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ABSTRACT

Prisoners re-entry into the society has emerged as a lens through which to view the numerous issues related to the process of prisoner incarceration, release and subsequent failure or success on the outside world. There is, therefore, need to look into the influence prison education has on recidivism, with the aim of improving the quality of education for inmates in terms of physical facilities, manpower requirements and funding. The objectives of the study were: to establish the influence prisoners rehabilitative education on recidivism, to assess the status of educational and vocational facilities in prisons and to identify the challenges facing inmates rehabilitative education in Kiambu County. The study was based on human capital theory. This theory was relevant since prison education should be externally efficient by making prisoners upon release participate in economic development and societal wellbeing. The target population of this study comprised 2 prison wardens, 23 prison instructors and the 1,364 prisoners. The study employed descriptive survey design. The selected sample for this study comprised 2 (100%) officers in charge, 5 (20%) prison teachers and 136 (10%) inmates both first-time offenders and recidivist inmates from 2 prisons in Kiambu County. Purposive sampling was used to select the only prison with both male and female prisoners and also to select the officers in charge to be interviewed. From the remaining two male prisons, one prison was used for pilot study meaning the remaining one male prison was automatically included in study. The prisoners were selected purposively to include first time offenders and recidivist inmate. Participants were selected through simple random sampling. Observation guide, questionnaires and interview schedules were the major tools for data collection. Questionnaires were administered to prison instructors (teachers) and inmates, while interviews were administered to officer in charge. The researcher sought the assistance of the supervisors, who as experts in research improved content validity of the instruments. The co-efficient value 0.61 was obtained, this was a positive result thus the reliability of the instruments was acceptable. The data were analyzed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Qualitative data obtained were grouped according to study objectives and then coded. The result was presented in form of tables and figures. The researcher found that prison in Kiambu County host large number of young prisoners who are not well educated. Prisons partly depended on volunteers teachers, prison teachers lack experience as their counterparts outside prison, there is severe shortage of learning facilities, education in prisons is voluntary, there is severe conflict between education time table and work schedule, the level of recidivism stands between 45% and 50% partly due to low education attainment, between 30 and 40% of recidivist inmates had benefitted from prison education. Lack of employment, capital and societal attitudes were other factors leading to recidivism. Based on the finding, the following recommendations were made; prisons should be provided with enough qualified teaching professions. Adequate teaching and learning resources should be provided. Prison education should be compulsory. Rehabilitative education should be given more priority than work. TSC should play a role by providing experienced teachers. Finally, provision of finances at prison level should be enhanced in order to meet the day-to-day educational needs.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter comprises background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, assumptions of the study, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of terms.

1.1 Background to the Study

Prison education, also known as inmate education and correctional education, is a broad term that encompasses any number of educational activities occurring inside a prison. The educational activities include both vocational and academic education. The goal of such activities is to prepare the prisoner to be successful upon release and to enhance the rehabilitative aspect of prison (Harer, 2000).

Prisons in Kenya have embraced both academic education and vocational training as a means of lowering recidivism rate. Those entering correctional facilities may benefit from literacy, communication and other subjects that will ease the individual’s transition into a correction setting. The main objective of prison services in Kenya is to carry out rehabilitation programmes aimed at training, counselling and reforming offenders for effective and sustainable reintegration back to society.

Successful prison rehabilitative programmes must be efficient. Prison rehabilitative education should have positive influence on the private and social benefits derived
from investment in education. Typically, these are measured by private and social economic rates of return. This concept is applied in order to monitor and evaluate how well resources are used in an educational system and to prioritize the use of such resources. For the case of this research, influence of prison education on recidivism would best be determined by ascertaining the impact which prison education is making on the individual upon release of the inmate. Items such as community gains, returns to individual, life time income, behavioural change and social stability are factored in determining influence of prison rehabilitative education on recidivism.

Education in the correctional services is meant to influence the behaviour of inmates by assisting them in coping with society and becoming self-reliant and impart knowledge, enabling the individual to make the most of his talents and contribute to wealth creation in society. Appropriate education and training that is externally efficient is a vital part of a successful rehabilitation and is thus an investment in the future. This research therefore intended to find out if the prison education the inmates receive influence on the rate of recidivism.

Despite these important roles prison education plays, most of stakeholders and the community at large seem less conscious of the state of prison education. A study on the efficacy of prison education in terms of curriculum, adequacy of facilities, finance and qualified teaching personnel and their impact in making prison education externally efficient in terms of promoting public safety, economic development and social cohesion will help to fill this gap in knowledge.
Kenya has a total of 93 prisons with a total of prisoner population of over 70,000. The prisoners comprise those convicted and remanded awaiting conclusion of their cases (Office of Public Communication, 2012). Table 1.1 shows the number of prisoners in Kenya prisons by age and year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4,455</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>27,838</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>30,122</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>20,471</td>
<td>2,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>37,005</td>
<td>5,666</td>
<td>35,102</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>29,339</td>
<td>3,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>6,549</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>11,301</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>97,785</td>
<td>13,349</td>
<td>99,547</td>
<td>14,540</td>
<td>79,449</td>
<td>8,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>111,134</td>
<td>114,087</td>
<td>88,414</td>
<td>108,032</td>
<td>88,631</td>
<td>76,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It’s observable from table 1.1 that prisons in Kenya hold thousands of many young people especially those between the ages of 16 to 25. This calls for the need to educate these young prisoners in equal measure as their counterparts in schools outside prison if they have to be properly reintegrated into the society upon release. Prisoners of compulsory school age need to participate in education and be provided with adequate educational facilities particularly in technical skills.

In late November 2013, the government through presidential pardon had to release over 4000 prisoners from Kamiti maximum prison who have served jail term of over twenty years with the hope of decongesting the prisons. This rekindles attention on
the reintegration into society of prisoners amid recent reports of many former inmates lapsing into crime (Nation Newspaper Thursday November 21st 2013).

Table 1.2: Prison Populations of Recidivists’ Inmates (sex) 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24,656</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>28,058</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>20620</td>
<td>1,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>28,058</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>20620</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28,058</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>20620</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>20620</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>26,436</td>
<td>25,932</td>
<td>30,547</td>
<td>22,586</td>
<td>12,949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although there is a significant reduction on the number of recidivist inmates between year 2011 and 2012, the number still remains high. The question if prison education offered is externally efficient needs to be addressed. This is the concern of this research.

Like any other prison in Kenya, prisons in Kiambu County have continued to offer inmates rehabilitation programmes and vocational education and training that would help them be reintegrated into the society and actively participate in positive socio-economic engagements upon release. What was not clear was whether the quality of prison rehabilitative education in Kiambu County is good enough to reduce recidivism. The skills gained by ex-convicts enhance their chances of engaging in gainful employment and minimize their chances of resorting to criminal activities. Many studies have been undertaken on the importance of prison education. This study therefore shifted its focus to the influence prison education has on recidivism with the purpose of sensitizing stakeholders in education sector on what needs to be done.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The rate of recidivism in Kenya stands at 50% (Karimi, 2011). In 2012 alone, there were 12,949 cases of recidivist inmates. This raises a serious concern about the influence prison education has on recidivism in Kenya. An indication that the prison service in Kenya has yet to fully realize the purpose of correctional education in providing inmates with an opportunity to change their personal behaviour, values and reduce recidivism. This high rate of recidivism could compromise societal security and development. The need for access to quality educational and vocational programmes in prisons that are efficient is an issue of concern if the cases of rising recidivism among released prisoners are to be addressed. In this recognition, this research intended to look into the influence prison education has on recidivism in Kiambu County.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to assess the influence prison education has on recidivism in Kiambu County.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

i) To assess the status of educational and vocational facilities in prisons in Kiambu County.

ii) To establish/assess the influence prisons rehabilitative education has on recidivism.

iii) To identify the challenges facing prisons rehabilitative education in Kiambu County.
1.4 **Research Questions**

The study was guided by the following research questions:

i) What was the status of educational and vocational facilities in prisons in Kiambu County?

ii) What influence does prisons rehabilitative education have on reduction of recidivism?

iii) What factors lead the recidivist inmates back to jail?

iv) What challenges did prisons face in the provision of rehabilitative education in Kiambu County?

1.5 **Significance of the Study**

It is hoped that the findings of this study would:

i) Provide valuable insight to policy makers and the public on the influence of prison education on recidivism.

ii) Contribute to the body of knowledge that would assist policy makers on how to improve the inmate education with an aim of making it more efficient thus promoting security by reducing recidivism.

1.6 **Limitations of the Study**

The research was limited due to the fact that prisoners have different jail terms; some are new convicts who may be emotionally stressed to give the correct information and may have not stayed in prison long enough to paint the correct state of affairs. The researcher used purposive sampling to try and overcome this limitation.
1.6.1 Delimitation
The study was confined in only two prisons in Kiambu County. It considered the officers in charge of prison, prison instructors and inmates but excluded other stakeholders who may have more information. In data collection, the study relied on questionnaires and interview which have a set of preconceived questions that may not capture every information the respondents may have pertaining to the status of prison education.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study
This study assumed that:

(i) All the respondents would give truthful and honest response to the questionnaires and interviews.

(ii) Inmates who enroll in educational programmes were less likely to return to prison.

(iii) Inmates who benefit from quality education end up being financially independent and thus promote national growth and security.

1.8 Theoretical Framework
This research was based on Human Capital Theory, an economist theory on the effect of education. According to Bouchard (1998:129) human capital represents those abilities and information that have economic value. Therefore, an efficient prison education should equip inmates with abilities and information that would make them participate in economic development by providing the manpower required by the economy. This may not necessary be inform of direct employment but also through self-employment.
Becker (1993) states that human capital is the stock of competence, knowledge, social and personality attributes, including creativity embodied in the ability to perform labour so as to produce economies value. It is an aggregate economic view of the human being acting within economies which is an attempt to capture the social, biological, cultural and psychological complexity as they interact in explicit and/or economic transactions. To this end-prison education is supposed to develop the human capital most appropriate for economic development and develop values in the human capital that are conducive for economic development such as ability to save, invest, transparency and ability to co-exist peacefully therefore reducing crime rates and recidivism. Many theories explicitly connect investments in human capital developments to education and the role of human capital in economic development, productivity growth and innovation.

