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ABSTRACT

Kenya Prisons Service has continuously undertaken reforms since the year 2001, with an aim of helping offenders to modify their behavior while in prison. Prison reforms focus on offender behavior modification through a correctional lens. Prisons are mandated by law to rehabilitate offenders through administration of rehabilitation programmes, which are the main intervention of correcting offenders in Kenyan prisons. Though prisons globally endeavor to correct offenders, there are occasional violent misconduct cases among inmates, which remain a major challenge in the modern prisons management systems. This misconduct has sometimes resulted in fatalities or injuries, or even enduring conflicts among the inmates. The purpose of the study was to establish how effective internal correction mechanisms are in dealing with the challenge of violent misconduct among inmates. A mixed method research approach incorporating both qualitative and quantitative research methods was carried out among prison officers and convicted offenders from Nairobi County Prisons. A descriptive study design was used to solicit the desired data. A representative sample of 111 participants was used for the study while 10% of the sample population was interviewed. Qualitative methods included semi-structured interviews while quantitative methods involved the use of questionnaires composing both structured and unstructured questions. Data analysis was done using SPSS version 25. The findings of the study indicated that there was a positive relationship between internal correction mechanisms and violent misconduct among inmates. Notably, internal disciplinary procedures, early release mechanisms and open door policy proved significant in management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi county prisons. The recommendations of the study include having all stakeholders involved in development and implementation of internal correction mechanism; review of existing legislature and subject Kenya Prisons Service to scrutiny by a civilian independent oversight authority.
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**OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission:</td>
<td>Process of receiving a prisoner whether convicted or not after being handed over by a police officer or on transfer from another prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td>Use of prison security infrastructure, programs and equipment’s to manage and respond to prison incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offender:</td>
<td>A person discharged after serving a prison sentence or payment of fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate/prisoner:</td>
<td>An individual lawfully serving a custodial sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal correction</td>
<td>Strategies aimed at correcting inmate’s behavior while in prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum prison:</td>
<td>Establishment where offenders perceived to be the most dangerous are assigned to maximum security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open door policy:</td>
<td>Opening of prisons for scrutiny by the public and oversight bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole:</td>
<td>Concept where inmates are conditionally release from prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison:</td>
<td>Any place or enclosure or building establishment where a person(s) are legally confined while awaiting trial or under punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officer:</td>
<td>Member of Kenya prisons service whether uniformed or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison offence:</td>
<td>Conduct or behavior against prison discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison reforms:</td>
<td>Attempts to dramatically transformation and improvement of prison conditions and system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent misconduct:</td>
<td>Unlawful human behavior that leads to unwarranted physical, social and psychological pain or harm thereby attracting criminal or institutional redress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation/</td>
<td>Reformation agenda that result from psycho-social, cultural and economic interventions intended to reform offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation:</td>
<td>Interventions that seek to correct inmate’s non-conforming behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes:</td>
<td>through; formal and informal training, vocational training, counseling, recreational activities and chaplaincy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-offending:</td>
<td>Relapse to criminality or indiscipline while serving a custodial sentence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction
This chapter in the study presents; background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, justification and significance, scope and limitations, assumption and conceptual framework of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study
Violent misconduct cases among inmates have become a major challenge that prison managements across the world have to deal with. In addition to working towards punishing and reforming offenders, the management in prisons has to deal with conflicts that result in violent misconduct among the inmates. Even though inmates are convicted for committing crimes, they still have a right to safety. However, violent misconduct among inmates has continually posed a threat to the safety of inmates, prison officers and other stakeholders. The risks that violent misconduct poses to not only the inmates but all the other stakeholders call for a review of ways to mitigate and reduce the occurrence of violent misconduct cases which often result in injuries and at time, fatalities.

Crime evolution in frequency, nature, target and methodology is a major concern of every nation (Amnesty International, 2016). Globally, prisons are mandated by law to administer sentences as punishment to offenders after conviction; thereby transforming them and protecting citizens (Omboto, 2013; Spector, 2006). Imprisonment though the most preferred mode of punishing law breakers, has a dual purpose of punishing and rehabilitating offenders. Prisons play a crucial role of confining persons during their trial process, execution of punishment and acts as agents of behavior change among offenders (Osebe, 2015; Diessel, 2007).

Global reports on violent inmates misconduct point that; overcrowding, coercive prison environment, torture, inhumane treatment, drugs, prison gangs, inadequate rehabilitation programs and low prison officers to inmate’s ratio have a significant relationship with inmate’s violent misconduct (Amnesty International, 2016). A report by Robert Muggah (2017) titled “Brazil’s Deadly Prison System” indicated that almost one hundred inmates were killed during a week of bloody gang violence in Brazil’s prisons. Further, the House of Commons Justice
Committee in England, sixth report of session 2015-2016 pointed out that prison safety in England and Wales was steadily deteriorating since the year 2012. Further, published statistics in the year 2016 indicated a high rate of assault incident among inmates on inmates, inmates on prison officers and inmates self-harm as a major threat to prison safety.

In African prisons, most studies indicate violent misconduct among inmates as a normal occurrence, evidently due to the diverse inmates criminogenic backgrounds, gang rivalries, overcrowding, poor dispute resolution mechanism, prison architecture, inadequate rehabilitation programmes, slow rate of prison reforms and inadequate prison officers to match the ever increasing inmates population. These factors often culminated to violent misconduct attacks mainly involving inmate on inmate, inmate on prison officer, and self-inflicted (Muntingh, 2009; Gatotoh, Omulema, & Nassiuma, 2011). Studies by Omboto, (2013); Ngugi and Nyaura (2014); and Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNHCR), (2005) showed that there was gross abuse of human rights, overcrowding, neglect by family, drugs and substance abuse, prison contrabands, rampant overcrowding and inadequate rehabilitation programmes are the salient factors leading to prison violent misconduct among inmates and other forms of indiscipline such as escapes, riotous strikes among others, in Kenyan Prisons. Despite existence of rich scholar empirical data linking inmates’ violent misconduct to a number of variables, there is still a large gap in knowledge on how to merge rehabilitation programmes and actual prison conditions in rehabilitating and reforming offenders. The consistent inmate’s re-offending to violent misconduct subjects prison officers to a practical dilemma of whether to advocate for security or rehabilitation (Oruta, 2016).

