

Community Factors and Recidivism in Nigeria: A Study of Kuje Correctional Center Abuja

¹Usman A. Yusuf,
²Ambrose Ogidi,
³Jibrin Hassan,
⁴Ibrahim Haruna &
⁵M. D Isah

*Department of Sociology
Nasarawa State University, Keffi
Department of Public Admin
Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria*

Article DOI:
10.48028/iiprds/ijsrhlir.v6.i1.05

Keywords:
Community,
Recidivism, Kuje,
Correctional center

Corresponding Author:
Usman A. Yusuf

Abstract

The study examined Community factors and recidivism in Nigeria: A study of kuje correctional center Abuja. The study hard achieved specific objectives which looked at the impact of community-based factor such factors could be explain as poverty, unemployment, ghetto area, poor educational background and lack of proper policies and programmes established by the government or any agency have triggered recidivism, the study to assessed the functionality and rehabilitative facilities in the effective programmes in Kuje correctional center. The study highlighted the causes of recidivism among inmates in Kuje Correctional Centre. to examine the inmates' perception of the basic infrastructural facilities in Kuje Correctional Centre. The study additionally, introduced social survey research design was adopted and questionnaire instrument of data collection was used, 200 questionnaires were administered to inmates in Kuje correctional center, the questions were obtained and answers were provided through the assistance of research assistance which are the workers from the center, for easy interpretations. The study findings revealed that all the respondents were discovered to be male who are virtually single and within age bracket of 18-35 years. The study also discovered that all the available rehabilitative facilities and programmes are functional including educational programme, carpentry, welding, tailoring, games, guardian and counselling, among others. The study further discovered that poverty and lack of proper reintegration programme are the most causal factors in recidivism, the study had made up recommendations that could improve in the standard of living for those inmates so as it would serve as control mechanism for future occurrences

Background to the Study

Community factors for long has contributed in the rise of recidivism in several correctional centers in Nigeria, however, recidivism is major issue in the criminal justice policy is the differential effectiveness of sentences, programs, and/or their interventions in achieving criminal justice goals. The search for systematic means of enhancing effectiveness is invariably the issue of addressing recidivism. There has been an increase in the population of incarcerated adult offenders that has largely been contributed to by repeat offender crime. This has impacted negatively on public safety policies in countries globally. High crime rates threaten the safety of communities and at times evoke responses which, according to Albertus, (2010), the aspiration to live in a state founded on human dignity, freedom and equality. From public safety perspective, a lot of time and resources is invested within the criminal justice, only for the offenders to recidivate in the long run. This has contributed to the high rates of crime throughout the world calling for different strategies and methods in trying to control it.

Imprisonment, one of the most popular sanctions, is the primary method for preventing and combating crime. Besides being both a public mark of disapproval and a punishment, prison serve as correctional attitudes and it play a role in reducing crime in human society. Number of socio-economic and political factors has contributed in the rise of recidivism in many correctional centers in Nigeria (Hall 2015), arising from limited budget ceilings (Cheyet and Brown 2010). This is coupled with limited support and fewer family relationships, contacts and visits while incarcerated (Bales and mears, 2008, Duwe 2012). They also face barriers arising from lack of prerelease preparation. On discharge, they struggle to find stability (Bell, 2014).

When offenders are perceived as sick and helpless persons who, therefore, need to be treated or helped in order to recover or to be restored to a state of normalcy this is referred to as reformation. This is the idea of changing the offender from their law-breaking behavior to law abiding behavior. According to Igbo (1999), prisons today have a number of programmes designed to divert offenders from crime to useful pursuit that will make crime unattractive or condemnable. This includes moral and religious instructions, education and vocational training, and the value of hard work and discipline.

Today, the Nigerian correctional service is assigned the onerous responsibility of ensuring the safe custody of offenders as well as their reformation and rehabilitation. According to Igbo (1999), carefully designed and well-articulated administrative, reformatory and rehabilitative programmes aimed at inculcating discipline, respect for law and order, and the dignity of honest labour. The offender in this wise is prepared to become not only law abiding but also useful to both himself and the society (NPS, 1984).

Virtually, recidivism is a social and community factors, and the only way forwards is by ensuring adequate policy and programmes not only from the government but from the community leaders, spiritual leaders, traditional leaders and many more in order to control the rate of recidivism in Nigeria, particularly Abuja metropolitan.

Statement of the Problem

The correctional facility or penitentiary is a place designated by law to house inmates who have either been tried or sentenced, or are remanded in custody to await trial. The philosophy under-pinning the existence and role of the correctional facility has experienced a shift over the years from that which was wholly punitive and retributive in nature, to the current philosophy of reformation and rehabilitation. The penitentiary is a place whereby those who are serving sentences for offences committed are remanded so as to enable them evaluate their actions, learn new skills, abilities and behaviors that are pro-social in nature and will help move them to a non-offending pattern of life. The goal therein is to ensure that when released into the society these, former inmates are sufficiently equipped to fit in alongside the rest of the society (Fitzgerald and Sim, 1982). It is in line with the above scenario that the correctional facility should be a place where offenders are properly classified into those sentenced and awaiting trial, and for those sentenced, based on the type of offence committed, gender and regularity of offence. The penitentiary should be a place equipped with the requisite security infrastructure to forestall inmate escape.