The adoption of human capital theory in this research is, therefore, relevant since prison education should be efficient by making the prisoner upon release to participate in economic development, thus self-dependency and also be able to develop their distinct talents and relate well with the community.

Education that is efficient increases labour productivity and economic returns are higher. In addition, it reduces fertility, improves health and nutrition and promotes other behavioural and attitudinal changes which are helpful to economic development such as reduced crime rates. As such, prison education is expected to be efficient in reducing possibility of recidivism.
Based on the assumption that well-educated prisoners upon release re-enter the community with the ability to seek work and to re-establish their civic identity and participate in economic developments of the society. Educated prisoners upon release are less likely to engage in crime due to financial independence and the opportunity cost involved in committing crime and thus incarceration. This theory was therefore the most appropriate for this study since prison education should be geared towards efficiency thus developing the whole person in totality thus maximizing on their innate and acquired skills for the benefit of the individual, the society and the country at large.

1.9 Conceptual Framework

**Status of prison education in terms of:**
- Financial support from government, non-governmental organizations, individuals and sponsors,
- Availability of physical facilities:
  - Classrooms
  - Laboratory
  - Textbooks, etc
- Availability of qualified teaching staff in prison

**Ideal Status of prison education leads to:**
- High Enrolment by prisoners to quality education:
  - Academic training
  - Vocational training
  - Others

**Outcomes of efficient prison education:**
- Reduced recidivism
- Employability
- Economic independence
- Savings
- Social transition
- Public safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conceptual framework indicates that financial support from government, non-governmental organizations and sponsors leads to availability of different physical facilities in prisons as well as availability of qualified teaching staff which makes enrolment to quality education by prisoners to be practical. However, other factors play important role in deciding the drive of prisoners to pursue education such as motivation of the prisoner to learn and motivation from prison staff to the prisoners to pursue education. Individual characteristics upon entry to prison such as prior academic training determine the level of entry of prisoner to formal education or vocational training in prison. Once enrolled in academic, vocational education and other forms of faith-based programmes, the prisoner is expected at the end the programme to be tested, certified and accredited.

Upon accreditation and release of the prisoner after completing jail term, the efficiency of prison education should be evident since the level of recidivism is expected to reduce, the prisoner becomes economically independent, the government is able to save money that could have otherwise been used if the prisoner was not trained and not economically independent thus committing another crime leading to further imprisonment. It will also promote social transition of the prisoner to a more prestigious social level hence the prisoner is less likely to engage in further crime. This results to public safety. These entire outcomes promote economic development of the individuals and public safety of the nation at large.
1.10 Operational Definition of Terms

County: A territorial division of a country forming the chief unit of local administration.

Curriculum: Planned interaction of learners with instructional context, material resources and process for evaluating the attainment of educational objectives.

Efficiency: An education system that meets individual and societal needs and expectations.

Facilities: The prison plant, equipment such as buildings, instructional material etc.

Inmates: A person confined to an institution such as a prison.

Officers in charge: Prison warden is the chief administrative official of a prison.

Prison education: A number of educational activities occurring inside a prison. Also known as correctional education.

Prison instructor: An inmate tutor or teacher in a prison setting.

Recidivism: Act of repeating an undesirable behaviour after experiencing negative consequences of that behaviour.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on nature of prison educational and reduced recidivism, challenges of prison education, prison education in developed countries, prison education in Africa and prison education in Kenya.

2.1 Nature of Prison Education and Reduced Recidivism

Education for prisoners should be like the education for similar age-group in outside institutions. This kind of education must also be able to meet the individual and societal needs, meaning it has to be efficient. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 45/111 on Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners at article 6 states, “All prisoners should have the right to take part in cultural activities and education aimed at the full development of the human personality (UN, 2007).

The understanding of the term prison education varies considerably from country to country. NMES (2005) states that education and training in prison service follows the current curriculum of education in a country. Skills acquired while in serving time will form the basis for qualification. Sulton (1993) puts it down that the immediate objectives of prison education at the basic level is to enhance employment, vocational skills and/or advance to further education and training.

Prison education must be effective in bringing the change the society and the individual desire; Bracker (2011) suggests is that prison education must be adequately efficient to be able to meet individual and societal needs by holistically
rehabilitating inmates by equipping them with basic knowledge and skills to ensure self-employment and the reduction of recidivism. In addition, Werner (1990) states that correctional education has a social responsibility to provide the inmates with clear thinking, wise judgment and effective communications.

There are critics who view prison education differently as a waste of tax payer’s money on criminals who are supposed to be punished for their deeds. This shouldn’t be the case, both Erisman and Cantardo (2005) observe that prison education should not be seen as a way of rewarding inmates for their crimes but as an opportunity offered to prisoners to aid their re-entry into society by providing them with enhanced work skills. To allow continuation with education by inmates upon release, there is need to harmonize the prison curriculum with that of ordinary schools outside prison. UN stresses the importance of aligning the prison curriculum with that of the community so that upon release, the prisoners may resume learning without significant difficulty (UN, 2007). This research sought to find out the kind of curriculum offered in prisons in Kiambu County and if it was aligned to the curriculum in mainstream education, since the curriculum offered in prisons will have direct bearing on the possibility of inmates upon release to further their skills.

Teachers in prisons should be as qualified as any other teacher outside prison. Rechel (2012) observes that teachers in correctional setting should be qualified with their professional status recognized. Bera (2004) observes that in some countries the prison educator is a highly qualified professional teacher who enjoys the same terms and conditions of employment as their colleagues on the outside. In some countries, the teacher trainers are employed by the Ministry of Justice or Prisons and are
considered to be prison officers first and foremost and only second as a teacher or trainer. This research sought to find out where prisons in Kiambu County source their teachers from, since this would affect the quality of education and in turn determine the efficiency of prison education in reducing recidivism.

Prison education should reduce recidivism. Recidivism is the rate at which offenders that have been imprisoned return to crime (and prison) after their release from prisons. Recidivism is thus a personal psychological phenomenon in that the particular person has not been able to overcome the conditions that pushed them into crime in the first place. Recidivism is also an economic phenomenon in that the state spends more and more money on the security system, the justice system and the correctional systems with no apparent effect (Kofi, Baffour & Zawada, 2004).

Prison has traditionally been designed to punish and confine those who break the law; however, policy changes demands that prisons expand programmes that rehabilitate inmates and that are efficient by preparing prisoners to return to serve their communities. Asokhia (2005) states there is no better way to help inmates to re-enter the larger society successfully and break in and out of jail than provide them with skills that they need to succeed in the outside world.

Marotti (2001) emphasizes the role of education as an important determinant of crime; education has a multiple role in deterring crime. It raises skills and abilities and then improves labour market perspectives thus implying a higher opportunity cost of crime and it has a non-market effect that affects the preference of individuals.
Many scholars agree that prison education increases the prospects of an inmate upon release to secure a job or to participate in positive socio-economic activities. Wells (2000) states that there is a positive relationship between post-secondary education, social bonding and recidivism. Case and Fasenfest (2004) states that prison education gives inmates the opportunity to increase their job marketability, it represents the difference between returning to criminal activities and possessing the skills and credentials necessary to find suitable employment upon release. This research intended to find out whether inmates in prisons in Kiambu County benefit from quality academic programmes that are efficient thus equipping them with suitable skills that enable them to secure employment upon release.

Correctional education programmes participants and legislators and public are frequently unaware of the potential savings, in terms of fiscal resources and public safety, which correctional education can offer. This research intended to document trends in inmate access to quality instructional programmes and their impact on influence of prison education on recidivism, this will equip the reader with an understanding of the impact, prison education programmes have on efficiency.

Klein, Michelle and Forrest (2004) note that increasing inmate access to correctional education programmes, will require providing state policy-makers and the general public with a better understanding of the scope and effectiveness of correctional education programmes and training efforts. Thus, the purpose of this research was to bring into the limelight the influence prison education has on recidivism in Kiambu County with an aim to sensitizing the public and policy makers on what needs to be done in order to enhance efficiency of prison education.
2.2 Challenges Facing Prison Education

There are challenges that face the prisons in their endeavor to provide prison education. The physical and social environment in which education takes place can either strengthen or weaken the prisoner’s motivation. It is important that the atmosphere for learning in prison to be as attractive as possible. The attitude of prison staff towards prisoners’ education must also be positive if Kenya has to realize the full benefits of an efficient inmates’ education.

Despite the possible positive impacts of prison education in most countries, the criminal justice system has not been given adequate recognition and support to educate prison inmates. Quigley (1997), notes that there are primary barriers to literacy education; dispositional, institutional and situational. In correctional education dispositional barriers involve the inmates’ attitude towards formal learning. Institutional includes lack of economic funding, educational resources (such as books, handout materials, and computers (etc), classroom space, teaching personnel and security personnel. Situational barriers to inmates include transfer to another prison site and inmate disciplinary problems that result in solitary confinement. These factors noted by Quigley will have a direct impact on determining how efficient prison education would be.

The major challenges that could be facing provision of prison education as highlighted by Kennedy (2007) are overcrowding, a serious lack of facilities, drug abuse, violence and intimidation among prisoners and inhumane conditions facing prison education. Braggers and Talbot (2003) further add to the list of challenges facing prison education such as lack of better teaching staff, better teacher-student
relationship, and lack of study space, unsympathetic inmates and long waiting list in available places. Financial challenges cannot be over emphasized in fact Tolbet Klein and Pedroso (2006) observe that due to resource constraints not all inmates eligible for educational services are able to enroll. There are many other factors that would have a direct bearing on the external efficiency of prison education as noted by Whitney (2009) such as access, turnover of population and segregation, lack of remedial schooling prior to high school level instructions to bring inmates up to speed, security issues and remote site that pose transportation problems for teachers. This research focused on finding out if such challenges face prisons in Kiambu County thus compromising the influence prison education has on recidivism and to find out the possible remedies.

