration to society. Others have maintained a view that education in prison is an end in itself with potential to promote active citizenship [12]. In practice, correctional education encompasses academic as well as vocational education; in which the overarching goal is to reduce offending tendencies; and therefore enable offenders to desist from crime. For example, a study [18] reported that effective correctional education programs reduced recidivism among participants in a range of 25% to 80% with an average of 50%. Other studies have also reported that higher qualifications result in lower rates of recidivism [23]. Regression analysis was used to examine the influence income of the inmates before incarceration on rehabilitation outcomes in the various components; because income as the independent variable and the various aspects of rehabilitation were classified, (operationalized) as interval data. The outcomes of the analysis were summarized in Table 8.

Table 8: The influence of Income on rehabilitation components

Components of Rehabilitation	N	F	P	R	R²
Vocational Rehabilitation	151	27.5	.00	.59	.35
Formal education	155	21.8	.00	.45	.20
Commercial and Mentorship	156	.44	.51	.05	.00
Religious Rehabilitation	163	7.7	.01	.21	.05
Individual counseling	152	.92	.34	.09	.01
Peer counseling	149	.09	.76	.03	.00
Expected success after release plans	150	25.9	.00	.47	.22
Expected sustainability after release	145	37.6	.00	.54	.29

In principle, significant influence of income was on the vocational rehabilitation, formal education, and expected success after release plans as well as sustainability after release. More specifically, the effects of income on vocational rehabilitation resulted to $F=27.5$ with P (probability of error) less than 0.001. Further, $R = 0.59$; R^2 of 0.35 as explained variance, reflected magnitude of the influence and indicated that income accounted for 35% of variation on the vocational rehabilitation program. The influence of income on formal education in prison resulted to $F = 21.8$ and P (probability of error) less than 0.001. The degree of influence was $R=0.45$; $R^2=0.20$ indicating that income of the inmates explained 20% of the variation in embracing formal education in prison. The effects of income of the inmate on expected success after

release plans resulted to $F = 37.00$ with a P value of less than 0.001. The magnitude of the relation was $R=0.47$; $R^2=0.22$, indicating that education explained 22% of the variation in expected success after release plans. Further, the influence of income on expected sustainability after release resulted to $F = 37.6$ while the P value was less than 0.001. The degree of influence was $R=0.54$; $R^2=0.29$, indicating that income explained 29% of the variation in expected sustainability after release. In view of these results, income of the inmate prior to incarceration was the principle determinant of formal education, vocational rehabilitation, expected success after release plans and sustainability after release. This was consistent with the importance of socio-economic vulnerability theory in which resources provide capacity to support rehabilitation and to reduce risks related to crimes and reoffending [16]. Other studies have also acknowledged that income is an integral aspect of the socio-economic vulnerability theory which can be eroded (diminished) during conviction and incarceration and at the same time can be rebuilt during institutional rehabilitation, and post release rehabilitation to support livelihoods and sustainability of the post institutional release [36,38,40,56,59].

It involves the view that poverty as a component of socio-economic vulnerability and as inability to meet basic needs has been associated with increased crime rate, imprisonment, challenges in rehabilitation and re-offending (Duque & McKnight 2019, Rabuy& Kopf 2015, Ashish 2014, Wacquant 2009).

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above findings, it was concluded that rehabilitation outcomes were substantially limited or inadequate in most of the 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. The inmate characteristics were consistent with those of the life course perspective and socio-economic vulnerability theory; where the early phases of life are typically 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).

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 study also concluded that a number of characteristics had considerable influence on rehabilitation outcomes. Gender of the inmates had substantial and significant influence on seven (7) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices. Similarly, religious affiliation had substantial and significant influence on six (6) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices; occupation before conviction also had substantial and significant influence on six (6) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices; and residence also had substantial and significant influence on six (6) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices. It was established further that the age had substantial and significant influence on four (4) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices. Similarly, education had substantial and significant influence on four (4) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices; and income had substantial and significant influence on five (5) out of the eight (8) rehabilitation practices. Accordingly, it was concluded that life course and socio-economic characteristics of the inmates will need to be taken into account in the institutional rehabilitation for the purposes of sustained rehabilitation outcomes

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of these observations, the study recommended that rehabilitation of the inmates in Kenya will need to be reviewed with a view to: 1) adopt a customized rehabilitation plan for each inmate; based on life