Basically, number of factors have manufacture recidivism in Nigeria, particularly, in the study area \, such factors are educational, ghetto area, economic, bad friends, poor family socialization, community factors, poor policy and programmes from the government and many more. Similarly, several measures were taken from the government community leaders, family, spiritual and traditional leaders on the implications of recommitting crime which could lead someone into isolation centers, still government need to introduced rigid policies regarding those criminals who wanted to recommit crime and go back to prison

Objectives of the Study

This study is generally community factors and recidivism in Nigeria. In order to achieve this broad objective, the research intends to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. To examine the factors that have contributed in the rise of recidivism in Kuje Correctional center
2. To explain the socio-economic factors that influence offenders to re-offend
3. To examine the implications of such recidivism behaviour both on the individual and correctional centres as a whole
4. To offer recommendation regarding the offer of re-committing crime

Literature Review

Concept of Recidivism

Recidivism is a broad term that refers to relapse of criminal behaviour, which can include a range of outcomes, including re-arrest, reconviction, and re-imprisonment. Prisoners represent a high-risk group compared to other offenders with huge associated costs and a large contribution to overall societal criminality and violence (Andersen and Skardhamar, 2014). A number of studies have tried to identify factors that influence repeat offending rates within and between countries but these studies are hampered by problems with sample selection, definitions of what constitutes recidivism, and the length of follow-up.

Recidivism measures can provide policy makers with information regarding relative threat to public safety posed by various types of offenders, and the effectiveness of public safety initiatives in (1) deterring crime and (2) rehabilitating or incapacitating offenders. Recidivism measures are used by numerous public safety agencies to measure performance and inform policy decisions and practices on issues such as pretrial detention, prisoner classification and programming, and offender supervision in the community. Recidivism is typically measured by criminal acts that resulted in re-arrest, reconviction, and/or the re-incarceration of the offender over a specified period of time. Provided multiple measures of recidivism allow users to select the performance measure best suited to their outcome of interest.

Re-arrest classifies a person as a recidivist if they have been arrested for a new crime after being released into the community directly on probation or after serving a term of imprisonment. Re-arrest also includes arrests for alleged violations of supervised release, probation, or state parole. Reconviction classifies a person as a recidivist if an arrest resulted in a subsequent court conviction. Violations and revocations of supervision are not included in reconvictions since no formal prosecution occurred. Re-incarceration classifies a person as a recidivist if a conviction or revocation resulted in a prison or jail sentence as punishment.

Concepts of Correctional Centers

A prison according to McCorkle and Thorn (1954), is a physical structure housing a number of people in a highly specialized condition where they utilize resources availed to them and adjust to the alternatives by a unique kind of social environment that is different from the larger society. Offender rehabilitation and reintegration is imperative in ensuring safe and secure communities. Many scholars such as Albertus (2010), and Polaschek (2012), argue that traditional approaches in combating crime in the past mostly favoured retribution and incarceration of offenders. As noted by Muntingh (2001), and Perry (2006), over 30 years of experimentation with the punitive and retributive approach have seen prison populations skyrocketing, leading to the conclusion that deterrence has hardly had any impact on reoffending and in some situations, actually increased it (Public Safety Canada, 2007).

Growing body of scientific evidence shows the punitive approach to combating crime around the world is not yielding much success prompting countries to re-strategize ways of dealing with offenders. This has seen a shift to a more holistic approach which mainly incorporates the need to rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders into mainstream society in a manner that reduces the likelihood of reoffending. Padayachee, (2008), notes that offender reintegration as opposed to retributive punishment and imprisonment is aimed at protecting both offenders and society. In spite of the introduction of correctional programs, there is still an increase in cases of reoffending. Albertus (2010), argues that relapsing of ex-convicts is mainly due to the lack of support for their reintegration into society as law-abiding citizens, which in turn exacerbates the already increasing crime rate. While on the other hand, Gaum et al (2006) argues that recidivism is a result of intervention being introduced too late. The other point of view could be to do the failure of correctional programming in achieving the intended goal of rehabilitating inmates.

Imprisonment continues to play an important role in the crime policy of many countries. Over 10 million people are held in penal institutions throughout the world (Watmsley, 2008). When asked if a correctional program —works, most people would want to know if the program was successful in changing offender's behavior and if those who completed are less likely to relapse into crime than those that did not complete or did not participate in programming. There is little doubt that recidivism remains a criterion in measuring correctional effectiveness. In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of people arrested especially in the US which has increasingly used imprisonment as a means of rehabilitation, (Stern 1998). The greatest concern however, is the growing numbers of recidivist offenders among prison population. Mark Souder, US congressman noted that recidivism has turned US Justice system into a revolving door and represents a — massive failure of the penal system to return law-abiding citizens to society (Elsner, 2005).

In Africa, statistics reveal that recidivism in Nigeria has become a common phenomenon among offenders. Soyombo (2009), reported that the prevalence rate of criminal recidivism in Nigeria in 2005 was 37.3%. The prevalence rate rose to 52.4% in 2010 as reported by Abifor. Kenya as is the case with other countries is also grappling with its share of high numbers of repeat offenders. This questions the rationale of sentencing objective since the period served as awarded by presiding magistrates and judges are deemed important to enable the offender to undergo various rehabilitative programs while in prison custody. Going by its mission statement of facilitating responsive administration of justice, rehabilitation and social reintegration, it is the expectation of the public that Kenya prisons service has done their part thus discharging a reformed individual back to a responsive community. This is not always the case as inmates' relapse into crime and find themselves back to prison.

Characteristics of the Offenders

Research on offender characteristics helps to predict level of threat an individual poses or chances of recidivating. Some of the characteristics include; marital status, unemployment, level of education and a history of drug abuse. Offenders in correctional institutions are confronted by a range of social, personal and economic challenges that tend to become obstacles to a crime free lifestyle (Borzyeki and Baldry 2003, Visher, Winterfield and Coggeshall, 2005). Some of these challenges are a result of offender's past experiences while others are more directly associated with the consequences of incarceration and difficult transition back to the community (Borzyeki, 2005).