The circulation of teachers and good contact with other schools is desirable for teachers in the schools in prison. If this does not happen, then the prisons are at risk of becoming isolated. Teachers in the correctional service normally tend to remain permanently in their positions. This may have a static effect and thus cut off the supply of fresh ideas and new expertise from the main school. This will have a direct bearing on the efficiency of prison education in reducing recidivism. NMER (2005) states that educationalists working within prison should have qualifications and experience similar to those of main stream education, in this regard this research sought to find out if teachers in prisons in Kiambu County are flexible in terms of movement from ordinary schools to prison schools and vice versa for this would determined the quality of education provided and therefore, affect the influence of prison education has on recidivism.
Prison educators and policy makers should be aware of some of the concerns related to prison education. This research sought to highlight on the effects these challenges have on efficiency of prison education in reducing recidivism in prisons in Kiambu County, thus sensitizing the policy makers on the need for better planning. Sirken (2008) suggests that challenges facing prison education in Africa can be mitigated by implementing adequate training programmes; recruiting additional staff, building staff camaraderie, increasing staff pay and benefits, adequate supervision, directing and disciplining staff. This research sought to find out how challenges facing prison education in Kiambu County can be mitigated thus making it more efficient.

2.3 Prison Education in Developed Countries

In developed countries, prison education is more advanced and better coordinated than in most African countries. In fact, the curriculum for inmates is exactly the same as those of main stream education and teachers are well-trained. For instance in Denmark, convicted persons have the same right to schooling as other citizens. Most of the education and training in prisons are provided by full-time employed teachers by the Ministry of Justice (UN, 2007). While in Finland, education and training are primarily provided by teachers employed by local educational institutions, others by justice and also others hired on contract (UN, 2007). This research intended to find out who provides teachers for prisons in Kiambu as this would determine the quality and hence efficiency of prison education.

In other countries, there exists partnership between prisons and other educational institutions outside prison; for instance in Ireland, public library services make the biggest contribution to the prison education service. The Irish prison system works
in partnership with a range of educational agencies as community colleges, public libraries and vocational educational committees to provide a broad programme of education. Prisoners may take classes ranging from basic literacy to Open University degrees (Kennedy, 2006). Weldon (2003) notes that in USA, local universities or colleges oversee most college programmes in prison and offer degree programmes. This research intended to find out if there exists any partnership between other educational institutions and prisons in offering inmates quality education that is effective in reducing recidivism.

Countries have different financing strategies for inmate education, in Finland, the central government financing education and training in the correctional service is based on agreement between the central government and each county administration with prisons within the country. In Australia, the provision of educational programmes in correctional setting is publicly funded and not subject to outsourcing to private or profit organizations (UN, 2007). In North Carolina, funding for inmate education is through tuition waivers, contact hour reporting and education welfare funds collected from the prison canteens and inmate telephone. State sponsored tuition is one of the key funding strategies. (Erisman & Contardo, 2005).

In Texas, the cost of additional courses must be paid directly to the college by the inmate at registration or inmates must repay the costs of tuition fees and tests after inmates are released from prison by developing a payment plan or pay immediately for these costs using personal funds, scholarships or grants (UN, 2007). Kenya as a developing nation is faced with many financial challenges of inadequate funds; this may compromise the quality of educational facilities in prisons and hence the
influence prison education has on recidivism. To make quality of educational programmes in prisons viable, monetary and non-monetary incentives need to be put in place. This research intended to find out what kind of incentives that have been put in place to fund prison education thus promoting quality of such programmes in Kiambu County.

Prisoners have different jail terms, some serve short and others long jail terms therefore for externally efficient to be realized appropriate courses for each kind of mates have to be provided. For instance in USA, agencies and boards that provide post-secondary education in prisons consider the appropriateness of the programme for the offender population (e.g. licensing requirements and safety issues), statewide labour market demands, availability of funds, space, offender and the average length of stay at a facility (Weldon, 2003). This research found which factors prison instructors/wardens do consider when offering courses in prison in Kiambu County, since such factors would determine enrolment to prison education by inmates and hence determine how efficient prison education would be in reducing recidivism.

2.4 Prison Education in Africa

The conditions in prisons in many African countries are afflicted by severe inadequacies as observed by Sirken (2008) including high congestion, poor physical health and sanitary conditions, inadequate recreational, vocational and rehabilitation programme. Rehabilitation is a difficult end point for many African prisons to achieve in large part due to lack of resources, overcrowding and under funding. These hamper the implementation of effective rehabilitation schemes. African prisons experience a high rate of recidivism which further strains the social and
financial resources of already impoverished nations. This called for a need to carry out a research on the influence prison education has on recidivism.

Some African countries have engaged prisoners in aggressive educational programmes as the rest of the world. For instance in South Africa, prison education is seen as a constitutional right. Both Queen and Zawada (2000) observe that in South African context, it is regarded as common sense that much crime committed is motivated by poverty as a result of the lack of relevant skills and knowledge for employment. This suggested the need to have an aggressive prison rehabilitative education program that has the ability to reduce cases of recidivism.

Nigeria is the other country that has made remarkable progress as observed by Asokhia (2004), where Nigerian prison is charged with the responsibility of training inmates specifically in prison farms and industries for the purpose of not only imparting self-sustaining skills in them but also in the process inculcating in them the positive orientation of finding dignity in labour. There are also cottage industries which train inmates in mid-range industrial production, some of these are furniture-making, soap-making, toilet roll production, manufacturing, aluminum pots and metal works, fabrication all geared towards giving inmates practical skills to help them live self-sustaining lives on discharge. This research intended to find out if these kinds of training are offered to inmates in Kiambu County thus making prison education more effective in reducing recidivism.
2.5 Prison Education in Kenya

Kenya continues to grapple with the challenge of congested prisons and increased recidivism. To cope with the challenge of congestion, the government through the presidential pardon release prisoners from jail occasionally. However, some of the released prisoners end up committing more crime and find themselves back to jail. Preparing inmates for release is a critical issue that must be handled with the seriousness it deserves. The educational programmes must be effective if cases of recidivism have to be addressed.

In Kenya, prisons service is headed by the Commissioner of Prisons. It derives its mandate from the prisons Act, Borstal Act and Public Service Commission Act. Kenya prisons functions are to contain and keep offenders in safe custody, rehabilitate and reform offenders, facilitate administration of justice and promote prisoners opportunities for social re-integration (http://softkenya.com/kenya-prisons-services).

Kenya’s prisons have take offer to inmate’s rehabilitation programmes and vocational education and training that would help them be reintegrated into the society and actively participate in positive socio-economic engagements upon release. The skills gained enhance their chances of engaging in gainful employment and minimize their chances of returning to criminal activities. Vocational education and training expose them to livestock production, which encompasses dairy production, rearing of cattle, rabbits, pigs, fish and chicken poultry and bees, olericulture (vegetable production), promology (fruit production), sericulture (silk production), floriculture and production of spices and herbs (http://softkenya.com/kenya-prisons-services).
Inmates also engage in mushroom production, carpentry, garment making, upholstery, metalwork, soap making, salon management and cosmetology, masonry, painting, knitting, pottery and brick making. Efforts to enhance rehabilitation services have been stepped up by recruiting professionals in relevant disciplines, including religion, psychology, social work, medicine, engineering and law (http://sofikenya.com/kenya-prisons-services). There is a gap in the literature highlighting on prison education in Kenya. This has been an obstacle in doing literature review related to prison education in Kenya.

2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided insight on how prison education reduces recidivism by providing prisoners with skills that promote employment and positive personal behaviour and values, the practice of prison education in Africa and Kenya. The literature review shows that prison education faces many challenges that compromise effectiveness of rehabilitative education in reducing recidivism. This research focused to fill a number of gaps such as the nature of educational facilities in prisons, the qualification and circulation of teachers in prisons, the nature of financial support to prison education and the gap between prison and mainstream education among others and their impact on recidivism.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the procedures that will be used to conduct the study, the research design, variables, location of the study, target population, sample and sampling procedures, research instruments and data collection procedure and method of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey research designs are used in preliminary studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2002). The study adapted descriptive research design since it allowed the researcher to collect data and report on external efficiency of prison education in Kiambu County without manipulating any variable and report on the way things are. Descriptive studies are usually conducted through questionnaires, interviews or observation as research instruments (Abagi & Mwiraria, 1995). Kathure (1993) states that survey is concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and reporting conditions that exist or have existed.

3.1.1 Variables of the Study

The independent variable is also known as predictor variable because it predicts the amount of variation in another variable. The dependent variable varies as a function of the independent variable (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). In this study, financial support towards inmate education, availability of physical facilities such as
classrooms, laboratories and textbooks and availability of qualified teaching staff are
the independent variables since they determine the quality of academic training,
vocational and other forms of training which in turn determine the effectiveness of
prison education in terms of reduced recidivism, employability, economic
independence, savings, social transition and public safety (dependent variables).

3.2 Location of the Study
This study was carried out in Kiambu County. The County has 8 constituencies,
namely; Gatundu South, Gatundu North, Juja, Githunguri, Kiambaa, Kabete, Limuru
and Lari with a total of three prisons, namely; Thika, Ruiru and Kiambu. No similar
research has been carried out in the county. The researcher was interested in
carrying out the research in the area owing to high crime rate in the county due to
increased number of unemployed youth who lack skills thus end up committing
crime which lead to imprisonment.

3.3 Target Population
All the items or people under consideration in any field of inquiry constitute a
universe or targeted population (Orodho, 2004). The target population of this study
comprised 2 prison wardens, 23 prison instructors and 1,364 prisoners. These
categories of respondents were selected because they were directly in touch with
realities of the status of prison education and its influence on recidivism.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size
Sampling is the process of selecting a sub-set of cases in order to draw conclusions
about the entire set (Orodho, 2004). Kiambu County a total of three prisons;
purposive sampling was used to select the only prison with both male and female prisoners and also to select the officer in charge to be interviewed. Purposive sampling involves selecting samples using set criteria such as gender (Orodho 2004). Since one male prison was selected for pilot study, the one remaining male prison was automatically selected for study. The prisoners to be interviewed were selected through purposive sampling, one group of prisoners comprised first-time offenders and the other the recidivist inmates, then simple random sampling was used in each stratum to select participants. The selected centres were representative of prisons in Kiambu County since they have the attributes of a correctional Centre.