Majority of studies done, have suggested that various correction procedures such as early release mechanism, open door policy, and internal disciplinary mechanism being effective in the management of violence among inmates (Spector, 2006; Hairston, et al., 2001). Others indicate disparity in their findings advocating for punishment through solitary confinement as a way of modifying inmates’ behaviour (Armstrong, 2015). However, majority of the studies were carried out in western world contexts, indicating a gap in studies in the African and more specifically the Kenyan context. Existing studies suggest correction through rehabilitation programmes. The discussion among scholars of whether inmates are in prison for or as punishment continues to be a worthy discourse. Furthermore, the dilemma on whether to punish or rehabilitate re-offending
inmates in prison complicates the enforcement of discipline and overall management of inmate’s misconduct.

Volumes of empirical studies on management of inmate’s violent misconduct in a non-punitive model have championed for correction through rehabilitation programmes (Cook, Kang, & Braga, 2015). In Sweden, Norway and Australia the role of prison system is not to punish as punishment is the prison sentence (Larsen, 2002). A study by Bruhn, et al., (2010) among inmate’s population and prison officers in Swedish prisons found out that imprisonment is the punishment itself, as the prison policy requires inmates to compulsory participate in various rehabilitation programmes.

In Africa prison systems operations are guided by United Nations Standard Minimum Rules (UNSMR) and Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Contrary to global expectations, rationalization of punishment and agitation of rehabilitation and reformation by Nigeria penal policy subjects prison officers to a practical dilemma (Ugwuoke, 2014). Behaviour modification through rehabilitation programs highlights a significant and paradigm shift in correction philosophy (Oruta, 2016). Though prison reforms and agitation for rehabilitation in Kenya are ongoing in prisons, the inmates’ rates of re-offending to violent misconduct continue to rise (United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), 2016; KNCHR, 2005). Extreme forms of isolation and segregation programs for correcting violent misconduct among inmates employed without space for rehabilitation is vital in controlling prison indiscipline and more so violent misconduct among inmates (Monteiro, 2016). Kimani (2006) and Owino (2016) found out in their studies that non-punitive correction models are vital managing inmate’s violent misconduct. Adoption of treatment model through rehabilitation programs seeks to transform, change and modify behavior of offenders both while serving custodial sentence and while social re-integrating back to the society (Gatotoh, et al., 2014; McNeill, 2014).

Kenya Prisons Service had a paradigm shift from punishment to correction through rehabilitation programmes in 2001 (Okanga, 2014). However, inmates are still being involved in violent misconduct despite numerous studies inclining towards interventions or strategies such as counseling, chaplaincy, and recreational activities, which are currently used to manage violent misconduct among inmates in prison. The main question however remains how effective these rehabilitation programmes on their own are in correcting inmates’ violent misconduct. It is
against this background that the current study sought to ascertain the prevalence of violent misconduct and scrutinize correlates of inmate’s violent misconduct to internal correction mechanisms interventions.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

From the background, most studies agree that internal disciplinary procedures play a vital role in the management of violent misconduct cases among inmates which are prevalent in most prisons (Cook et al, 2015; Owens, 2009 & Lidovho, 2003). These studies which have largely been carried out in western contexts, have however not reached a conclusive findings, on the effectiveness of internal disciplinary procedures in managing violent misconduct among inmates (Bruhn, 2010; Maguire & Raynor, 2006 & Larsen, 2002).

In Kenya despite the notable efforts to rehabilitate offenders the rate of violent misconduct among inmates is still high. Studies on management of violent misconducts among inmates provide competing ideals and disparity in their findings. Whereas majority of studies are in support of rehabilitation programmes, (Oruta, 2016 & Ombati, 2014) a few of the studies do not support this view. However, none has reviewed the role of internal correction procedures in management of inmate’s violent misconducts. To determine what the effective interventions or strategies of dealing with violent misconduct among inmates are, this study investigated the effectiveness of internal correction procedures in dealing with violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective of the study

To establish the role of internal correction procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons

1.3.2 Specific objectives of the study

1. To establish the prevalence of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons.

2. To determine how internal disciplinary procedures impact on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons.
3. To evaluate how early release mechanisms impact on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons.
4. To assess how open door policy impact on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons

1.4 Research Questions
1. What is the prevalence of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons?
2. How do internal disciplinary procedures impacts on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons?
3. How does early release mechanisms impact on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons?
4. How does open door policy impacts on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons?

1.5 Justification and Significance of the Study
The contemporary phenomenon of violent misconduct among inmates in prisons is a serious impediment to the security, rehabilitation and reformation agenda in prisons. Therefore, the importance of carrying out this study was to justify the need for KPS to adopt internal correction procedures as a reinforcement tool of the rehabilitation programmes. This would help in arresting inmate’s violent misconduct. With limited studies on the role of internal correction procedures especially in the Kenyan context, this study would provide valuable insights especially to prison officers on how to manage violent misconduct among inmates. The finding of the study would add to existing knowledge on this area of study. It will also generate interest and debate among KPS practitioners on the possibility of merging internal correction procedures with rehabilitation programmes; and help the National Government would save cost of running prisons and more so costs associated with medication as a result of inmates engaging in violent misconduct

1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study
1.6.1 Scope of the Study
The study only covered Nairobi County prisons in Kenya. The Prisons hold a large number of male and female inmates with different criminogenic and risk factors who are drawn from different nationalities, social economic backgrounds, diverse cultures, and different ages. The
prisons further hold various categories of prisoner’s majority serving long-term sentences, ex-law enforcement officers, escapees and holds huge number of violent offenders compared to other prison in Kenya. The prisons are administered by various categories of prison officers that is the; gazette prison officers, senior prison officers and junior prison officers spread across gender.

1.6.2 Limitation of the Study
The study focused on two Nairobi County Maximum Prisons alone where strict time schedules of operations and escorted movement of inmates are the routine. Prisons operate under a command structure that limits the accessibility of information to the public. This posed an obstacle to the data collection process involving prison officers and inmates thereby constraining the generalisability of research findings to medium security prisons and juvenile institutions. To reduce the impact of this limitation, the researcher informed the relevant bodies in advance. A convenient schedule for the participants, the prison management, and the researcher was developed.