A number of studies points to employment status as a highly significant factor in predicting recidivism (Morgan, 1994: Sims and Jones, 1997). A study conducted by Jones (1997) found unemployment as one strongest predictors of failure. A North Carolina study determined that unstable employment, marital status and past convictions significantly predicted recidivism. According to Mpuag (2001), most offenders in South Africa are unemployed, uneducated and impoverished which often pushes them to a life of crime. Employment plays a critical role in facilitating the reintegration of discharged

offenders. As a protective factor, it directs would be criminals away from offending into a more pro- social role in society (Dector et al, 2015). Looking into the job skills of the respondents informs the study on extent of this criminogenic factor among the prison population

Research has consistently shown strong correlation between employment and reduction in future criminal behavior (Berg and Hueber, 2011). Returning offenders are faced with multitude obstacles in their attempt to gain employment (Brown 2011 b). Majority of returning offenders also face legal employment restrictions arising from Criminal records, (Harris and Keller 2005). The lack of employment predisposes former offenders to anti-social behavior and criminality in comparison to offenders who are able to find employment (Chamberlain 2012, Hall, 2015).

Research studies conducted to ascertain the willingness of employers to hire offenders revealed that majority were not willing to trust ex-offenders thus not hiring them (Battle, 2011, Western and Suggie, 2009). In another study, Holzer et al 2002 found that 60 percent of employers were not willing to hire ex-offenders. Offence type was also found to influence willingness to hire as brought out by Pager and Quillian, (2005). As brought out by Maruna and Immarigeon, (2004) those offenders who experience discrimination after discharge from prisons have higher probability of recidivating. In another study, Tripodi et al (2010), examined the relationship between employment and recidivism. The study sought to determine as to whether getting employment by offenders on release decreased the odds and time spent in the community before re incarceration. The results of the study confirmed this. On their part, Pettit a Lyons (2009) revealed that incarceration had significant negative effects on both employment and wage earning as time spent in prison being directly associated with deterioration in hourly earnings for men regardless of age (Pettit and Lyons 2009)

Low level of education especially in regard to high school dropouts also has a bearing in increased risk of recidivism (Albonnetti and Hepburn, 1997). By some measures, the less educated and less skilled the offenders, the more likely they are to recidivate. This theme repeats itself in a number of studies (Waller 1979, Grendreu and Andrews 1990: Andrew and Bonta 1994: Leone et al 2005).

Social and criminal psychology research when examining what influences criminal behavior consistently indicates that attitudes (thinking style) are important. The significant link between criminal attitudes and criminal behavior has been well established in previous studies, (Nesdale et al 2009, Mills et al 2002, Hall and Innis, 2003; Sigmound, 1999, Andrews and kard, 1979, Bagozzi and Bunkrunt, 1979), indicating that individuals who are orientated towards criminal behavior and have internalized criminal concepts of behavior are at a greater risk of engaging in that particular behavior.

Researchers have also examined the role that drugs play in the commission of crime. A US survey of inmates revealed that 19 percent of state prisoners and 16 percent of Federal inmates stated that they committed the offence for which they were incarcerated in order

to obtain money for drugs (Mumola, 1999). Harlow (1993) also found out that one-third of prison inmates stated that they were under the influence of drugs at the time of the offence. Further, a national study of adult probationers revealed that two thirds of respondents used drugs at some point in their lives and nearly half were under the influence of a drug or alcohol at the time of their arrest ((Mimola and Boncar, 1998).

The individual characteristics associated with recidivism among sexual offenders have been previously reviewed (Hanson and Busiere 1998, Hanson and Morton Bourgo, 2005). In general, the two broad domains associated with sexual recidivism are sexual deviancy and lifestyle instability/criminality. The criminal lifestyle characteristics (e.g., history of rule violation, substance abuse) are most strongly related to violent and general recidivism among sexual offenders (Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2004). Returning prisoners' attachment to society such as employment and family relationships are relatively weak. According to Lynch and Sabol (1997), the comparison of four measures of social integration among a cohort of soon to be released offenders for 1991 and 1997, depict minimal change in reported marital status, education, employment and children. About one-quarter of the offenders was divorced and nearly 60 percent were never married, about one-third of the offenders were unemployed prior to prison entry and two-thirds of the offenders had not completed high school.

Offenders released from confinement encounter a myriad of challenges with respect to securing employment. These include personal factors such as low self-esteem, low motivation, skills deficit, lack of training, mental illness and substance abuse; a lack of stable accommodation; social factors such as negative peer influence and absence of family support and poor employment record (Visher, et al, 2005; Rakis, 2005, Graffam, et al, 2004). Obtaining legal employment is one of the best predictions of the post release success of ex-prisoners (Visher, Winterfield and Coggeshal, 2005).

Community Factors Affecting Criminal Recidivism

The effect that the environment has on the individual returning back to community after being incarcerated, can determine if the individual's reintegration will be successful or not. Till year Vose (2011) state that the community setting which an ex-offender returns is crucial in developing an explanation about recidivism. This is based on the fact that many individuals being discharged from prisons are not returning to nurturing environments. Many return to homes that are shared with other individuals who engage in criminal activities, in chaotic communities, or communities that have a lack of community resources (Bellair and Kowalski, 2011).

To understand the individual transitions from prison custody to the community, one must focus on the complex dynamic of the moment of release (Travis et al 2001). The moment of release from prison and the hours and days that follow may be quite pivotal to the transition back to community life. The process of release is daunting and difficult as expressed by one prisoner who states: —You are taken to the front gate and whatever possession you have got are boxed up and checked and dumped (Hinton, 2004).