A total of 2 (100%) prison wardens, 5 (20%) prison teachers, 68(10%) first time inmates and 68 (10%) recidivist in mates were selected. Gay (1992) recommends that when the target population is not very large the sample size should be between 10-20% of the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in charge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison instructors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Research Instruments

The main tools of data collection for this study were questionnaires, interviews and observation schedules.
3.5.1 Questionnaires

A questionnaire is an instrument used to gather data, which allows measurements for or against a particular viewpoint. A questionnaire has the ability to collect a large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time (Orodho, 2005). Questionnaire is also used to collect information that is not directly observable such as feeling, experiences and attitude. Two different questionnaires were administered to prison teachers and inmates to get information on their take on status of education in prisons and its impact on recidivism. The questionnaire for prison teachers collected both qualitative and quantitative data, while that of inmates collected quantitative data. The researcher guided those prisoners unable to fill the questionnaire.

3.5.2 Observation Guide

According to Orodho (2004), this method implies the collection of information by way of own investigation without interviewing the respondents. The information obtained relates to what is correctly happening and is not complicated by either past behaviour or future intentions or the attitude of respondents. The researcher did direct observation on availability, nature and status of physical facilities related to provision of education in prison.

3.5.3 Interview Schedule

This is a method of investigation that follows a rigid procedure and seeks answers to a set of pre-conceived questions (Orodho, 2004). The researcher sought both qualitative and quantitative data from the interview with officers in charge on the
external efficiency of prison education. The officers in charge oversee the day-to-day programmes of the prison.

3.6 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to check the reliability of the instruments. The instruments were pre-tested in Ruiru prison. The pilot study prison was not included in the actual study. The pilot study helped identify instruments ambiguities and ensured that the instruments collected the expected data. It also checked the appropriateness of the language used in the instruments. The researchers then made relevant corrections and rectified any weakness with the assistance of the university supervisors.

3.6.1 Validity

Validity according to Borg and Gall (1989) is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. According to Orodho (2004), validity is the degree to which several measures of the concept accurately measure the concept. The researcher sought the assistance of his supervisors, who as experts in research improved content validity of the instruments.

3.6.2 Reliability

Reliability of measurements concerns the degree to which a particular measuring procedure gives equivalent results over a number of repeated trails (Orodho, 2005). Split-half technique of reliability testing was employed. The pilot questionnaires were divided in two equivalent halves and computed using Kunder-Richardson formula 20. This method reduces time required to compute reliability and requires
only a single administration of test and was a reliable method of testing reliability. This formula was useful in assisting to revise the questionnaire to make sure that it covers the objectives of the study. The co-efficient value 0.61 was obtained, this was a positive result thus the reliability of the instruments was acceptable.

3.7 Data Collection Techniques

Before proceeding to the field, the researcher obtained authority to conduct research from the university and obtained permit from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. Appointment was scheduled with the selected prison wardens on the appropriate time and date to administer questionnaires and conduct observation.

3.8 Data Analysis

The researcher went through all the responses and identified the incomplete or spoilt responses for the purpose of improving the quality of the results. The data analyzed and discussed according to the information obtained from the questionnaires and observations. Collected data were coded and fed into the computer for analysis using statistical package for social sciences. Descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequency, mean and standard deviation were used to analyze quantitative data which were reported in summary form using frequency tables and graphs. Qualitative data obtained were grouped according to study objectives and then coded.
3.9 **Logistical and Ethical Consideration**

The researcher sought permission to carry out the study from the relevant authorities. The participants in this study were told the purpose of the study and assured that the information they gave was to be treated in confidentiality. To ensure anonymity, the researcher did not require names of the participants. Finally, the researcher kept the information obtained in absolute confidence and used it for the purpose of this study only.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The findings were presented, interpreted and discussed in connection with the Influence of Prison Education Recidivism. The findings were presented in major sections in line with the objectives and discussed in relation to the reviewed literature. The study sought information from officers in charge, prison instructors, and prisoners through questionnaires, interview schedules and observation. Data analysis, presentation of results and discussion of the findings were guided by the following objectives:

i) To assess the status of education and vocational facilities in prisons in Kiambu county.

ii) To establish/assess the influence of prisons rehabilitative education on recidivism.

iii) To identify the challenges facing prison’s rehabilitative education in Kiambu county.

4.1 Background Information

Table 4.1: Categories of prisons where the research was done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male prison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed prison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prisons sampled fall into two categories; male prisons had (50%) representation while mixed prison which was the only one had (100%) representation.
4.2 The Status of Prison’s Educational and Vocational Facilities

The first research objective sought to find out the status of prisons educational and vocational facilities. The inmates were asked to give their age; the responses were as shown in figure 4.1

![Figure 4.1: Age of the respondents](image)

From the responses given, 44(32%) were aged between 18-25 years, 66(49%) aged between 26-35 years while 26(19%) were aged above 35 years. The purpose of looking at the age of the inmates was to find out if their age corresponds with a certain level of education such as primary, secondary or tertiary. Prisoners of ages 18 to 25 are expected to be at tertiary level in education, those above 26 years are supposed to be productive outside prison. Their incarceration is, therefore, an extra cost to the society and at the same time loss in terms of productivity of these young citizens. The researcher asked the inmates to state their jail term; the responses given were as shown in figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2: The jail term of inmates

From the responses given, 38 (28%) were serving a jail term of below one year, 61 (45%) were serving between 2-5 years, 30 (22%) served a jail term of 6-10 years. 7 (5%) were serving a jail term of above ten years. The jail term would have a direct bearing on the kind and nature of rehabilitative education an inmate can get. Shorter terms would be ideal for short courses while long-term jail would be best for long-term courses. Short sentences may preclude participation in correctional education.

The researcher further wanted to know the level of education of inmates the responses given were as indicated in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Level of education achieved before imprisonment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school – not completed</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed primary education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school – not completed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school completed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses given show that none of the inmates had no schooling, 53(39%) had not complete primary schooling, 37(27%) had achieved primary education only, 22(16%) had not completed secondary education, 16(12%) had completed secondary school while 8(6%) had tertiary education. The purpose of looking at the educational level was to establish inmates’ educational needs and what would be the most ideal entry level to formal education for inmates and then determine the most appropriate course for the inmate. The responses show serious educational needs of inmates most of whom have low educational achievements and are less likely to be productive or competitive in the society. The researcher wanted to know whether inmates participated in education in prison, the responses given were as shown in figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3: Participation in education programmes in prison](image)

From the responses given, 95(70%) of all the inmates said they participated in one or another form of rehabilitative education, while 41(30%) said they did not participate in any rehabilitative education. The purpose of asking this question was to find out the level of participation in correctional education by inmates which will have a
direct bearing to manpower and physical facilities required to train the inmates, this
in turn will determine if the inmates are well-rehabilitated. The 41(30%) who were
not engaged in rehabilitative education are a concern for this study.

The researcher wanted to know from inmates why they participated in education
programmes, the responses given were as shown in table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3: Why inmates participated in education programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better their life imprisonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the response given, 69(73%) said they participated in education programmes
in order to better their lives after imprisonment while 26(27%) said they did so to
pass time while in jail. The concern is on the 27% who did not conceptualize the
essence of correctional education because they may end up in prison again as
recidivist inmates.

The researcher further wanted to know why some prisoners did not participate in
correctional education, the responses given were as shown in table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4: Why inmates did not participate in education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relevant courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority 17(40%) said they did not participate in education because of lack of time, 11(27%) because of ill health, 5(13%) were not interested in education, while 8(19%) said they did not participate due to lack of relevant courses. These responses revealed the reality of the impact that ill health, prioritizing work to education and irrelevant courses have on participation on correctional education, this in turn compromises effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism.

The researcher further requested the inmates to state the educational programmes they participated in, the responses given were as seen in figure 4.4.

![Figure 4.4: Educational programmes inmates participated in](image)

From the responses given, 30(22%) participated in academic courses while 65(78%) in vocational courses. These responses clearly show that most of the inmates prefer vocational courses because they are of above school going age or due to the length of their jail terms while majority of those who serve short terms are therefore appropriate for short vocational courses. The researcher asked the inmates whether they intended to continue with education after release, the responses were as shown in figure 4.5.
When asked if they intended to continue with education after release, 85(89%) said yes while 10(11%) responded in the negative. The purpose of asking this question was to find out if there was need to harmonize prison education with mainstream education if inmates were interested to continue with education after release. It is clear that there was need to harmonize prison education with mainstream education. The instructors were asked if the curriculum offered in prison is the same as the one offered in public education institutions, the responses given were as shown in figure 4.6.
All instructors 5(100%) answered in affirmative that the curriculum offered in prison is the same as the other offered in other institutions outside prison. This agrees with NMES (2005) statement that education and training in prison service should follow the current curriculum of education in a country. This is of essence since it would enable inmates to continue with education after release and would also make them acceptable and competitive in the labour market as their counter parts outside prison.

The inmates were asked if there were instances where school fees were charged. The responses given were as indicated in figure 4.7.
Figure 4.7: Inmates responses on if a school fee was charged

From the responses given, 114(84%) said there was no school fees charged while 22(12%) said school fees was charged. The fact that the government is the major financier of prison education is a positive step in promoting accessibility to prison education, however there should be more incentives in financing rehabilitative education for instance in North Carolina, funding for inmate education is through tuition waivers, contact hour reporting and education welfare funds collected from the prison canteens and inmate telephone (Erisman & Contardo, 2005). In Texas, the cost of additional courses must be paid directly to the college by the inmate at registration or inmates must repay the costs of tuition fees and tests after inmates are released from prison by developing a payment plan or pay immediately for these costs using personal funds, scholarships or grants (UN, 2007).

The researcher further asked the inmates who paid for the school fees charged, the responses were as in figure 4.8.
From the responses given, 17(75%) said sponsors paid for their courses while 5(25%) said that their parents paid for some of their courses. The researcher further asked if the instructors were trained as teachers the responses given were as in figure 4.9.
The responses indicate that 3(60%) have been trained as teachers while 2(40%) have not trained as teachers. The purpose of asking this question was to find out if the prison instructors (teachers) were properly trained, since this would have a direct bearing on the quality of education given and its impact on reducing recidivism. The response shows a need to recruit more trained teachers to enhance the quality of rehabilitative education thus promoting effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism. The researcher further wanted to know if the instructors were employed by TSC, the responses given were as in figure 4.10.
Figure 4.10: Instructors responses on if they were employed by Teachers Service Commission

From the responses given, 5(100%) of all the instructors were not employed by Teachers Service Commission. NMER (2005), states that educationalists working within prison should have qualifications and experience similar to those of mainstream education. This failure compromises the quality of prison education and subsequently the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism.