However, for the study to remain focused, and minimize the margin of error the researcher assured respondents that the study was for academic purpose. Data collections instruments were structured in a manner that respondents were assured of their confidentiality and anonymity. During interview questions were asked in a simple language that was easily comprehensible, hence boosting the response rate. This attracted voluntary participation in the study by respondents. The researcher sought prior permission from the Prisons Headquarters during the pilot test in order to ensure that data was collected without interfering with prison operations. The prisons were in close proximity to the researcher; hence the researcher was able to align with the tight prison schedule in order to ensure that requisite data was collected.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study
The assumptions in this study included:

1. All participants would respond truthfully
2. The participants understood what violent misconduct entailed.
3. The structure of the interviews and other data collection processes would not be interfered with by any changes in the prison schedules.
1.8 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework presents relationship between the variables in the study. In the study the independent variables were internal disciplinary procedures, early release mechanism and open door policy; the intervening variables were rehabilitation programs and Internal correction procedures; and the dependent variables were either violent misconduct or positive change from rehabilitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Intervening Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Disciplinary Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehabilitative Ideals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Punitive Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Release Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decongestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Door Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnerships with Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Change from Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehabilitation Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internal Correction Procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2019

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction
This chapter presents a critical review of both primary and secondary sources. The review of literature captured the study’s theoretical framework, summarized findings and highlighted research gaps.

2.1 Literature Review
The section presents a review of scholarly work guided by the variables of the study. The dependent variable was violent misconduct in prisons. Internal disciplinary mechanisms, early release mechanisms and open door policy formed the independent variables.

2.1.1 Prevalence of Inmates Violence Misconduct
Globally, a prison system is an institution in the criminal justice system that does not only seek to punish offenders, but also plays a critical role in their rehabilitation of prisoners. However, violent misconduct among inmates is a global phenomenon that challenges prison management (Hackett, Njoga, & Ounsted, 2017). Worldwide, the prevalence rate of recidivism is high in prisons. A report by Amnesty International (2000) on prisons in the United States, indicated that the number of prisoners in most prisons outnumber the prison officers by ratio. Further, UNDOC (2012) stated that prison population in the United States is pegged at 52%; Chile has 50%, with France having 46%. Due to overcrowding the gap between the prison officers and the inmate population offers the inmates opportunities to settle scores through violence, smuggling, rioting, and escapes, among others. Prisoners who engage in illicit activities while in custody are transferred to modern prisons with a view of isolating them and preventing contact between them and other inmates. High prisoner population and prisoners violent misconduct has been poised by various studies significant challenge to the modern prison system (World prison brief, 2017; UNODC, 2016). Violent misconduct among inmates is a real threat to orderly management of prisons as normally they curtail enforcement of discipline. Inmates’ indiscipline is a global phenomenon (Amnesty International, 2016).
A study in USA by Muscat (2008) on inmate’s violent misconduct and safety programmes in women prisons indicated that poor communication, individual vulnerabilities, prior victimization, drug addiction, ineffective prison administration that curtail human rights unjustifiably and gang affiliations are the major contributors of high rate of violence among inmates. Spector (2006) conducted a study on American inmates, and concluded that control of violence is dependent on acceptable policies, supervision of force, effective management of risks and threats. In the study prisoners perceived unacceptable risks, (injury or death) and acting violently as a means of survival. As a way of addressing the vice of violence in prisons inhumane corporal punishment was administered in order to control inmates.

A Howard league for penal reforms report (2015) projected 43% increase in inmate to inmates assaults, 15% in self harm while prison officers to inmates was 6.9%. The report highlighted that when prisoners engage in riots, hunger strike, violent misconduct and other forms of gross indiscipline their cases are heard and determined by an adjudication officer. The officer exercised his/ her powers discretionally and handed over as punishment, extra days that the prisoner had been earlier pardoned as remission, solitary confinement or discontinuation from rehabilitation programmes for a specified time. A report by Ministry of justice in England and Wales, (2015) indicated that reported incidents of inmate’s indiscipline increased at a rate of 200%. This was attributed to a new National Offender Management Service. The report further indicated that prisons were challenged by overcrowding, shortage of prison officers and lack of sufficient rehabilitation programmes. However, the findings cannot be generalized in Nairobi County Prisons as KPS does not have a National Offender Management Service.

Prison officers and inmates encounter risk of violent victimization by violent inmates. A study by Chelemu (2009), found out that colonial governments in Africa aimed at achieving easy governance and exploitation through the establishment of prisons. The phenomenon in civility transcended to the prison environments. Studies in African prisons point to numerous prison challenges whilst trying to reinvent themselves. For example overcrowding has a direct influence on rehabilitation, safe custody and a pointer to inmate’s misconduct (Muntingh, 2009)

The Kenyan prison system continues to face a myriad of challenges including recidivism among convicted inmates estimated to be very high, though official figures are not known, overcrowding and inadequate rehabilitation programmes. The Kenyan prisons conditions before
the year 1963 were largely punitive, overpopulated with no rehabilitation programmes to correct inmate behavior were available for correcting inmates misconduct (Ngugi, et al., 2014). According to the Kenya Prisons strategic plan, 2013-2017 the Kenya Prisons Service (KPS) was introduced in 1902. Until 1962, the colonial prison system was punitive, oppressive and discriminatory only emphasizing on punishment. After 1962 the KPS attempted to improve operations with an emphasis on rehabilitation.

Mbugua (2008) did a descriptive study at Nairobi Remand Prison, where he collected data from 40 inmates and 30 prisons prison officers on the effect of reforms on inmate’s discipline. He found out that failure of prison officers and inmates to comply with prison rules and regulations; the slow prison reform agenda; and manifestation of inmate’s indiscipline contributed to inmate’s violent misconduct. The phenomenon is attributed to conflicts emanating from scarcity of resources due to overcrowding, poor dispute resolution mechanisms and poor working conditions. Further, it influenced smuggling and use of drugs in the prison. However, the study cannot be generalized to convicted inmates as the sample for the study was drawn from inmates who had been released, who possess different characteristic, participate in different rehabilitation programmes and enjoy different privileges while in prison.

Omboto (2013) did a study at Kamiti Maximum security prison where he administered questionnaires and interviewed 60 inmates and 20 prison officers on the challenges facing rehabilitation of prisoners. He found out that harsh prison conditions, low capacity of prison officers to rehabilitate offenders, inadequate rehabilitation programmes, failure to release inmates early on amnesty and poor working conditions negatively affected prison officer’s work as violent misconduct among inmates were witnessed averagely on a daily basis. The study further indicated that high number of prisoners placed on death sentence over the years were the trigger of violent misconduct. The study concurred with Madoka report (2008) which indicated a figure of around 3481 inmates placed under death sentence against a total population of 4107 inmates confined in the prison hence spurring violent misconduct and other forms of gross indiscipline.

Based on all the studies reviewed, it is evident that cases of indiscipline and violent misconduct among inmates are highly prevalent. It is a challenge that prison management continue to battle with, even as they strive to correct and reform the inmates. Therefore, there is need to address
this as a major issue in correction and reformation facilities as it poses a threat to not only the goal and purpose of these systems but also to the lives of the inmates.