Following release from prison, inmates are moved directly from a controlled environment to low level of supervision or complete freedom. They may immediately be exposed to high-risk places, persons and situations and few have developed relapse prevention skills during their incarceration to deal with these risks. Prisoners facing release often reported feeling anxious about reestablishing life in the community after their discharge from prison.

John Irwin (1970) identified a three part component of an offender's return to the community. The first part is when the offender begins to —get settled down or get on your feet. During the initial period of return, they realize the difficulties of getting adjusted. Normal survival, functions like clothing, residence, transportation, employment and food dominate the offender efforts. Coupled with this is the initial impact of disorientation, which can be unsettling, as the offender has to restate —his position with family, peers and others. The next part is either get by or make it phase. After the initial settling down phase, the offender is confronted with the reality of maintaining him/herself. The search for meaning is coupled with frustrations of re-establishing the position and becoming satisfied with new life. During this phase, the offender must overcome the stigma of being an ex-offender, address vocational deficiencies and establish gratifying relationships. They return in the community with grand expectations about their prospects, and their revived role as a citizen in the community. The offender must then try to manage a citizenship role while being —Less of a citizen —(Uggen and others, 2003 37) as described by Irwin (1970) and furthered by Maruna (2001), the pathway to an outcast is far easier for many offenders than trying to overcome the obstacles to being a citizen.

Empirical Review/Crime, Poverty and Offending

The relationship between crime, poverty and recidivism is a complex one. While some critical commentators have argued that crime rates can be linked directly to rises in unemployment and the associated social and economic consequences (Box 1987), most often for a more subtle explanation which describe it as a complex relationship between various factors (Currie 1995, Downes 1995, Nillson and Agel 2003). Certainly, as Machin and Meghir (2000), have argued with regard to the UK and Gould, Weinberg and Mustard (2002) have contested regarding the US, decreases in unskilled, poverty and unemployment can be linked directly to increases in crime.

Similarly, Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2001) report results indicating that a substantial portion of the decline in US property crime rates during the 1990s is attributable to the decline in the unemployment rate. Fougere et al (2003) in France have found similarly that drugs and property offences were directly related to unemployment. However, as Currie has argued, and the idea has been developed by others (Downes 1995, Kelly 2000, Fajnzylber, Lederman and Loayza, 2002), the combination of poverty, stigmatization and unemployment cannot be divorced from broader questions which may be grouped under the heading 'inequality'. As Currie (1985) put it, access only to insecure under-employment is little better than unemployment as a source of livelihood to support a family and experience an active sense of citizenship.

The particular complexities of this crime/ poverty and unemployment relationship have been clarified to an extent by studies which have focused specifically on the employment status of offender populations rather than on the more general crime/unemployment nexus. A number of studies have contended which are empirical that shows that in developing nations like Nigeria where like of employment, unskilled and poverty have triggered number of out inmates to recommits another crime again due to the nature of their country that for offenders who succeed in moving out of a criminal lifestyle, employment plays a central role. For example, Mischkowitz reported that “erratic work patterns were substituted by more stable and reliable behaviour” amongst his sample of non-offending ex-offenders (1994:313).

Sampson and Laub (1993:220-222), describe their success stories as having “... good work habits and were frequently described as 'hard workers'.” Similarly, Horney et al found that starting work was related to reductions in offending, whilst ceasing to work was associated with the re-initiation of offending (1995:665). Like Ouimet and Le Blanc (1996) and Cusson and Pineseault (1986), Uggen (2000) also found that those aged 27 and over are more likely to desist from offending when provided with employment opportunities than those who are not offered such opportunities.⁴ One Probation based study (Bridges 1998) which examined over 700 probation clients across 11 probation areas found that twice as many offenders who were not economically strong may likely re engages in another crime activities

Theoretical Framework: Social Learning Theory

Learning theories, particularly social learning theories, believe that criminality is function of individual socialization, how individuals have been influenced by their experiences or relationships with family, peer groups, teachers, church, authority figures and other agents of socialization (Arkers et al, 1979). The social learning theory is associated with the Classical work of Bandura (1969) who formulated the principles of —Stimulus Control. According to social learning theory, the influence of peers is central to understanding the development of criminal act (Conway and Mc Cord, 2002; Mills and Faith, 2002). In order to understand and develop explanatory model of criminal behavior, social learning theorists have placed great emphasis on internal and cognitive (attitudes, beliefs, thinking style etc.) which is a focus of Bandura (1969).

According to behavioral learning theorists, people most likely repeat activities for which they are rewarded than those for which they are not rewarded or are punished. They also tend to imitate others they see being rewarded. In this case reward is experienced vicariously. This line of thought was adopted and modified by thinkers like Burges and Arkers (1966), and Glacers (1956) from Albert Bandura's social learning theory. According to Glacers (1956), all forms of interactions between an individual and his or her social environment may be incorporated in a modified theory of differential identification. He noted that —a person pursues criminal behavior to the extent that he identifies himself with real or imaginary persons from whose perspectives his criminal behavior seems acceptable.¹ Prison environment may offer a suitable environment where learning can take place as some inmates who have engaged in serious crimes may be admired and therefore serve as role models to fellow inmates.

In the context of this study, the challenge maybe on how to minimize negative and maximize positive modelling among inmates for enhanced programming outcome. Bandura's (1973) experiment on acquisition of aggressive behavior confirmed that it can be acquired through imitation. Hugh, et al (2010) states that —there is evidence that suggests imitated behaviors do survive overtime and that people will generalize the initial modeling situation to other sometimes quite dissimilar situations. It is thus important that prison rehabilitation programs help offenders to unlearn the acquired criminal behavior.