The researcher wanted to know the employer of the prison instructors, the responses given were as shown in table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Employer of prison instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses indicate that 3(60%) were prison officers first and teachers second while. 2(40%) were not employed by any institution and were purely volunteer teachers. This finding agrees with Bera (2004) who observes that in some countries, the teachers are employed by the Ministry of Justice or Prisons and are considered to be prison officers first and foremost and only second as a teacher or trainer. This system has a shortcoming in the sense that there is no movement of teachers between mainstream education and prison, this hampers importation of experience.

The researcher wanted to know if there was a well-developed curriculum for inmate education, the responses given were as in figure 4.11.

![Figure 4.11: Responses of the presence of a well developed curriculum for inmate education](image)

All the instructors 5(100%) said there was a well-developed curriculum for prison rehabilitative education. The researcher wanted to know if the curriculum offered in prison is the same as curricula for normal education; the responses given were as in
The researcher further wanted to know the curriculum offered in prison, the responses given were as in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Instructors responses on curriculum offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both formal and vocational education were mentioned by all the instructors 5(100%) as being offered in prison rehabilitative education. The researcher asked the kind of vocational curriculum offered to inmates, the responses given were as in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Officers in charge responses on the kind of vocational curriculum offered to inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade and industry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, all 2 (100%) of the officers in charge said the offered trade and industry, farming, tailoring, blacksmith, industry and masons. This finding agrees with (http://softkenya.com/kenya-prisons-services-12.9.2015), that vocational Education and training exposes inmates in Kenya to livestock production, which encompasses dairy production, rearing of cattle, rabbits, pigs, fish poultry and bees, olericulture (vegetable production), promology (fruit production), sericulture (silk production), etc.
production), floriculture and production of spices and herbs. Inmates also engage in mushroom production, carpentry, garment making, upholstery, metalwork, soap making, salon management and cosmetology, masonry, painting, knitting, pottery and brick making.

The researcher wanted to know from the instructors if the education programmes were voluntary or compulsory; the responses given were as in figure 4.13.

![Graph showing voluntary and compulsory responses](image)

**Figure 4.12: Instructors responses on if the education programmes are voluntary or compulsory**

All the instructors 5(100%) said that prison rehabilitative education was voluntary. This is a major shortcoming in prison rehabilitation efforts since the inmates may only be inculcated, work and not receive any form of rehabilitative education. This could in turn lead to recidivism.

The researcher wanted to know the factors that were considered when enrolling inmates into educational programmes, the responses given were as in table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Instructors responses on factors considered when enrolling inmates into educational programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of sentence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read and write</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the instructors 5(100%) mentioned the following factors as being considered before enrolment; length of sentence, level of education and interest while 2(40%) said they considered age. However, there are more important factors that need to be observed for an externally efficient prison education to be realized. For instance, Weldon (2003) observes that in USA, agencies and boards that provide post-secondary education in prisons consider the appropriateness of the programme for the offender population such as statewide labour market demands, other factors, availability of funds, space and the average length of stay at a facility. The researcher wanted to know from the instructors what obstacles demotivate inmates from participating in correctional education, the responses given were as in table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Instructors’ responses on obstacles that demotivate inmates from participating in correctional education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of conducive environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The obstacles mentioned by all instructors 5(100%) facing inmates were too much work, lack of enough time and lack of conducive environment. These obstacles have a direct bearing on the quality of rehabilitative education inmates receive which in turn affects the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism. The researcher wanted to know if the instructors kept achievement records, the responses given were as in figure 4.13.

![Figure 4.13: Instructors response on keeping achievement records](image)

All the instructors 5(100%) responded in affirmative that they kept achievement records. This is important since it would assist in continuation of rehabilitative education in the event an inmate is transferred to another prison or intends to continue with education after incarceration. The researcher also wanted to know from the instructors if there was a well-established classroom timetable, the responses were as shown in table 4.14.
From the responses given, all the prison teachers 5(100%) said there was a well-established classroom timetable. The researcher wanted to know from the instructors how the inmates are evaluated, the responses given were as in table 4.10.

**Table 4.10: Instructors responses on how learners are evaluated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Assessment Tests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal exams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External exams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral testing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government proficiency tests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common methods of evaluation mentioned by all instructors 5(100%) were continuous assessment tests, internal exams, oral testing and government proficiency tests.
Methods of evaluation are important because they would determine the quality of graduates and their acceptability at the labour market and also determine the efficiency of prison education, since reliable evaluation methods give the true level of education achievement and rehabilitation. The researcher further wanted to know who certify inmates; the responses given were as in table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Instructors responses on who certify inmates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations and tertiary colleges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given by all 5(100%) instructors said certification was done by the Kenya National Examinations Council and other training institutions such as religious organizations and tertiary colleges. This is important since certification is proof of qualification and would determine acceptance of the qualification by potential employers.

The researcher asked the officer in charge the number of inmates who enroll in academic education do the national examination yearly, the responses given was as in table 4.12.

**Table 4.12: Officers in charge responses on number of inmates who enroll in academic education do either KCPE or KCSE national examination yearly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses given, 16 inmates sat for K.C.P.E in year 2009, 18 inmates in year 2010, 13 inmates in year 2011, 13 inmates in year 2012 and 10 inmates in year 2013. These responses testify the willingness of inmates to pursue academic education and therefore need to adequately invest in academic education in prison. However, it’s evident that most inmates were in vocational education. The researcher further wanted to know from the instructors on the adequacy of educational physical facilities in prison, the responses given were as shown in figure 4.15
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**Figure 4.15: Instructors responses on adequacy educational physical facilities for inmates**

From the responses given, all 5(100%) of the instructors said there were inadequate physical facilities for learning in prisons. This is a major shortcoming in provision of prison education as inadequate facilities directly compromise the quality and thus the external efficiency of prison rehabilitative education. The researcher asked the
instructors if there was a well-established library, the responses given were as in figure 4.16.

![Figure 4.16: Instructors responses on availability of library](image)

From the responses given, all 5(100%) said there were no libraries at all. From the observation done by the researcher, none of the prisons had library facilities relevant to academic education. The only existing one was a book store with magazines and pamphlets. This is a major shortcoming as it would severely affect the quality of prison education and subsequently the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism.

The researcher asked the instructors if there was a well-established ICT facility, the responses given were as in figure 4.17.
From the responses given, 3(60%) of the instructors had ICT facilities while 2(40%) of instructors did not have ICT facilities. This is an important part in learning in prison since it’s the only means through which inmates can be in touch with the current trends in the outside world and also get information in the absence of libraries. The researcher did observation to find out the nature of physical facilities as shown in table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Availability of physical facilities in prisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Facilities available</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT facilities</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the observation all the prisons 2(100%) did not have library, 2(100%) of the prisons had classrooms 1(50%) of the prisons did not have ICT facilities while 1(50%) had ICT facilities, all the prisons 2(100%) had desks, 2(100%) did not have Laboratories and all the prisons 2(100%) had blackboards. The lack of libraries ICT facilities and laboratories is an issue of concern because these facilities are a prerequisite to effective teaching and learning and their lack compromises the quality of education given and thus negatively affects the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism. Further, the researcher asked the officers in charge of the role the Ministry of education, Science and Technology plays in provision of Education, the responses given were as shown in table 4.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and supervision of exams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adult education teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 2 (100%) of the officers in charge said that the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology provided adult education teachers and 2 (100%) said the Ministry also did the administration and supervision of terminal examinations. The researcher further wanted to know from the officers in charge who does the administration of prison education, the responses given were as in figure 4.15.
Table 4.15: Officers in charge response on administrators in charge of educational programmes in prison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer in charge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison instructors (teachers)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the officers in charge 2 (100%) said that they and the prison teachers (instructors) were in charge of provision of prison rehabilitative education. This is a concern since officers in charge who oversee rehabilitative education do not necessary need to have educational background yet they are required to oversee successful administration of prison education. This loophole compromise the quality of prison education and by and large the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism

The researcher asked the officer in charge to state the policies that guide the provision of prison education, the responses given were as in table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Officer in charge response to the guidelines in provision of prison education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education for those willing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay in prison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only guidelines mentioned by the 2 (100%) of the officers in charge is the provision of prison rehabilitative education on the basis of interest and voluntary. Only those interested and willing were given chance of participating in prison
education. These guidelines leave a serious concern about those inmates without basic education, who leave prisons without any form of rehabilitative education. This compromises the security since these inmates may commit crime again. Further, the researcher wanted to know from the officer in charge the average age of offenders pursuing education for accreditation purpose, the responses given were as in table 4.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given 2 (100%) of the officers in charge said that inmates aged 18-30 were the majority who pursued education for the purposes of accreditation. The researcher further asked to know from the officer in charge the total amount of expenditure invested in correctional education. None of the officers in charge was aware or in control of the financial expenditure in correctional education in their respective prisons. They said this was done elsewhere at a higher level of leadership. This is a serious gap in provision of prison education since there is need for constant supply of consumables such as chalks, books and pens. This long bureaucracy may hinder effective and timely provision of learning resources. This in turn compromises the quality and therefore, effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism. The researcher also asked the officer in charge to state the how prison education is financed; the responses given were as in table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Officers in charge responses on how prison education is financed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the officers in charge 2 (100%) said that the government was the major financier of prison education, followed by sponsors who gave inmates education and later accredited them. One officer in charge 1 (50%) said there were cases where parents paid fees particularly at tertiary level. With minimal resources in Kenya, there is need to find out ways of financing prison education as in advanced countries, for instance, Erisman & Contardo (2005) observes that in North Carolina, funding for inmate education is through tuition waivers, contact hour reporting and education welfare funds collected from the prison canteens and inmate telephone; however, state sponsored tuition is still one of the key funding strategies. In Texas, inmates meet the cost of additional courses and must repay the costs of tuition fees and tests after they are released from prison by developing a payment plan or pay immediately for these costs using personal funds, scholarships or grants (UN, 2007).