2.1.2 Internal Disciplinary Procedures in Management of Inmates Violent Misconduct
Globally the 21st correctional philosophy demands managing violent misconduct among inmates through a discipline process that is acceptable, balanced and humane (Petersilia, 2008). A study by Donald (2006) in Washington DC on making prison safe found out that indiscipline among inmates in prisons continues to impact immensely on rehabilitation, and reformation of inmates. Vices like drug abuse, violence, rape, involvement in gangs and extortion or trafficking takes place inside the prison walls painting a dire and sad ordeal (Donald, 2006). Prisons systems seek to confine, rehabilitate, protect community and socially reintegrate prisoners who have changed behavior as law-abiding citizen out of reformation. Discipline with no more restriction than necessary should be maintained in prison environment in-order to ensure safety, Security and order (Rule 36 on United Nations Standard Minimum Rights). Studies in USA and UK concluded that self-responsibility to modify and change behavior as a major prerequisite in reformation endeavor. It is rehabilitation with certain demands on the offender in terms of behavior, discipline, hard work and respect for authority. The decision to change is dependent on the individual prisoner (Maguire, et al., 2006; McNeill, 2014).

Cochran (2014) conducted a study on adult inmates confined at United States of America (USA) prisons, where he found out that 13% of the inmates participants in his study were earlier incarcerated for violent misconduct and other forms of indiscipline in highly restrictive segregation units. The success of segregation as a behavior control model in form of disciplinary solitary confinement for 22-24 hours in a cell in modifying inmates’ behavior was difficult to quantify. Therefore, based on this study it was difficult to determine the effectiveness of solitary confinement as a disciplinary tool among juvenile and women inmates’ population. A common finding was that inmate’s misconduct were not managed by segregation, instead they hardened. The study was conducted in one male State prison therefore it’s a description of a small group of inmates who were sampled during the study. The study findings cannot be generalized to Nairobi County Prisons either male or female oriented. Both genders have unique characteristics different from each other.
Armstrong (2005) did a study on prison discipline across three USA prisons in California, where he interviewed over 150 prison officers and inmates. The researcher concluded that inmate’s punishment for disciplinary violations was dependent on prison officer’s discretion. For example, disciplinary codes reinforce the disciplinary rules that generally prescribe the acceptable and unacceptable behavior with little emphasis on behavior modification through rehabilitation. The study revealed that re-offending rate in prisons is quite high estimated to be between 63-65%. Notably those who relapse to criminality had prior tendencies of indiscipline in prison leading to solitary confinement or punishment while in prison. Further, as punishment rehabilitation is halted when inmates engage in violent misconduct and other forms of indiscipline. However, the study did not address the relationship between severity of punishment and inmate’s frequency of re-offending while in prison. More empirical research is required to establish if there are alternative ways of correcting re-offending inmates in prisons, other than solitary confinement and more so for the first-time offenders of violent misconduct.

Researches in the USA penal system on the subject of management of inmate’s violent misconduct, (where inmates and prison officers were the main target population) showed that overreliance on solitary confinement for prolonged periods of time served to harden the inmates. Furthermore, inmates who were re-offending in prisons had a history of being placed in solitary confinement in a locked prison cell (Cunningham & Sorensen, 2007; Spector, 2006). Prolonged solitary confinement exposes inmates to aggression, loss of self-esteem and threat to mental health. A report by special reporter of human rights council on torture and other cruel and degrading punishment concluded that solitary confinement beyond fifteen days amounts to torture. A study on enforcement of prison discipline in New Zealand found out that growth of prisoner’s population is a challenge in prisons. This undermines many of the advances that have been made to reform inmates and manage inmates’ misconduct. However, studies reviewed above though in western cultures have differing view on solitary confinement as a methodology of enforcing discipline in order to manage inmate’s violent misconduct hence making their findings less generalizable in Kenyan context.

Lobi and Kheswa, (2014) did a study and found out that, use of prolonged solitary confinement in prison when inmates commit an offence means that thousands of prisoners return to their communities after long period of isolation hence emerging with diminished social and life skills.
The hard reality of misuse or overuse of solitary confinement and need to appear tough on indiscipline, as opposed to addressing needs of prisoners has adverse effects such as re-offending while in prison. Psychological and social pressures, health problems, denial of visitation, gross disregard of fundamental human rights promote coercive tendencies in prisons where prisoners view imprisonment as punishment. Whereas as a coping mechanism inmates engaged in violent misconduct (Amnesty International, 2016). However, there exists a limited body of empirical data that evaluate the rationale of solitary punishment on reformation of offenders.

Studies on solitary confinement as a methodology of attaining inmate’s discipline in USA revealed that correctional systems have more restrictive cells or units designed to isolate errant inmates. Segregation for long hours unjustifiably of inmates when they commit disciplinary offence while in prison serves a punitive effect such as boost aggression, self-harm, violence, suicidal tendencies, drug abuse and upscale smuggling of contrabands (Armstrong, 2015 & Monteiro, 2016). Question whether punishment or rehabilitation is a conflicting concept in the minds of penologists while seeking to address it in the context of management of violent misconduct among inmates while in prison hence necessitating further research.

A study on Swedish prison titled ‘rehabilitation as punishment’ indicated that prisons are not meant to punish offenders, since the punishment is limitation of fundamental human freedoms. The duration a prisoner spends while undertaking rehabilitation is punishment on its own. The prison policy requires inmates to participate in rehabilitation activities or treatment programs. The penal system remains humane and rehabilitative as inmates are actively engaged in meaningful work that foster reformation packaged in rehabilitation programmes. Swedish prisons are renowned for being humane, liberal and focused in rehabilitation of prisoners, this translates to a few cases of inmates re-offending and returning to prison after being released (Bruhn, Nylander, & Lindberg, 2010). Therefore, more research is required to find out how best inmates who engage in violent misconduct and other forms of indiscipline practices can be effectively rehabilitated. Current studies cannot be generalized as western cultured inmates have unique characteristics, needs and backgrounds from Africans.

Prisons systems in Africa, seek to transform and change inmate’s behavior through various rehabilitation strategies and interventions (Homel & Thomson, 2005). A study by World prison brief (2012) concluded that the endeavor of correcting prisoners in Africa mostly curtailed by
factors such as: overcrowding, lack of sufficient manpower to man the prisons, competing interest of whether prisoners are in prison as punishment or for punishment, weak rehabilitation programmes, and unprofessional conduct of prison officers, among others. Violent misconduct among inmates is an unfortunate occurrence in African prison systems, and South Africa prisons are not an exception. For example, conditions of African prisons are afflicted by congestion, poor sanitation, violent misconduct, inadequate rehabilitation programmes, restricted contact of inmates with outside world and poor prison governance (Amnesty International, 2016). Studies in South Africa on rehabilitation of inmates concluded that the main objective of correction service is to rehabilitate and assure safety of inmates and the society (Singh, 2016).