course and socio-economic characteristics, related vulnerabilities, pre and post release indicators; 2) expand prison industries and related industrial collaborations with a view to expand apprenticeship, work experience and to enhance the socio-economic capability of the inmates; and 3) strengthen rehabilitation practices along the UN guidelines including 2015 minimum rules and the various roadmaps.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Achode, M.M. (2012). The socio-economic characteristics of women offenders at Lang'ata Women's Prison, Nairobi. (Unpublished Thesis), University of Nairobi, Nairobi.
- [2]. Aghan, P.L. (2016). The association between custodial rehabilitation and recidivism of male prisoners in Kenya: The Case of Nairobi Remand Home.
- [3]. 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-in-research-and-practice>.
- [4]. Ayuk A.A. (2012). Security Parody: A paper presented on the inauguration of the Executive of National Social Work Student of Calabar. Unpublished
- [5]. 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.
- [6]. 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
- [7]. 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.
- [8]. Bureau of Justice Statistic (2016). *Crime trends*. New York.
- [9]. 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)
- [10]. Campbell, A. (2002). *A mind of her own: The evolutionary psychology of women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [11]. Cohen, B.H., & Lea, B. R. (2004). *Essentials for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons; Hoboken. New Jersey.
- [12]. 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.
- [13]. Cullen, F.T. (2013). Rehabilitation: Beyond Nothing Works". *Crime and Justice*, 42:299-376
- [14]. Dammer, H.R. (2002). *Religion in Corrections*. The University of Scranton.
- [15]. Dissel, A. (2008). Rehabilitation and reintegration in African prisons. *Human rights in African prisons*, 89-103.
- [16]. Duwe, G. (2017). *The use and impact of correctional programming for inmates on pre-and post-release outcomes*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- [17]. Fleisher, B. M., (1966). The effect of income in delinquency. *American Economic Review*; 13, 56-79.
- [18]. Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s. *Justice Quarterly*, 4(3), 349-407.
- [19]. Gideon, L., & Sung, H.-E. (2011). *Rethinking Corrections: Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Reintegration*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc
- [20]. Government of Kenya (1977). *Prison Act CAP 90. Revised Edition 1977*. Nairobi: Government Printing Press.
- [21]. Grudzina, P. (2016). Secular dissent: protecting non-believers from coercive religious parole programs. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, 106, 565. Handbook on Women and Imprisonment (2014). *Criminal justice handbook series United Nations office on drugs and crime*. Vienna.
- [22]. Harlow, C. (2003). "Education and Correctional Populations." *U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*. USA.
- [23]. 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.
- [24]. Hesse, C.A., & Ofosu, J.B. (2018). *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. Akrong Publishers, Accra, Ghana.
- [25]. Katz, M.H. (2016). *Multivariate Analysis – A practical Gide for Clinicians*. 2nd ED. Cambridge University Press. USA
- [26]. Kenya prisons (2009). *Needs assessment for developing educational and vocational training programs for inmates in Kenya, 2009*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- [27]. Kenya Prisons Service, (2005). *Strategic Plan 2005-2009*. Government Press, Nairobi, Kenya

- [28].Laws, D. R., & Ward, T. (2011). *Desistance from sex offending: Alternatives to throwing away the keys*. Guilford Press.
- [29].Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (1993). Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology*, 31(3), 301-325.
- [30].Lewis, M.V. (1973) *Prison education and rehabilitation: Illusion or reality? A Case Study of an Experimental Program*. Institute for Research on Human Resources.
- [31].Looney, A., & Turner, N. (2018). Work and opportunity before and after incarceration. *Washington, DC: Brookings Institution*. Accessed October, 5, 2018.
- [32].Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- [33].Miceli, V. (2009). *Analyzing the Effectiveness of Rehabilitation Programmes*. University of Rhode Island.
- [34].Muteti, S. M. (2008). *Factors undermining the effectiveness of prison officers in the rehabilitation of offenders In Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [35].Murhula, P. B. B., Singh, S. B., & Nunlall, R. (2019). A Critical Analysis on Offenders Rehabilitation Approach in South Africa: A Review of the Literature. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies: AJCJS*, 12(1), 21-43.
- [36].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.
- [37].National Council on the Administration of Justice (NCAJ 2016). *Criminal justice system in Kenya: an audit*. National Council on Administration of Justice.
- [38].Ndombi, C.S. (2014). *Impact of prison rehabilitation programs on recidivists: A case of prisons in the North Rift Region of Kenya*. MA, Unpublished
- [39].O'Connor, T.P., & Perreyclear, M. (2002). *Prison religion in action and its influence on offender rehabilitation*
- [40].Omboto, J.O. (2013). The challenges facing rehabilitation of prisoners in Kenya and the mitigation strategies: *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*
- [41].Ongek M., & Otieno, S.O. (2017). Education for prisoners as a driver for sustainable development in Kenya: *International Journal for Innovative Research and Development*
- [42].Oruta, E.M. (2016). Socio-Economic factors that influence recidivism in Kakamega County, Kenya: *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, 47, 2224-3240
- [43].Penal Reform International (2015). *Global Prison Trends*. Penal Reform International.
- [44].Penal Reform International (PRI 2017). *Global Prison Trends*. Penal Reform International.
- [45].Penal Reform International (PRI 2017). *The Global Prison Trends 2017 report*. Penal Reform International.
- [46].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
- [47].Pollock, J.M. (2003). The rationale for imprisonment
- [48].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*.
- [49].Research Brief (2008). *Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of releases in three states; urban institute*. Justice Policy Center.
- [50].Richard, J.S. (1988). *Statistical Reasoning for the Behavioral Sciences*: Needham Heights, MA; Allyn and Bacon.
- [51].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
- [52].Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC) (2014). *A study of crime in urban slums in Kenya*. SRIC.
- [53].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.
- [54].Steurer, S., Smith, L. & Tracy, A. (2001). *Three state recidivism study*. Lanham, Md.: Correctional Education Association.
- [55].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>
- [56].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.
- [57].UNHR (1990). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for non-custodial measures (The Tokyo Rules)*. Office of the Higher Commissioner, Geneva.
- [58].United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC 2011 & 2013): *The global study on homicide*. UNODC.

- [59]. UNODC (2011). Prison Reform and Alternatives to Imprisonment: Concept Note. Justice Section, Division of Operations. United Nations, Geneva
- [60]. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC 2015). *Global Crime Trends*. UNODC
- [61]. UNODC (2015). *Addressing the global prison crisis; Strategy 2015/2017*. UNODC.
- [62]. UNODC (2018). Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Integration of Offenders. United Nations, Vienna.
- [63]. UNSMR, (2015). The Mandela Rules. E/CN.15/2015/L.6/Rev.1. Durban: South Africa
- [64]. Visher, C., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2008). *Employment after Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- [65]. World Prison Brief (2017, 2016 and 2015). World Female Imprisonment List. 4th ed. Institute for Criminal Policy Research; Birbeck, University of London. UK.
-