The researcher asked the officer in charge to state the kind of partnership prisons have with other educational institutions, the responses given were as in table 4.19.

Table 4.19: Officer in charge responses on kind of partnership prisons have with other educational institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses given, 2(100%) of the officers in charge said they had partnership with other institutions such as religious organizations, universities and other tertiary colleges in provision and accreditation of inmates. These findings shows that the trend in prisons in Kenya is similar to those of more developed countries as Weldon (2003) observes that in USA local universities or colleges oversee most college programmes in prison and offer degree programmes.

4.3 Influence of Prison Education on Recidivism

The second research objective sought to gather information on Effectiveness of Prison Education in reducing recidivism. The researcher requested the officers in charge to state why they thought the rehabilitation education they offer inmates assist them to cope with life after prison, the responses given were as in table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Officer in charge responses on how rehabilitative education helps inmates cope with life after release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted the inmates in behaviour change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave inmates source of livelihood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate related well with the society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the officers in charge 2(100%) said that rehabilitative education assisted the inmates in behavioural change, 2(100%) said rehabilitative education gave inmates source of livelihood, and 1(50%) said it assisted the inmates to relate well with the society. These findings agree with Sulton (1993) who posits that the immediate objectives of prison education at the basic level is to enhance employment, vocational skills and/or advance to further education and training. The researcher
further wanted to know from the instructors why rehabilitative education is beneficial to released inmates; the responses given were as in table 4.21.

**Table 4.21: Instructors responses on why rehabilitative education is beneficial to released inmates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-independent after release</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance behavioural change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue with education after release</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 5(100%) of the instructors said that rehabilitative education would make the inmates self-independent after release, 4(80%) said it would enhance behavioural change, while 3(60%) said the inmates would be able to continue with their education after release, this letter response agrees with UN observation of the importance of aligning the prison curriculum with that of the community so that upon release, the prisoners may resume learning without significant difficulty (UN, 2007). Further, the researcher wanted to know from the instructors if there were cases of recidivist inmates in prison, the responses given were as in figure 4.18.
All the instructors 5(100%) said that there were cases of recidivist inmates in prison. Also, the researcher asked to know from the officers in charge the percentage of recidivist inmates in prison, the responses given were as in table 4.22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35% of recidivism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% of recidivism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 1(50%) of the officers in charge said they had 45% of recidivist inmates while another 1(50%) said they had 35% of recidivist inmates. This raises serious concern about the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism, if at all the prisoners had benefitted from any kind of prison rehabilitative education.
The researcher requested to know from the officers in charge why they thought recidivist inmates commit crime again. The responses given were as in table 4.23.

**Table 4.23: Officers in charge responses on why recidivist inmates commit crime again**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level of education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capital</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society attitude or lack of acceptance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 1(50%) of the officers in charge mentioned low level of education being a factor leading to recidivism, 2(100%) of the officers in charge said lack of capital lead the recidivism, 2(100%) of the officers in charge mentioned society attitude or lack of acceptance of the inmates by the society as a factor leading to recidivism. Two (100%) of the officers in charge mentioned lack of employment as a factor leading to recidivism. These were the factors seen as rendering prison education ineffective by pushing released inmates back to crime and therefore, going against the societal expectations. Further, the researcher asked the instructors why they thought recidivist inmates commit crime again. The responses given were as in table 4.24.

**Table 4.24: Responses by instructors on why recidivist inmates committed crime again**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level of education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capital</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal attitude towards inmates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses given by the instructors were similar to those given by the officers in charge where 1(50%) of the instructors said low level of education contributed to recidivism, 2(100%) mentioned lack of capital, 2(100%) mentioned societal attitude towards inmates and 2(100%) mentioned target by police as a factor leading to recidivism. These causes of recidivism cast a serious concern of how well prisoners are rehabilitated and prepared to cope with life after jail term and be accepted by the society as good citizens. The researcher also wanted to know from the instructors if recidivist inmates had benefited from rehabilitative education earlier, the responses given were as in table 4.25.

**Table 4.25: Instructors’ responses on if recidivist inmates had benefited from rehabilitative education earlier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% had benefited from prison education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 40% of recidivist inmates had benefited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 3(60%) of the instructors said that 50% of the recidivist inmates had benefited from the rehabilitative education, while the other 2(40%) of prison instructors said that between 30% and 40% of recidivist inmates had benefited from prison education. This percentages raise concern about the external efficiency of prison education. The policy of voluntary rehabilitative education seems to also lead to increase in recidivism since a significant percentage of (50%) and (60%) of recidivist inmates had not benefited from any form of prison education. Further, the researcher wanted to know from the recidivist inmates if they had benefited from rehabilitative education in their earlier jail term, the responses given were as in figure 4.19.
Figure 4.19: Responses by inmates on if they had benefited from rehabilitative education in their earlier jail term

From the responses given, 39(58%) of recidivist inmates said they had benefited from one or another form of rehabilitative education whereas 29(42%) said they had not benefited from any form of rehabilitative education. The 39(58%) percentage of recidivist inmates who said had benefited from rehabilitative education raise concern about the external efficiency of prison education, whereas the 29(42%) who had not benefited creates concern about policy of voluntary education in prison which seems to create a toll on cases of recidivism bearing in mind the low level of education achievement of prisoners as already highlighted in the research.

The researcher wanted to know from the inmates if prison education would better their lives after release. The responses given were as in figure 4.20.
Figure 4.20: Inmates responses on if prison education would better their lives after release

From the responses given by inmates, 55(76%) of those in education answered that prison education would help them better their lives while 23(24%) said prison education may not benefit them. When asked how prison education would better their lives, inmates gave the responses as in table 4.26.

**Table 4.26: How prison education better inmates life after release**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self sustenance</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate well with other members of society</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural change</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 51(54%) of the inmates said that prison education would make them upon release be self-independent, 30(32%) of the inmates said that education would help them relate well with other members of the society, while
13(14%) said that prison education would make them change their behaviour. The responses indicate that the inmates valued the importance of rehabilitative education which seems not to be meeting their expectations. Further, the researcher wanted to know from the recidivist inmates if rehabilitative education received earlier had benefited them, the responses given were as in figure 4.21.

![Figure 4.21: Recidivists inmates’ responses on if rehabilitative education received earlier had benefited recidivist inmates](image)

From the responses given, all 39(100%) of the recidivist inmates said that the rehabilitative education they had received earlier in their jail term had not benefited them. This response contradicts the earlier response by inmates on their belief in rehabilitative education; in reality, the rehabilitative education seems not to assist the inmates much after release. The researcher wanted to know from the recidivist inmates why rehabilitative education received earlier had not helped recidivist inmates, the responses given were as in table 4.27.
Table 4.27: Recidivist’s inmates responses on why rehabilitative education received earlier had not helped recidivist inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They could not find employment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courses received were not relevant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the recidivist inmates 23(59%) said that they could not find employment with the level of education they had achieved while 8(21%) of the recidivist inmates said the courses they received were not relevant in the job market. These responses clearly indicate that the rehabilitative education inmates receive does not meet the expectation of inmates and by and large the expectations of the society of security, thus compromising the external efficiency of prison education. The researcher wanted to know from the recidivist inmates the length of their first jail term. The responses given were as in figure 4.22.

Figure 4.22: Length of first jail of recidivist inmates
From the responses given, 37(55%) of recidivist inmates had a jail term of below one year while 31(45%) between 2-5 years. None of recidivist inmates had a jail term of over five years. The majority of the recidivist inmates appear to be petty offenders whose jail terms were too short and may not have benefited from any concrete form of rehabilitative education while 40% had jail terms of significant long stay of 2-5 years this raises serious concern about the external efficiency of prison education because this duration of jail term was significantly long enough to have produced the desired behavioural change in the recidivist inmates. Further, the researcher wanted to know from the recidivist inmates the kind of rehabilitative education they had benefited from in their earlier jail term; the responses given were as in figure 4.23.
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**Figure 4.23: Response on rehabilitative education recidivist inmates had benefited from in their earlier jail term**

From the responses given, 29(42%) had not benefited from any form of rehabilitative education, 31(46%) had received vocational training while 8(12%) had benefited from academic education. The responses indicate that most inmates prefer
vocational education skills that may help inmates earn a living immediately after release. The researcher asked to know recidivist inmates’ rating of rehabilitative education they received in their previous jail term; the responses given were as indicated in figure 4.24.

![Figure 4.24: Rating of rehabilitative education received by recidivist inmates in their previous jail term](image)

From the responses given, only 3(7%) of recidivist inmates rated the education received as good, 8(22%) as average, and 28(71%) as poor. This low rating of rehabilitative education by recidivist inmates casts aspersions on whether rehabilitative education given in prison is effective in meeting released inmates’ expectations and those of the society at large. When the researcher wanted to know from the instructors, they rate the quality of rehabilitative education received by recidivist inmates, responses given were as in table 4.28.
Table 4.28: Instructors rating of the quality of rehabilitative education received by recidivist inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given 4(80%) of instructors rated the rehabilitative education as average while 1(20%) rated it as low. The responses clearly show that there are certain serious concerns about the quality of rehabilitative education in prison that would in turn compromise the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism. The researcher ASLO requested to know instructors’ rating of benefits of rehabilitative education; the responses given were as in table 4.29.