Muntingh (2009) conducted a study on reducing prison violence in South Africa. He defined violence as deaths due to unnatural causes and assaults in prison settings where he interviewed inmates and prison officers in the major South African correctional facilities. He concluded that inmate’s violent misconduct included: individual inmate’s response to abnormal environment, prison officer’s culture of violence, overcrowding, and architectural inheritance that limit supervision, among others. The ordeal bleeds resentment, violent misconduct and frustration among inmates. The study found out that gang membership is the main factor in propagating violent misconduct among inmates. Through inmate classification and criminal profiling, conflict resolution, rehabilitation programmes and fostering disciplinary action, the vice was managed.

Numerous studies have been conducted on measuring the extent of violent misconduct among inmates (Asokhia & Agbonluae 2013; Diesel, 2001; Drake, 2014) but hardly have any availed current evidence on the interface between internal correction procedures and inmates violent misconduct.

A study titled “Rehabilitation of Convicts in Nigerian Prisons: A Study of Federal Prisons in Kogi State” concluded that the system is largely retributive in nature only ensuring the safe custody of offenders and ignoring the noble reformation and rehabilitation agenda. Deterrence and retribution becomes the rationale for incarcerating offenders and more so in addressing inmates violent misconduct and other indiscipline while serving sentence. For example inmates view solitary cellular segregation as being placed in prison within a prison (Ugwuoke, 2014). However, the findings of the study cannot be generalized as the State prison is not the best when it comes to compliance and adherence to UNSMR. This is noncompliance with the UNSMR guidelines may accelerate the occurrence of violent misconduct among inmates. For example,
cases of prisoners not being protected from inhumanity and punishment were witnessed as prison life is largely characterized by unending violent misconduct. Research within a prison system that is compliant is therefore needed.

Prisons in Kenya are overcrowded and Under-manned thus prison officers have to ‘get along’ with inmates thereby complicating and undermining their correction responsibilities (Cunningham, et al., 2007). Researchers have found out that solitary confinement has been used arbitrary to torture and grossly violate inmate’s fundamental rights when they engage in violent misconduct with little room for rehabilitation while in prison thereby sophisticating management of inmates’ indiscipline amicably (KNCHR, 2011; Amnesty International, 2000).

Omboto (2013) conducted a study on challenges facing rehabilitation of offenders in Kenya. Data was collected from 55 inmates held at Kamiti maximum security prison. He concluded that overcrowding and harsh prison conditions such as drug use, poor diet, boredom, lack of necessities of life, prison officers smuggling contrabands among others, predisposed inmates to violent misconduct. The study was conducted in a maximum prison. With a sole focus on a maximum security prison, the findings could not be easily generalized to medium and juvenile prisons. Moreover, the findings of these studies have not been replicated using both qualitative and quantitative research designs, with a bigger and diverse sample size. Hence, the methodological weaknesses may lead to biased findings and conclusions that may threaten generalisability. The study agrees with Ngugi, et al., (2014) and Oruta, (2016) studies in Kenyan prisons that concluded that rehabilitation programmes were inadequate, and needed to be boosted for them to help and empower inmates.

KNCHR (2005) did a study on State of Kenyan prisons where they interviewed and administered questionnaires in several Kenyan prisons. The study indicated that Kenyan prisons continue to be harsh and life threatening despite a continued reform agenda. The study further revealed that inmate’s violent misconduct against prison law, policies and procedure are witnessed and sanctioned through an internal disciplinary procedure that is perceived by inmates as unfair. However, the extent of internal disciplinary process to bring inmates to an acceptable behavior rather than merely punishment remains empirically scanty (Ombati, 2014). Omboto (2013) did a study on the paradox of prison reforms in Kamiti and Langata prisons in Kenya where he established that the endeavor towards rehabilitation of those confined in KPS continuously faces
myriad of challenges among them violent misconduct among inmates. Through interviews of prison officers and inmates in prisons he established that unremorseful, hardcore and capital offenders formed a significant prisoner’s population and possessed; dreadful violent behavioral characteristics, were re-offenders, deviant and greedy while in prison. Humane prison conditions are a prerequisite for a successful rehabilitation (KNCHR, 2005). Prison statistics (2018) concluded that violent misconduct are reported in all Kenyan prisons on a daily basis notably being in form of; self-harm, inmates versus inmates and inmates versus prison officers.

Osebe (2015) did a descriptive study on effects of imprisonment on inmates at Industrial area remand prison and Langata women prison in Kenya. He interviewed 34 male and 24 female inmates where he found out that male inmates aged 51-60 years and female inmates 18-25 years are violently assaulted most by fellow inmates. He concluded that a positive relationship exists between high re-offending rate among inmates and indiscipline.

The studies indicate a positive relationship between internal correction mechanisms and violent misconduct among inmates. When done right, it is evident that internal correction mechanisms can be a great asset in dealing with violent misconduct cases among inmates. Hence, there is need for further research on existing internal correction mechanisms and how effective they are in addressing violent misconduct cases so that they can be reviewed accordingly for ultimate effectiveness.

2.1.3 Early Release Mechanisms in Management of Inmates Violent Misconduct.

According to UNODC (2013) handbook on strategies to reduce overcrowding in prisons, more than 10.1 million inmates were held in prisons globally as of 2011. This translated to 146 out of every 100,000 people of the world being in prison. International Center of Prisons Studies (2005) gave a statistical figure of more than nine million prisoners worldwide and the number is ever growing. In the USA, it is estimated that incarceration rate is fifteen times higher than those of other Western nations (Tonry, 2011). The Ouagadougou Declaration (2002) advocated for adoption of strategies against overcrowding such as early release mechanisms. Globally inmates are released from prison because of completion of jail term, decongestion, parole, power of mercy, presidential pardon among others. Ideals of early release from prison are ever competing hence necessitating a study (Owens, 2009; Maguire, et al., 2006).
Zapryanova (2014) did a study in USA where he drew his study population from convicted inmates. He found out that more than 600,000 inmates were released early from prisons of which two-thirds had not completed their jail term. This is actualized due to properly designed release programmes that tend to improve institutional discipline, reduce inmate’s misconduct rate. Inmates’ early release saves taxpayers money. Increasing costs and demands on correctional systems mandates the USA to drastically cut its inmate population. Early release mechanism provides stronger incentives for inmates to take advantage of corrective procedures such as adhering to early release policy and rehabilitation programmes hence achieve reformation opportunities in prison (Singh, 2016). The concept of early release in western contexts tends to reward well behaved prisoners with a reduction of sentence (Schmalleger, 2003). However this study cannot be generalized to Kenyan prisons contexts as little is known about how early release before completion of sentence affects re-offending in prison. This necessitates further research on the subject as it remains empirically scanty.