From Differential association theory perspective, (Sutherland et al, 1992) criminal behavior patterns can be acquired through interaction and communication just like other behavioral patterns. Learning occurs through association with other people who hold favorable attitudes towards crime. Factors crucial in the process include with whom the individual associate, the length, frequency, and personal meaningfulness of such associations and how early in the individual's development such associations were formed.

Methodology

Research Design

This research adopted descriptive cross-sectional survey which focused on collecting data using structured questionnaires and key informant interview. The study adopted single method approach of data collection which involves using quantitative methods of data collection. The study employed questionnaire to elicit information from the targeted population, questionnaires were also distributed within the scope of Kuje prison, inmates were the targeted population particularly, the inmates that committed crime for more than one time. The sex are men from the age of 19 and above in order to find out their views on why they prefer committing of crime if they were out of prison. And the questionnaires were distributed to 200 inmates from the scope of Kuje correctional centers

Population of the Study

The study was conducted in the Kuje correctional centre focused on the total number of men between the age of 19 and above living at Kuje prison which cauterizes single sex, it was shown that from the age of 19 to 25 there were 23 inmate that have recommitted crime for more than one time, from the study shows that, from the age of 30 to 40 there were 111 inmates and from 41 and above respectively, have 54 which composes the total number of 200 inmates that were issued questionnaire

Melville and Goddard (1999:29) refer "to population as any group that is the subject of research interest. According to Weiman and Kruger (2002:46) a "population is the study object, which may be individual, groups, organizations, human products and events, or the conditions to which they are exposed". The size of the population usually makes it impractical and uneconomical to involve all members of the population in a research project and thus a sample of the population shall be usually taken. In this case, the research shall focus on the data to be obtained from a sample of the population.

Methods of Data Collection

For the purpose of this study questionnaire was administered to the respondents with the help of some staff from within Kuje Correctional Centre. The questionnaire was categorised in three to four sections. The first comprised of the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, the second comprised of the availability and functionality of the rehabilitative facilities and programmes, while the third section comprised of the causes of recidivism.

Sources of Data collection

The study utilized both primary and secondary data; the primary data was generated through questionnaires. Similarly, 200 questionnaires were also distributed to various inmates in the correctional center from the different age groups within the Kuje Prison, combination of Muslims prisoners and Christian. From the Islamic side, 120 number of inmates groups were identified in the prison. Secondary, data was obtained from the Kuje correctional center documentary from the year of 2000 to date books, committee reports and journals.

Sampling Technique

For the purpose of the study, purposive sampling technique was adopted in the choice of respondents for the study in the Kuje Correctional Center, Purposive sampling is referred to as judgmental sampling which refers to sampling plans where the sampling is carried out through the selection of subjects by the researcher who are believed to be typical of the population that is to be studied and as such are presumed to be the representatives of the entire population. Purposive sampling is also referred to as a sampling method that relies on a particular population, subgroups or individuals who may have special characteristics or who may in the past have exhibited certain qualities which qualify the individuals or groups to be sampled (Makodi, 2005).

Furthermore, purposive sampling refers to that process of selecting or handpicking a desired sample from a group or individuals that have already been identified as useful indicators for the study. The sampling method has a wide applicability where the focus has always been on groups or individuals that are regarded as a benchmark personality in regions or the area of study. And for the purpose of the study, purposive sampling was adopted in the choice of respondents for the study in the Kuje prison the reason for choosing this sample method was to enable the study to have valid information from the targeted population

Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This section highlights the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents as they relate to the subject of the study. In this regard, the study highlighted and analysed the distribution of the respondents on the basis of their sex, age, marital status, educational qualification and occupation.

Table 1: Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Socio-demographic variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	183	100
Total	183	100
Age		
18-23	70	38
24-29	55	30
30-35	40	22
36-41	11	6.2
42 and Above	7	3.8
Total	183	100
Marital Status		
Married	22	12
Single	161	88
Total	183	100
Marital Status		
Married	22	12
Single	161	88
Total	183	100
Educational Attainment		
Primary	14	7.5
Secondary	9	5
Tertiary	11	6
Non-formal education	73	40
None	76	41.5
Total	183	100
Number of times been to prison		
Twice	103	56.3
Thrice	62	33.7
Four times and above	18	10
Total	183	100
Length of first imprisonment		
Less than 6 months	46	25
6months-1year	69	37.5
1-2years	23	12.5
2-3years	34	18.8
3-4years	9	5
4years and above	2	1.2
Total	183	100
Occupation before first conviction		
Drivers/Conductors	92	50
Trader	57	31.3
Welder	12	6.3
Apprentice	22	12.4
Total	183	100
Religion affiliation		
Muslims	111	69.6
Christian	89	31.4
None of the above		
Level of income		
30. 000.	None	0
20. 000	None	0
10. 000	None	0
5. 000	None	0
1.000	None	0
None of the above	Yes	100
Family size		
Compound family	19	21
Simple family	121	54
None of the above	60	34

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondent. Then findings from the table revealed that 100% of the respondents are male. The age distribution shows that, respondents within the ages of 18 – 23 years were of the highest number representing 38%. This is followed by respondents who are of the ages of 24 – 29 years representing 30%. While the ages 30 – 35 years representing 22%, 36 – 41 years representing 6.2% and 42 years and above were 3.8% each representing the lowest age of respondents. These indicate that most of the respondents who took part in this study were young adults. On the marital status of the respondents, 88% of the respondents were single while 12% are married.

Level of respondents who were single was due to the age range of majority of the recidivists, in educational level of respondents revealed that 5% had secondary education while 7.5% had primary education 40% had non-formal education and 41.5% had no form of education and they consist the highest range of respondents. Majority 60% of the respondents spent less than two years in prison at their first conviction. It was also discovered that majority of the respondents 56.3% have been to prison twice while 33.7% have been to prison three times and finally, 10% have been to the prison four times and above. The table also reveals that majority 50% of the respondents were transporters before their first conviction. Majority 37.5% of the respondents at first conviction spent between 6 months to a year in prison.