Table 4.29: Instructors rating of benefits of rehabilitative education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly beneficial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 1(20%) of the instructors were undecided if prison education was beneficial, while 4(80%) agreed that prison rehabilitative education was fairly beneficial. This low rating of prison rehabilitative education by the same people who administer it demonstrates that the quality of the rehabilitative education is not of standard to be effective in reducing recidivism.
4.4 Challenges Facing Prison Rehabilitative Education

The third research objective sought to find out the challenges prison rehabilitative education could be facing. The researcher asked the inmates what challenges they faced in pursuing education in prison. The responses given were as shown in table 4.30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient learning resources</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of conducive environment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to other prisons</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, 98(72%) of the inmates mentioned insufficient learning resources as the major challenge facing them in their effort to get rehabilitative education, 69(51%) mentioned lack of enough time for learning as an obstacle, 67(49%) said lack of conducive environment as another hindrance to successfully pursue education while 22(16%) said transfer from one prison to another as an obstacle to successful learning. These findings confirm Kennedy’s (2007) assertion that overcrowding, a serious lack of facilities, drug abuse, violence and intimidation among prisoners and inhumane conditions facing prison education as major obstacles to successful rehabilitation. Further, Quigley (1997) notes that, there are primary barriers to literacy education in prison; lack of educational resources (such as books, handout materials, and computers etc.) and transfer to another prison site. This in turn compromises the efficiency of prison education in reducing recidivism. Further, the researcher asked the instructors what challenges they faced, the responses given were as in table 4.31.
Table 4.31: Challenges faced by prison teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing inmates up-to-date for those who left school early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of inmates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict between work schedule for inmates and timetable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about the challenges teachers faced, 5(100) said they lacked adequate teaching resources, 5(100) said conflict between work schedule for inmates and timetable, 5(100) also mentioned transfer of courses, 5(100) also said lack of enough time was a challenge, 2(40%) mentioned lack of motivation as a hindering factor and 3(60%) said bringing inmates who left school early to catch up with others was a major challenge. Lack of adequate teaching resources affects how a teacher prepares the learning experiences and the right instructional materials which in turn affects the efficiency of the teacher while poor teaching and learning resources lead to the inefficient outcomes, this challenge is further compounded with conflict between timetable for class and work schedules assigned to inmates, where the latter is given more priority to education, leading to inadequate training thus making prison education external ineffective.

The researcher requested the officers in charge what challenges they faced in provision of correctional education, the responses given were as in table 4.32.
Table 4.32: Challenges faced by officers in charge in provision of correctional education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate teaching staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate teaching materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the officers in charge 2(100%) mentioned inadequate teaching staff, inadequate instructional materials, and library are the major challenges facing them in the effort to provide prison rehabilitative education. One (50%) mentioned lack of classrooms and lack of financial resource as challenges in effective implementation of prison rehabilitative education. Inadequacy of the above mentioned factors, compromises to quality and in turn compromise the external effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism.

The researcher asked the inmates to suggest possible solutions to the challenges they faced, the responses given were as in table 4.33.

Table 4.33: Possible solutions to challenges faced by inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adequate learning resources</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of more time for learning</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of well trained teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of conducive</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting transfers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses given, 80(59%) of the inmates mentioned provision of adequate learning resources as a solution to the challenges they faced, 52(38%) mentioned creation of more time for learning, 15(11%) mentioned provision of well-trained teachers, 19(14%) proposed creation of conducive and limiting transfers respectively as a solution to the problem they faced in getting prison education. Further, the researcher asked the instructors to suggest possible solutions to the challenges they faced, their responses are given in table 4.34.

Table 4.34: Possible solution to challenges faced by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adequate learning resources by government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership between Ministry of Education, Science and Technology in provision of prison education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving education more priority in prisons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about solution to the challenges 5(100%), mentioned provision of adequate teaching resources as possible solution, 4(80%) said giving priority to prison education than to work as the solution to the problem, 3(60%) suggested a stronger partnership between prison and Ministry of Education, Science and Technology should be enhanced.

The researcher asked the officers in charge to suggest possible solutions to the challenges they faced, responses given were as in table 4.35.
Table 4.35: Solution to mitigate challenges faced by officers in charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teaching staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teaching materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of financial resources at prison level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses given, all the officers in charge 2(100) suggested the provision of teaching staff, teaching materials, and library by the government as possible solution to challenges they faced in provision of rehabilitative education. One (50%) of the officers in charge suggested construction of classrooms and provision of financial resources at prison level as possible solution to challenges they faced in provision of rehabilitative education.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism Kiambu County. This chapter gives a summary, draws conclusions from the findings and eventually makes appropriate recommendations.

The study was used a descriptive survey design. The researcher used purposive sampling to arrive at the sample size of the prisons. Data were collected by use of questionnaires served to the 136 inmates and 5 prison instructors while an interview was conducted on the two officers in charge. Observation was also conducted by the researcher. Information related to this work was also obtained from textbooks, newspapers, government publications and internet.

5.1 Summary of the Research Findings

The study findings from the analyzed data were presented according to the objectives of the study.

5.1.1 The Status of Educational and Vocational Facilities in Prisons in Kiambu County

Majority of the prisoners (81%) are within the age blanket of the youth aged 18-35, 45% of inmates serve a jail term of 2-5 years while 28% of below one year. Sixty per cent of the prison instructors were trained as teachers while 40% were not trained as teachers and are volunteer teachers. None of the instructors was employed
by TSC but were first officers employed by Ministry of Home Affairs or were purely volunteer teachers.

There was a well-established curriculum in all prisons. Both vocational and academic courses were offered in prisons. The curriculum offered in prison was the same as that offered in ordinary schools outside prison. The vocational courses offered in prison include trade and industry, farming, tailoring, blacksmithery and masonry. Education in prisons was voluntary. Factors that were considered before enrolling inmates to academic courses include; length of sentence, age, level of education and interest.

Instructors kept achievement records and there was a well-established timetable. Most common methods of evaluation include continuous assessment tests, internal exams, oral testing and government proficiency tests. Accreditation was done by Kenya National Examinations Council and other training institutions as religious organizations and universities.

From the responses given, 16 inmates sat for KCPE in 2009, 18 in 2010, 13 inmates in 2011, 13 inmates in 2012 and 10 inmates in 2013. The role Ministry of Education, Science and Technology played in provision of prison education was by providing adult education teachers and administration and supervision of terminal examinations. The officer in charge and the teachers were the key administrators in provision of prison education, irrespective of whether they were trained as teachers or not. The age bracket of majority of inmates pursuing education for accreditation was between 18-30 years.
The major financiers of prison education were the government through the Ministry of Home Affairs, followed by sponsors and lest by parents. None of the officers in charge was aware of expenditure allocated to prison education. Twenty-two per cent of inmates participated in academic education while 78% in vocational courses, 39% of the inmates had not completed primary education, 27% had completed primary education, and 16% had not completed secondary education. Another 12% had completed secondary education school, while 6% had tertiary education. Twenty-seven per cent of the inmates served a jail term of below one year 46% of between 2-5 years, 22% a jail term of 6-10 years while 5% served a jail term of over ten years.

From the responses given, 70% of the inmates participated in one or the other form of correctional education while 30% did not participate in any of correctional education. Seventy-three per cent 73% said they participated in education in order to better their lives after release, while 27% said they did so in order to pass time while in jail. Eighty-nine per cent of inmates intended to continue with education after release. 11% did not wish to continue with education after release. There exist partnerships between prison and other institutions such as tertiary and religious institutions.

5.1.2 The Influence of Prisons’ Rehabilitative Education on Recidivism

The rate of recidivism as per 1(50%) officer in charge stood at 45%) while 1 (50%) officer in charge said it stood at 35%. The causes of recidivism were due to low level of education attainment, lack of capital, societal attitude, and target by police and lack of employment as mentioned by instructors and recidivist inmates.
Between 40 to 50 per cent of recidivist inmates had benefited from prison rehabilitative education. Rehabilitative education would assist inmates in behavioral change, source of livelihood and good relations with the community as mentioned by prison instructors.

The education level of majority of the prisoners is too low where 39% had not completed primary school education while 27% had only completed primary education. This problem is made worse because the prison education is voluntary and the staff are not motivated to carry out effective rehabilitation. This leads to releasing offenders back into the community who are not properly rehabilitated, this in turn, leads to recidivism.

Majority of the officers in charge, teachers and inmates perceive prison education to have positive outcomes that reduce recidivism such as improved self-employment opportunities, good social cohesion and improved behavioural change. Lack of community trust on released prisoners was mentioned as a factor leading to unemployment and subsequent recidivism.

A significant number of inmates 28% serve short sentences which do not allow sufficient time for correctional education that can result to recidivism There is over emphasis on work than correctional education in prison, combined with voluntary enrolment in education as opposed to compulsory compounds the problem of lack of education among released inmates making prison education ineffective thus leading to recidivism.
Majority of recidivist inmates 55% had a first jail term of one year and below while 45% had a jail term of 2-5 years. Fifty-eight per cent of the recidivist inmates said they had benefited from rehabilitative education in their first jail term, while 42% had not. Majority of the recidivist inmates 88% had benefited from vocational training in their first jail term, 12% had pursued academic education.

All recidivist inmates who had benefited from rehabilitative education said that the education received had not helped them in securing employment after release. All 100% of recidivist inmates said they committed crime again because of lack of employment due to irrelevant courses, lack of capital to start up business, and rejection by the society. Majority of the instructors 80% rated rehabilitative education as average while 20% as low. Seventy-one per cent of recidivist inmates rated the rehabilitative education they received as poor, 22% as average and 7% as good. Eighty per cent of instructors rated prison education as beneficial while 20% were undecided.

5.1.3 Challenges Facing Prisons’ Rehabilitative Education in Kiambu County

Prisons in Kiambu County lack adequate teaching professionals rendering them to depend on volunteer teachers. There is severe shortage of teaching and learning resources in prisons in Kiambu County. All the instructors said physical facilities were inadequate. There were no libraries in all the prisons. Half of the prisons (50%) had ICT facilities while another half did not have. Too much work, lack of enough time, conflict between timetable for class and work schedule was a challenge, lack of finances at prison level, transfer from one prison to another and lack of conducive environment (disturbance by other inmates) were the major obstacles in prison education.
5.2 Conclusions

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be made;

5.2.1 The Status of Educational and Vocational Facilities in Prisons in Kiambu County

The partnership between prison and Ministry of Education, Science and Technology exists, where the latter provides teaching personnel, administers and supervises exams. Religious organizations and tertiary institutions play a significant role in rehabilitation of inmates. However, there wasn’t any role that Teachers Service Commission played in provision of rehabilitative education.

5.2.2 The Effect of Prisons’ Rehabilitative Education on Recidivism

The major causes of recidivism were low level of education achievement among released inmates rendering prison rehabilitation education extremely inefficient. This can be attributed to poor quality of rehabilitative education offered in prisons.