World prison brief (2014) indicated a overcrowding at 157% of the official capacity in prisons and the situation is ever worsening. The high costs associated with running of prisons due to overcrowding provoked a study by O’Hear (2015). He did a study titled “Early release for good behavior” in American States where he interviewed prison officers and inmates. He found out that prison reform agenda was continuously being adopted and cherished. The reforms availed well-designed inmates rehabilitation programmes that helped to empower inmates thereby helping to improve discipline and reducing re-offending while in prison. This had a direct relationship with reducing the costs associated with mass incarceration. However, this study cannot be generalized to Nairobi County prisons as Kenyan prisons system does not have a structured early release mechanisms or policy for inmates.

In South Africa prisons overcrowding remains one of the major challenges. According to a study by Muntingh (2002) the total prison population was 162162 of which 49695 (31%) were undergoing trial and 112467 (69%) were serving sentenced offenders. Nationally, there is an overcrowding level of 137 percent. Lidovho (2003) conducted a study on ‘Parole boards in South Africa’ where he concluded that prison focus on rehabilitation as opposed to punishment is a noble cause in South Africa. The prison system addresses inmate’s needs while remaining true to change and reformation. This has boosted inmates discipline and minimized inmate’s violent
misconduct. However, empirical evidence on the extent of rehabilitation in South Africa found re-offending rate to be between 66 and 94 percent (Dissel, 2001 & Singh, 2016).

Louw (2008) did a study on the parole process from a South African perspective. He drew a sample of 8 Correctional Supervision and Parole Boards from a population of 52 boards. He found out that overcrowding in prison limited inmates ability to be rehabilitated, parole motivated inmates to be disciplined, reformed as well as caused the society to also contribute in the rehabilitation process of offenders upon release. There are few studies done in Kenya on parole as a phenomenon making generalisability of the findings of this study difficult.

Kenya Prisoner population is ever increasing despite Government scaling up non-custodial sentencing (KNCHR, 2005). Data from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2017) on prisoner’s population stood at 51,974 against the official capacity of 26,000 indicating overpopulation. This concurred with Ngugi, et al., (2014) and Kimani, (2006) studies in KPS which concluded that significantly inmate’s population has increased owing to various socio-economic, cultural and political dynamics. The phenomenon greatly influence achievement of prison mandates. In order to reduce inmates re-offending prison environment must be favorable and early release mechanism is availed (Owino, 2015 & Armstrong, 2014). Kenya Constitution (2010), Prison Act (1977) and Prison standing orders acknowledges early release as a concept grounded in law. It empowers the president to grant remission, amnesty and parole to inmates who are of good behavior and disciplined. For example, Article 133 of Kenya Constitution (2010) empowers the presidency to pardon inmates.

Omboto (2013) indicated that early release from prison is a potentially contentious issue in Kenya of balancing between risks to public safety and custodial deterrence effect, versus cutting costs and inmate’s correction. The uncertainty among the previously mentioned proponent’s conflict hence needs further scrutiny.

2.1.4 Open Door Policy in Management of Inmates Violent Misconduct.

A study by Tasca, et al., (2016) in Arizona prisons on ‘moving visitation’ indicated that prison visitation encourage inmates and their families with a coping up mechanism. Visitation reprieve the prisoners’ pressure of prison life during interactions with loved ones. This is because they receive social-psychological support from significant others thereby remaining free of disciplinary violation while serving their prison term. The study concurred with Esposito (2014)
who studied Italian inmates on the same subject. The two studies found that prisons are enablers of wellbeing as well as if rehabilitation and reformation agenda is not championed in prisons they can be schools for advancing re-offending to violent misconduct. The studies cannot be generalized to Nairobi County prisons as western cultured inmates possess different characteristics from Kenyan inmates.

The open door policy also has its downsides as indicated by Martin and Hairston (2001). Family psychological, physical and emotional instability due to incarceration of one member exposes others to stress. For example if one parent is incacerated, it leaves one parent to raise the child. Harsh prison conditions affect the child wellbeing that is not limited to children experiencing negative prison hardships after visiting an incarceated parent such as post traumatic stress disorders. Martin and Hairston (2001) concluded that prison visitation results to behaviour problems and maladjustment among children and other family members. The question that remains to the prison officers is to either allow children visit their incarcerated parents or not. As to whether prison visitation cause psychological and emotional impact to children when they have contact during visitation or should the prison systems encourage, and allow children in general or just certain age groups of children or deny all together (Martin, 2001). However, a large body of empirical evidence highlights on positivity of prisoner’s visitation, surprisingly little is empirically known about negative impacts of the same (Hackett, et al., 2017; Hairston, 2001; Helliwell, 2011). What remains unclear is individual inmate’s perception on benefits of visitation on behavior modification while in prison as prior researches have overlooked the same.

Cochran (2012) did a study in Florida Department of Corrections in USA. He collected data from all convicted felon inmates released from Florida prisons between 2000 and 2002. He found out that inmate visitations strengthened social ties, boosted coping mechanisms and minimized adverse effects associated with prolonged isolation. Tasca, et al., (2016) did a study at Arizona prisons on prison visitation and confirmed that inmate’s visitation while incarcerated had a positive impact on prisoner behavior after visitation. Tascha (2014) did a study in USA where he interviewed 40 children who had earlier visited their incarcerated patents. The study found that nearly two-thirds of children reacted negatively to parental prison visitation. Often the punitive nature of prison environment often extended to them. As a result, children would experience negative emotions such as, anger, fear, depression and violent behavior after parental visitation.
However, this study cannot be generalized to Nairobi County prisons as it drew its sample size from ex-prisoners who may possess different characteristic from convicted ones. It was also as carried out in western a context which is different from Kenyan context.

Periodic prison visitation initiatives are vital in modifying inmate’s criminogenic risk factors and needs. It further reduces offender’s pain of imprisonment and likelihood of engagement in prison violence, and increase chances of early release (Martin, 2001). In South Africa a study by Singh (2016) found that open door policy in prison had tremendously enhanced policing by reducing crime rate and re-offending while in prison, prison rehabilitation programmes became vibrant, lessened caseloads and minimized risks to prison officers that are associated with criminality. Policy on opening prisons for scrutiny is a prison reform agenda that allows prisoners visitation while serving jail term by other stakeholders and family (Arditti, 2005 & Drake, 2014).