Table 2: Views of Respondents on How Functional the Available Facilities and Programmes are.

Facilities and workshop programmes available	Functional	Non-functional	Total
Educational	153(83.7%)	30(16.3%)	183(100%)
Carpentry	114(62.5%)	69(37.5%)	183(100%)
Metal workshop (welding)	114(62.5%)	69(37.5%)	183(100%)
Tailoring	114(62.5%)	69(37.5%)	183(100%)
Car wash	114(62.5%)	69(37.5%)	183(100%)
Laundry	130(71.2%)	53(28.8%)	183(100%)
Saloon	114(62.5%)	69(37.5%)	183(100%)
Games	183(100%)	0 (0%)	183(100%)
Religious activities	183(100%)	0 (0%)	183(100%)
Guardian and counseling	142(77.5%)	41(22.5%)	183(100%)
Health care	183(100%)	0(0%)	183(100%)

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 2 assessed views of respondents on the available facilities and programmes. The data obtained shows that majority of the respondents stated that there are functional educational facilities 83.7% available in the prisons. Majority 62.5% of the respondents stated that there is functional carpentry workshop while 37.5% said there is no functioning carpentry workshop. Majority 62.5% stated that there is functional metal

workshop while 37.5% are of the view that there is no functioning metal workshop. Majority of the respondents stated that there is functioning tailoring workshop 62.5% while 37.5% are of the view that the tailoring workshop is not functioning. 62.5% which represents majority of respondents are of the view that the car wash workshop is functioning while 37.5% are of the view that it is not in existence. Majority of the respondents 71.2% are of the view that the laundry workshop is functioning while 28.8% are of the view that the laundry workshop is not functioning. Majority of the respondents 62.5% are of the view that the saloon workshop is functioning while 37.5% are of the view that it is not functioning. All the respondents 100% are of the view that games activities are functioning. All the respondents 100% are of the view that religious activities are functioning. Majority of the respondents 77.5% are of the view that the guardian and counseling is functioning while 22.5% are of the view that it is not functioning. All the respondents 100% are of the view that health care is functioning.

Table 3: Views of Respondents on the Importance of Available Facilities

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	123	71.3
No	5.7	28.7
Total	183	100

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 3 shows the view of respondents on the importance of available facilities. The table shows that majority of the respondents 71.3% are of the view that workshops and programmes in prisons are important in the rehabilitation and reformation process while 28.7% are of the view that they are not important.

Table 4: Views of Respondents on the Causes of Recidivism

Items	Agreed	Undecided	Disagreed	Total
Unemployment	171(93.7%)	12(6.3%)	0(0%)	183(100%)
Poverty	183(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	183(100%)
Peer group influence	103(56.2%)	37(20%)	43(23.8%)	183(100%)
Low educational qualification	119(65%)	25(13.7%)	39(21.3%)	183(100%)
Length of first sentence	89(48.8%)	27(15%)	67(36.2%)	183(100%)
Prisonization	39(21.2%)	53(28.8%)	91(50%)	183(100%)
Weakness of rehabilitation and reformation programmes	142(77.5%)	23(12.5%)	18(10%)	183(100%)
Lack of proper re-integration programmes	183(100%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	183(100%)
Stigmatization	66(36.2%)	82(45%)	35(18.8%)	183(100%)
Lack of visits by loved ones and family	105(57.5%)	27(15%)	51(27.5%)	183(100%)
Devils doing	137(75%)	27(15%)	19(10%)	183(100%)
Habitual criminality	0(0%)	5(2.5%)	178(97.5%)	183(100%)

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 4 measures respondent's views on the causes of recidivism in Kuje Correctional Center. The Table showed that virtually all the respondents (93.7%) agreed that unemployment is a causal factor of recidivism. This implies that unemployment is a cause of recidivism. Also from the Table, 100% of respondents agreed that poverty is the major cause of recidivism in Kuje Correctional Centre. The Table further show that 56.2% of the respondents were of the view that peer group influence outside the prison is a contributing factor to the causes of recidivism in Kuje Correctional Center.

The Table further shows that 65% of the respondents were of the view that low educational qualifications are a contributing factor to the causes of recidivism in Kuje Correctional Center. This implies that lack of education is a casual factor to re-offending life style. The findings also showed that majority (48.8%) of the respondents were of the view that length of first sentence is a contributing factor to the causes of recidivism.

The table further shows that majority 50% of the respondents disagree that prisonization is a contributing factor to and majority (77.5%) of the respondents were of the view that weakness of rehabilitation and reformation programmes is a contributing factor recidivism. The Table also revealed that all 100% of respondents are of the view that there is lack of proper re-integration programmes. The Table also revealed that 36.2% of respondents are of the view that stigmatization contributes to recidivism while 45% are undecided if stigmatization actually causes recidivism and 18.8% totally disagree.

The Table also revealed that majority (57.5%) of respondents opined that lack of visitation by loved ones and families contributes to recidivism. The data from the table also revealed that 75% of respondents are of the view that devil himself is responsible for them committing another crime after release while 15% are undecided and 10% totally disagree. The Table also revealed that none of respondent's belief that they are habitual criminals while 2.5% are undecided and 97.5% totally disagree.