5.2.3 Challenges Facing Prisons’ Rehabilitative Education in Kiambu County

Prisons in Kiambu county face serious challenges in provision of prison rehabilitative education; lack of enough teaching personnel who are well-trained, lack of adequate physical facilities like library, ICT facilities, desks and laboratory, lack of adequate tools for vocational studies, conflict between work and rehabilitative education where work is given priority to education, lack of conducive environment for working because of interference from other inmates and lack of motivation are major shortcomings in prison rehabilitative education. These challenges severely affect the quality of rehabilitative education which in turn
compromise effectiveness of prison education which is seen through high level of recidivism which stands between 45-50%.

The policy of voluntary participation to rehabilitative education is a major shortcoming which creates a major loophole for recidivism to occur as many inmates leave prisons having not received any form of rehabilitative education. All these issues stand at the background of high number of inmates who lack adequate education. Challenges faced by recidivist inmates that pushed them to crime again were unemployment due to low level of educational attainment, lack of acceptance by society and lack of capital thus making inmates backslide to their previous habits. All instructors said rehabilitative education was beneficial to released prisoners through behavioural change and continuation of education later. The major challenge facing prison rehabilitative education was lack of adequate physical facilities and teachers, lack of conducive environment such as disturbance from other inmates, transfers of inmates to other prisons, lack of enough time due to much work and lack of motivation. All these factors lead to poor outcomes in prison education rendering it ineffective thus high levels of recidivism. The solution to these challenges were suggested as provision of adequate physical resources and teachers, giving priority to rehabilitative education than to work, stronger partnerships between prison and Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.
5.3 Recommendations of the Study

In the view of the findings of the research, the following recommendations were suggested.

i) Adequate teaching and learning resources such as books, blackboards, and ICT facilities should be provided if prison education was to be effective in reducing recidivism.

ii) As a means of rehabilitation and reintegration of inmates into society, prison education should be made compulsory for all prisoners. This would reduce the rate of recidivism.

iii) For prison rehabilitative education to be externally efficient, rehabilitative education should be given more priority as there stands a conflict between work schedule and classroom timetable where the latter is given more priority.

iv) There is need to support the prisoners after release in terms of acceptance by society and financial support to start up business if rehabilitative education has to realize its full potential of being externally efficient.

5.3.1 Policy Recommendations

i) There is need to provide finances at prison level in order to meet the day-to-day needs of rehabilitative education.

ii) There is need for Teachers Service Commission to play an active role in prison rehabilitative education in prison by providing experienced teachers who can oversee day-to-day learning in prisons thus providing prison education that is effective in deterring recidivism. Currently, prison education is overseen by officers in charge who have no experience on provision of education.
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

i) This study should be conducted in different areas of the country and at national level to establish true state of the effect of prison education on recidivism.

ii) This study considered only the inmates both first-time offenders and recidivist inmates. A study involving prisoners who have been released should be conducted to establish the benefits and effectiveness of prison correctional education.
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APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INMATES

I am a post-graduate student at Kenyatta University. I wish to carry out a research on the external efficiency of prison education in Kiambu County. I would be grateful if you answer the questions herein. This information will be treated confidentially and will be used only for the purpose of this research. Tick (✓) as appropriate

1. Your age?
   10-17yrs [ ] 18-25yrs [ ]
   26-35yrs [ ] Above 35yrs [ ]

2. Jail term?
   Below 1yr [ ] 2-5yrs [ ]
   6-10yrs [ ] Above 10yrs [ ]

3. What was your level of education before imprisonment? ..............................................

4. Do you participate in education programmes?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If yes, why?...................................................................................................................
   If no, why? ......................................................................................................................

5. Which education programmes do you participate in? ......................................................

6. Do you intend to continue pursuing education after release?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. What challenges do you face in the process of pursuing education in prison?

8. What do you think are the possible solutions to such challenges?

9. Do you think prison education will improve your life after release?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If yes how?..................................................................................................................
10. Are there instances where school fees are charged?

If yes, who pays the charges? .................................................................

11. What motivates you to pursue education? .............................................

This section should be answered by inmates who are in jail for the second or more times after release from their first jail term.

12. How long was your first jail term?
   Below 1yr [ ] 2-5yrs [ ] 6-10yrs [ ] Above 10yrs [ ]

13. Had you benefited from any form of rehabilitative education during your first jail term in prison?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. If you benefited from rehabilitative education during your first jail term, did it help you in anyway after release?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, how? ...........................................................................................
   If no, why? ..............................................................................................

15. How can you rate the quality of rehabilitative education you received during your first jail term?
   Very good [ ] Good [ ] Average [ ] Poor [ ]

16. What challenges did you face after your first release that made you be jailed again?
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS

I am a post-graduate student at Kenyatta University. I wish to carry out a research on external efficiency of prison education in Kiambu County. I would be grateful if you answer the questions herein. This information will be treated confidentially and will be used only for the purpose of this research.

1. Are you trained as a teacher?

2. Are you employed by the Teachers Service Commission in Kenya?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   If no who is your employer? .................................................................

3. Is there a well-developed curriculum for inmate education?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   If yes what kind of academic and vocational skills do you offer? ................

4. Do you offer the same kind of curriculum offered in other public educational institutions outside prison?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

5. Are education programmes voluntary or compulsory?
   Compulsory [ ]  Voluntary [ ]

6. What factors do you consider before enrolling inmates into educational programmes? .................................................................

7. What obstacles that demotivate inmates from participating in correctional education?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   If yes which ones? .............................................................................
8. Do you keep achievement records?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. Is there a well-established classroom time table for inmates?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. How do you evaluate learners?

11. Who accredits (give certificates) inmates after completing learning?

12. How many inmates do national examination yearly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What challenges do you face as a teacher?

14. What possible measures do you think should be put in place?

15. Are there enough physical facilities for inmates?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. Do you have a library?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

17. Do you have ICT facilities in prison for educational purposes?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. In your opinion how would you rate the benefits of prison education to the inmates after release? Put a tick (✓) in the box corresponding to your response.
   The key is: SA – Strongly Agree, A- Agree, U- Undecided, D-Disagree and SD – Strongly Disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Are there cases of recidivist inmates in the prison?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, had the recidivist inmate benefited from any form of rehabilitative education during their first imprisonment?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. Why do you think recidivist inmates committed crime again even after benefiting from rehabilitative education?

21. How can you rate the quality of rehabilitative education that inmates benefit from? Put a tick (√) in the box corresponding to your response. **Key is: SA – Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U- Undecided, D-Disagree and SD – Strongly Disagree.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality is high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality is average.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality is low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX III

## INTERVIEW FOR OFFICER IN CHARGE

### Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Main question</th>
<th>Probing questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish if prison rehabilitative education is externally efficient.</td>
<td>Is prison rehabilitative education externally efficient?</td>
<td>In what ways do you think the kind of rehabilitative education you offer inmates assist them cope with life after prison? What percentage of recidivist inmates are there? What do you think lead the recidivist inmates commit crime again? Had the recidivist inmates benefited from any form of rehabilitative education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the status of educational and vocational facilities in prisons in Kiambu County.</td>
<td>What is the status of prison education in Kiambu County?</td>
<td>• Who does the administration of educational programmes for inmates in prison? • Which policies guide the provision of prison education? • What vocational curriculum do you offer inmates training? • What is the average age of offenders pursuing education with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify the challenges facing prisons’ rehabilitative education in Kiambu County.</td>
<td>What kind of challenges faces prison rehabilitative education in Kiambu County?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of accreditation?</td>
<td>• How many inmates seat for national examinations yearly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What total amount of expenditure do you invest in academic or correctional education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In which ways is prison education financed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What kinds of partnership do have with other educational institutions in providing prison education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology play any role in correctional education?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What challenges do you face in implementing correctional education programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What possible solution do you think should be put in place to mitigate such challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX IV

**OBSERVATION DATA SHEET**

Availables of Physical facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>In good condition</th>
<th>Often utilized</th>
<th>Well ventilated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

FROM: Dean, Graduate School
TO: Mr. Mwangi Kiama James
     C/o Educational Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies Department

DATE: 30th June, 2014
REF: E55/CE/11715/07

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF PROJECT RESEARCH PROPOSAL

This is to inform you that Graduate School Board, at its meeting on 11th June, 2014, approved your Project Research Proposal for the M.Ed. Degree entitled, “The External Efficiency of Prison Education in Kiambu County, Kenya.”

You may now proceed with your Data collection, subject to clearance with the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology.

As you embark on your data collection, please note that you will be required to submit to Graduate School completed Supervision Tracking Forms per semester. The form has been developed to replace the Progress Report Forms. The Supervision Tracking Forms are available at the University’s Website under Graduate School webpage downloads.

Thank you.

JULIA GITU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

CC. Chairman, Educ, Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies Department
    Supervisors:

1. Dr. Michael Murage
   C/o Educational Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies Department
   Kenyatta University

2. Dr. Mukirae Njihia
   C/o Educational Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies Department
   Kenyatta University
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RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM NACOSTI

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Date: 27th August, 2014

NACOSTI/P/14/5485/2806

James Kiama Mwangi
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “The external efficiency of prison education in Kiambu County, Kenya.” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Kiambu County for a period ending 15th October, 2014.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Kiambu County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. S. K LANGAT, OGW
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
The County Director of Education
Kiambu County.
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RESEARCH PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

MR. JAMES KIAMA MWANGI
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 0-900
Kiambu, has been permitted to conduct
research in Kiambu County.

on the topic: THE EXTERNAL
EFFICIENCY OF PRISON EDUCATION IN
KIAMBU COUNTY, KENYA

for the period ending:
15th October, 2014

Applicant’s
Signature

Secretary
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the County Commissioner and
the County Education Officer of the area before
embarking on your research. Failure to do that
may lead to the cancellation of your permit.
2. Government Officers will not be interviewed
without prior appointment.
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been
approved.
4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological
specimens are subject to further permission from
the relevant Government Ministries.
5. You are required to submit at least two(2) hard
copies and one(1) soft copy of your final report.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to
modify the conditions of this permit including
its cancellation without notice.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

NACOSTI
National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation

RESEARCH CLEARANCE
PERMIT

Serial No. A 3006

CONDITIONS: see back page