A report by International Center for Prison Studies (2009) in Rwanda, South Africa, Malawi and Ghana have encouraged argumentation of Government efforts in provision of financial, capacity building and social support aimed at improving prison conditions and inmate’s welfare. This in turn strengthened the adherence to the UNSMR. Chapter four of Kenya constitution (2010) guarantees persons detained in prisons the right to be treated with dignity like any other human being regardless of the crime they have committed. The State must champion the respect for fundamental rights and freedoms as enshrined in the Kenyan constitution, of 2010.

The KPS has continuously reformed its operations in order to conform to the UNSMR standards (Gatotoh, et al., 2011; KPS, 2007; KNCHR, 2011). Notable is the adoption of the open door policy that sought to open up prisons for external scrutiny and partnerships by stakeholders. Ngare (2009) did a qualitative and quantitative research at Langata and Kamiti prisons on impact of prison reforms on inmate’s rehabilitation programs in Kenya. The researcher interviewed 53 prison officers and 51 inmates during the study. He found out that open door policy has greatly impacted on inmate’s wellbeing. The policy further fostered popular participation by stakeholders in the rehabilitation and reformation agenda of inmates where inmates cited improved prison conditions and advocacy for humane treatment as major strides (KNCHR, 2005). The study cannot be generalized as the extent of prisoner’s rehabilitation because of adoption of open door policy remains empirically scanty.
The Madoka Report (2008) titled “The High Level Committee on the Prison Crisis” averred that, the pronouncement of open door policy by KPS in the year 2002 ushered in a fundamental shift in policy direction with the aim of adopting best practice in prisons management. These initiatives augmented by responsive engagement with stakeholders, contributed to the development of programmes areas which consequently led to the adoption of prison visitation as a milestone in rehabilitation agenda. Open door policy seeks to encourage a participative and all-inclusive approach to rehabilitation and seemingly the most visible reform initiative of the KPS.

The Handbook on human rights in Kenyan prisons (2007) outlined that KPS has achieved great milestones, thanks to the reform process that started in 2001 by pronouncement of open door policy. The policy aims at opening prisons for scrutiny by various stakeholders such as donors, NGO’S, remote parenting, media, religious and charitable organization, prison visitors among others, aimed at enhancing prison efficiency in management. Moreover, the open door policy arguments ongoing prison reform agenda that enable stakeholders to mobilize resources, financial and technical support that ultimately ensure prisoners are treated humanely as per the guidelines of UNSMR 1955 (KPS, 2007 & KNCHR, 2005).

A report by Raoul Wallenberg Institute, and KPS (2017) titled ‘Human rights are good corrections’ indicated that the paradigm shift from a securely confining and containing function of the prison to a transparent, accessible, all-inclusive and participative imprisonment approach has continuously been agitated for. KPS seeks to enhance respect of domestic, International law and more so human rights. Prisons have for time been long been associated with inhumanity, unprofessionalism, overcrowding and inaccessibility more so by human rights watchdog and Non-governmental organizations. Prison officers view them as criticism, rather than tangible assistance. Hackett, et al., (2017) concluded that through partnership in training, prison officers are empowered to treat inmates humanely and with dignity thereby minimizing conflicts between inmates and prison officers that mainly culminate to violent misconduct among inmates.

Studies on open door policy in Kenya have shown that the policy as a prison reform seeks to empower inmates modify their behavior and become law abiding while in prison (Ngugi, et al., 2014; KPS, 2007). Ndimu (2010) did a study at Naivasha Maximum Security Prison on impact of prison reforms on rehabilitation of offenders where she interviewed 40 inmates during the study. She found out that opening up prisons ensured improved conditions for inmates and management became better, which is a precursor to inmate’s rehabilitation and reformation. The
study in one male dominated prison hence the findings cannot be generalized to Nairobi County Prisons. The County hosts several either male or female dominated prisons. The Madoka report in 2008, on prison crisis served as a catalyst that initiates vibrant steps towards penal reform, and respecting human rights. The report found out that initiating an open door policy allowed prison accessibility and scrutiny by other stakeholders. For example, allowing frequent visits and interactions with members of the community, civil groups, religious groups and family thereby lessening violent misconduct among inmates.

A Status report on prison reforms in Kenya titled ‘Beyond the open door policy’ by KNCHR (2005) audited the progress of Kenya Prisons reforms agenda since 2001. The report held that prison reform agenda is an important issue in Kenyan society, considering that prisons are ground for re-offending, torture, human rights violations and abuse. Prisons traditionally are closed institutions from the scrutiny by members of the public. However, Madoka Report (2008) observed that much as the Open door policy had been initiated by the KPS as a reform agenda still it was not anchored in a legal framework. This invariably led to confusion and varying interpretations and methodical application in different prison. This has subsequently affected the rehabilitation of offenders, their overall management by prison officers and inmate’s families due to lack of uniform application that is structured. Therefore the findings of the report cannot be generalized as in KPS has various categories of prisons such as; Maximum, Medium and Minimum security prisons that confine adult and juvenile offenders. For example the level of inmate’s misconduct varies across various prisons.

Mutui (2017) did a study titled analysis of the challenges facing Kenyan prisoners during their rehabilitation. He collected data from 100 inmates and prison officers at Naivasha prison. He concluded that civil society and the community should be invited for them to participate in the inmate’s rehabilitation process. For prison officers to cope up with inmates violent misconduct professional training and refresher courses necessary to enforce inmates discipline such as human rights, good governance and counseling must be availed on regular basis. This would equip prison officers with skills to address violent misconduct among inmates. Volumes of studies exist mainly in western context on positivity of prisoner’s visitation but there exists a limited body of empirical knowledge, which elucidate on the impact of prisoners visitation on violent misconduct in Kenya.
Restorative justice is a system of justice that provides different approaches in management of inmates violent misconduct. It is a concept and a system of criminal justice, which aims at rehabilitating, and transformation of offenders through reconciliation and forgiveness (Halsey, 2007). Restorative justice is a critical component of the open door policy in KPS as it offers various stakeholders a means of managing inmates violent misconduct (UNODC, 2016). Singh (2016) did a study on offender’s rehabilitation and reintegration. He found out that restorative justice rides on the premise that punishing offenders should strive to repair the harm done through opening prisons to other stakeholders. The stakeholders participate voluntarily in the inmates internal correction process on the premise that everyone has capacity to influence the other positively, through empowerment initiatives. The study though cannot be generalized to Nairobi county prisons as it was conducted in western context and moreover the study sampled respondents from a population of ex-prisoners as opposed to the current study which targets convicted inmates.