Level of Infrastructural Provisions on the Correctional Centre

Table 5: Views of Respondents on the level Infrastructural Provision of Basic Inmates

Items	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Total
Security	140(76.3%)	9(5%)	34(18.7%)	183(100%)
Discipline	165(90%)	12(6.3%)	6(3.7%)	183(100%)
Medical attention	62(33.7%)	16(8.8%)	105(57.5%)	183(100%)
Population of inmates (Recidivism)	7(3.8%)	27(15%)	149(81.2%)	183(100%)
Accommodation	0 (0%)	32(17.5%)	151(82.5%)	183(100%)
Feeding	71(38.8%)	23(12.5%)	89(48.7%)	183(100%)

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 5 Shows the views of respondents on the structure and problems of Kuje Correctional Centre. The table shows that majority 76.3% of the respondents are of the view that adequate security is provided in the prison. Also, same table shows that majority of respondents 90% are of the view that adequate discipline is in the prison.

The table also revealed that 57.5% of respondents are of the view that medical attention is in bad shape. It was observed that the beddings in the prison clinic are not adequate and modern medical facilities are not available. The table also revealed that 81.2% of respondents are of the view that the prison is over populated and 82.5% are of the view that their accommodation is in a bad shape.

Also, 48.7% which represents the majority of the respondents stated that feeding is in a very bad shape. This is true because the total population of inmates is more than the initial design or capacity of the prisons. In terms of feeding, there is no adequate provision for awaiting trial therefore; food has to be sorted out from that of the convicts.

Table 6: Views of Respondents on Ways of Reducing Recidivism

Solution to Recidivism	Yes	No	Total
Provision of modern and adequate facilities in the prison	74(92.5%)	6(7.5%)	80(100%)
Provision of employment (proper reintegration exercise) for released inmates	78(97.5%)	2(2.5%)	80(100%)
Public awareness of the impacts of stigmatization on released inmates.	67(83.8%)	13(16.2%)	80(100%)
Provision of affordable schools	71(88.8%)	9(11.2%)	80(100%)
Grass root awareness of the consequences of crime and the role of Nigeria Correctional Service	73(91.3%)	7(8.7%)	80(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 6 shows views of respondents on how to reduce recidivism. Majority of the respondents 92.5% are of the view that if recidivism is to be reduced, modern and adequate. From the interpretation on the above table indicated that, there is need for the effective and efficient provision of adequate facilities that would enable those inmates to developed sense of independence after coming out from the prison, such facilities include adequate provision of educational attainment from primary schools to tertiary institution and they should be able to obtained any kind of course of study medicine, Law and many more professional courses.

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the nature of existing structure of Kuje correctional centre in terms of rehabilitation and reformation of inmates, the causes of recidivism, what are the correctional facilities and programmes in place that helps in the rehabilitation and reformation exercise, what are the problems and finally what measures can be suggested to help in mitigating the phenomenon of recidivism in Kuje medium security correctional centre. The findings revealed that the recidivists are within the ages of 18-23, single, not educated, have mostly been to the prison twice and are basically bus drivers or bus conductors. The findings also revealed that these recidivists are individuals who are young, in their productive years and their educational status reveals that they cannot afford the prescribed means of attaining stipulated goals as suggested by the Strain theory of Merton. Therefore, they employ a non-conformist approach in achieving these goals and over time this has landed them in the prison more than once. It was also discovered that there are existing structures and facilities in Kuje medium security correctional centre. The study confirmed that the centre is well guarded, provided with security personnel whom are well equipped with arms. All these security measures are in place to protect inmates as well as forestall escapes.

These correctional facilities were believed to be useful in the rehabilitation and reformation exercise of inmates. This is consistent with the findings of Gulleng (2012). Gulleng (2012), observed that the provision of education, vocational and moral religious education along with the safe custody of the offenders is considered the primary responsibilities of correctional and penal institutions.

Social factors such as unemployment, stigmatization, peer pressure, lack of proper reformation and rehabilitation programmes in prison as well as poor reintegration exercise has been the reason for the high rate of crime as well as recidivism. This is consistent with the findings of Findley (1999), crime cannot be understood outside of its social context. He notes that its context is a transitional state within which crime influences, and is influenced by, a variety of social, cultural, political and economic determinants. The argument advanced by Findley (1999), seems to be particularly true for the respondents in this research as the findings reveal that crime and the increasing rate of recidivism is influenced by a range of socioeconomic factors that impact on ex-offenders.

Conclusion

Our findings posit a considerable proportion of recidivism among the inmates and it is higher among unemployed and those whose offence was stealing. Kaplan-Meier curves to the survival times were compared by using Cox-Mantel Log Rank comparison test. The null hypothesis that assumed equality of curves was rejected at 95% confidence level for employment status only. Whereas, KM curves for marital status, educational background, offence category and age were not significantly different. This is consistent with the preliminary analysis using Chi-square test. It leads to the conclusion that unemployment is the major cause of recidivism. It then follows that lack of jobs after release makes ex-convict return to committing crimes and consequently returning to the

prison. Unemployment in this fold may result from stigmatization of ex-convicts rendering them unemployable. Also, absence of statistical relationship between risk factors (marital statuses, educational background, Offence Categories, Age) and Recidivism does not imply that these variables do not influence recidivism, they do, but with only minimal effects and are inadequately explained in the model. Results of the mean/median survival time of inmates show that in both states, married ex-convict's recidivated earlier than singles and the average time until recidivating is 453 days. This leads to the conclusion that people in Ondo State return to prison early compare to Ekiti State. In age group, people who are within the age group 25-34 returned to prison earlier than the other age categories during the first 400 days. In Offence Category, people who committed assault returned to prison early compared to others. Lastly, we observed that people with primary education recidivate early compare to others in this category.

Recommendations

The history of punishment has shown that the trend in penal policy has been to move away from infliction of physical pain and emotional suffering. Yet, the situation in Nigeria seems to contradict these logical assumptions. Here in Nigeria, there seems to be a steady move towards more and more imprisonment with all the pains, suffering and humiliation that it entails. In order to avert this situation which undoubtedly lead to recidivism, this study has made the following recommendations: (i) Provision of more intensive rehabilitation and reformative services within Nigeria prisons (ii) Increase funding by the government so as to enhance correctional and rehabilitative programmes in the prisons. (iii) Vocational training in prisons should be expanded and adequately equipped so as to prepare the ex-convict for discharge. Empowerments and funding also should be made available in form of loans and interventions by government with effective follow-up in order to put the training to professional practice. (iv) The public should adopt positive attitude towards ex-convicts. This could be done by re-integrating them into the social system after their release and Laws prohibiting stigmatization of ex-convicts should be enacted to discourage the act. (v) The government should create employment opportunities for ex-convicts. (vi) Finally, other non-institutional methods of punishment such as fines, restitution, restoration and parole should be used in cases of common offenders.

Based on the findings of the research, the following recommendations are provided:

Based on the finding that shows the absence of correctional facilities, and where it is present inadequate and obsolete, the researcher wishes to recommend the provision of modern and adequate correctional facilities in Nigerian prisons. One of the important rationales for a total overhaul of the prison system in Nigeria is to reposition the system in order to perform its constitutional and expected roles in the society, which are not yet met. These roles are as follow: Reforming the prisoners to be better than what they were before. Rehabilitating the prisoners in order to equip them with new skills or improve on their old ones and the acquisition of skills should be mandatory to all inmates.

The Nigerian Prison Service should liaise with businesses for employment opportunities, specifically for ex-offenders. Family members should be encouraged to become more involved in the reformation, rehabilitation and reintegration process. In order to understand what interventions, the offender has gone through, the families concerned should be guided through counselling and family group sessions to prepare for the offender's release. Public awareness of the impact of stigmatization on ex-offenders should be a program hosted regularly. Adequate employment of competent prison staff should be done by the Federal Government. These will reduce the inmate to staff ratio, and this will allow proper monitoring of in-mates reformation and rehabilitation processes. Grass root awareness of the consequences of crime and the role of Nigerian Correctional services should be held occasionally.

References

- Adelola, O. (1991). A personal management in Ado Ekiti prison, *African Journal of Sociology*, 12-16.
- Adeseye, K. (2006). Human cages, *The Vanguard*, 17.
- Adetula, G., Adetula, A., & Fatusin, A. (2010). *The prison subsystem culture; Its additional effects on operatives*, *Convicts and the Free Society. Ife Psychology*, 232-251.
- Adler, C. & Coyle, E. (1996). The sociology of imprisonment, *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 73-80.
- Agomoh, I. (1996). A reflection of present Prison system in Nigeria, *Internet Criminology Journal*, 66-70.
- Ahire, P. (1990). The Nigeria prison system: A social history. *National Seminar on Prison Reform in Nigeria*, Abuja: Nigeria
- Albertus, C. (2010). *Offender reintegration in South Africa: A complimentary crime prevention strategy*, Open society foundation
- Alemika, E., & Chukwuma, I. (2000). *Juvenile justice administration in Nigeria: Philosophy and Practice*, Lagos: Center for Law Enforcement.
- Andersen, S. N., Skardhamar, T. (2014). *Pick a number: Mapping recidivism measures and their consequences Oslo*, Statistics Norway Discussion Papers
- Bohm, G. & Harley, R. (1996). *Introduction to criminal justice*, California: California Press.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). Prisonization and recidivism in New York, *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 297-280.
- Cox, & Wade, U. (1989). *Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dambazau, A. (2007). *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Grinnell, R. M. & Unrau, Y. A. (2005). *Social work research and evaluation: Quantitative and qualitative approach* (7thed.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Opara, A. (1980). Penal institutions in Nigeria, *Journal of Criminology*, 23-27.
- Olayiwola, A. O. (2007). *Procedures in educational research*, Hanijam publications, Ahmadu Bello Way, Kaduna: Nigeria 106.
- Osaze, L. E. (1996). *Behind the wall*, Lagos: Civil Liberties Organization Publishers,
- Patricia, S. (2001). *Stigma and misbehavior*, New York: Free press.
- Rod, A. (1997). *Drugs and crime*, Devon: Willian Publishing.
- Ryan, M., & Sim, J. (1998). *Power, punishment and prisons in England and wales comparing penal systems*, Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Soyinka, W. (1972), *In Prison. (A Paper, Interviewer)*
- Sutherland, E. H. (1978). *Principles of criminology*, Philadelphia: Lipincott.
- Tanimu, B. (2010), Nigeria Convicts and Prison Rehabilitation Ideals, *A Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*.
- Tappan, P. (1960). *Crime, justice and correction*, New York: McGraw Hill Book. Co.
- Thomas, C., & Hepburn, J. (1983). *Crime, criminal law and criminology*, Iowa: W.C Brown and Co. Pub.
- Thomson, D. (2004). *Crime and deviance: Introduction to sociology*, Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Travis, J. & Visher, C. (2005). *Prisoner reentry and public safety: Introduction, Prisoner reentry and Public Safety*, Cambridge University Press.
- Visher, C. A. & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community understanding individual pathways, *Annual Review of sociology*, 89-93
- Vold, G. B. (1958). *Theoretical criminology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wambugu, P. M. (2014). *Chaplaincy and rehabilitating prisoners: A case of Embu and Kamiti prisons in Kenya*, Unpublished. M.A Thesis, Kenyatta University
- Wilson, H. (2009). *A datum corporation*, Retrieved June 12, 2013, from A Datum Corporation: [http// .www.pioneering.com/article/php](http://www.pioneering.com/article/php)