2.2 Theoretical Framework
The study was anchored on the importation theory and an influential school of thought that helps to explain an unending phenomenon.

2.2.1 Importation theory
The study was guided by the importation theory. It sought to explain how inmates adjust to imprisonment and why there is persistent violent misconduct among inmates in prisons. Irwin and Cressey developed the importation theory in 1962. The theory is anchored on pre-prison socialization and attributes prison mal-adaptation (for example to violence) to characteristics that prisoners import into prison. The theory posits that inmates enter prison from diverse and dynamic backgrounds most of which reinforce criminogenic tendencies. Inmates from such backgrounds are more likely to engage in interpersonal aggression as a result of imported behavior into prison environment (Drago, et al., 2011). The coercive prison system coupled with the de- personalization associated with induction into prison life increases the probability of inmate’s high assimilation into prison subcultures such as violent misconduct.

The Importation theory asserts that pre-prison factors affect an inmate’s pattern of adjustment while serving a jail term (Irwin, et al., 1964). It argues that violent misconduct among prisoners is not a product of the prison characteristics but rather the characteristics of the individual
prisoner. According to the Importation theory, prisoner’s behaviour in prison is a replica of behaviours and values imported into the prison from outside world. Thus, inmates' social, demographic, and psychological characteristics and behaviour imported into prison system best explains inmate’s violent misconduct behaviour. Prison conditions offers opportunity for inmates to engage in violent misconduct but not the cause (Irwin, et al., 1962). Though outdated, the theory formed the basis on which variables in the study were anchored, tested and conceptualized premised on the fact that individual characteristics rather than prison environment best explain the phenomenon of violent misconduct among inmates.

2.3 Summary and Research Gaps

Violent misconduct among inmates presents one of the pressing security and safety threat in Prisons. Prison systems all over the world are handicapped by existence of numerous challenges among them re-offending among inmates to violence misconduct. This undermines their core mandate of rehabilitation and reformation of offenders. Violent misconduct among inmates while serving sentences in prison is high as indicated by numerous reports and studies in various jurisdictions. However, the reviewed literature at various platforms on the phenomenon under study paint that empirical gaps exist between the variables hence demanding extensive study. The literature reviewed in the study though majority in western context was guided by importation theory. The theory explores prison violent misconduct phenomenon based on the premise of humanistic approach in corrections through explaining the phenomenon under study in real life.

The reviewed literature on inmate’s internal disciplinary procedures in prisons highlights competing ideologies. While majority of the studies advocate for humanistic approach in correction, others advocate for punitive approach. The paradox of punitive and correctional approaches to inmate’s misconduct subject prison officers to a practical dilemma as existing data on merging punishment and rehabilitation as behavior modification factor in reformation of inmates with violent misconduct tendencies while in prison, is wanting.

Majority of studies have been carried out in western context are all at odds when it comes to the viability of prisoner’s early release. Proponents of the ideal are sharply divided on whether to release inmate’s in order to decongest prisons, encourage reformation and cut custodial imprisonment cost or to confine prisoners until they complete their jail term in the interest of
public safety and promotion of deterrence as a crime prevention strategy. While majority of studies advocate for early release, others are advocating on longer sentence in lieu of public safety and crime prevention.

Prison reforms ushered in open door policy through which prison officers rehabilitate prisoners humanely. The reviewed literature indicates positive impact of the policy to inmates behaviour modification, their family and prison officers. However, from the reviewed studies it is outright clear that open door policy transform, empower inmates and inspire public confidence paramountly though not anchored in Prison Act (1977) where KPS draws its mandate from. Majority of studies though in western context indicate positivism of open door policy while a few indicate otherwise.

The importation theory informed this study by offering the understanding that violent misconduct among inmates was not as a result of the prison characteristics but rather as a result of the behaviours abd characteristics the inmate import into the prison from their pre-prison socialization. Therefore, interventions and management mechanisms need to focus on reforming the individual rather the prison or prison system if they are to deal with violent misconduct among inmates, effectively.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter outlines procedures that were used to gather data during the study. It comprises of: the research design, site, study population, sample techniques and sample size, research instruments, pilot study, data collection techniques, data analysis and management as well as ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design
A mixed methods research method was used in this study. This included a qualitative research where data was collected through interviews and a quantitative method where data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. By using both methods the quality of data collected would be better and more comprehensive compared to solely using one of the two research methods.

A descriptive survey research design was used in this study. The design aided in collecting sufficient data that can answer research questions during the study. The design helped the researcher to describe and accurately depict the phenomenon under study hence generalizable to a wider population (Orodho, 2008).

3.2 Study Variables
The study had two key variables that are; independent variables and dependent variable. In the study; internal corrective mechanisms which included internal disciplinary procedures, early release mechanism and open door policy were the independent variables while violent misconduct among inmates formed the dependent variable.

3.3 Site of the Study
The study sites were within Nairobi County, Kenya (Appendix V). The County is home to Kamiti and Langata Maximum Security. The two prisons were purposively targeted since they are the largest male and female maximum-security prisons in Kenya and East Africa as well. It was thus expected that prisoner violent misconduct phenomenon would vary considerably because of varying differences such as social, economic and cultural demographics as well as varying criminogenic factors among inmates. Top notch experience of prison officers in managing the phenomenon under study was a worthy consideration.
3.4 Target Population

The study populations targeted were convicted inmates and prison officers spread across ranks stationed at Langata and Kamiti maximum security prisons within Nairobi County. The targeted population is ideal due to heterogeneity of the study population and the range of variations on the most important characteristics of the phenomenon under study. Considerable high phenomenon of violent misconduct among prisoners was reported in Kenyan maximum security prisons and mainly at Nairobi County Prisons.

Table 3.1 Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratus</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
<th>Prison Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langata Maximum Security Prison</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiti Maximum Security Prison</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2720</strong></td>
<td><strong>981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

According to the published prison records (15th December 2018) Langata and Kamiti Maximum Security Prison had a total population of 615 and 2105 inmates respectively totaling 2720. Prison officer’s total population is 396 and 585 totaling to 981 respectively spread across various ranks. The researcher purposively targeted only inmates who had been convicted justly for violence related offences and who had further committed violent misconduct while in prison and surcharged. Prison officers who were targeted are the ones who process, adjudicate or supervise inmate’s disciplinary processes hence acculturated into the prison violent misconduct. The researcher had cases that possess the required characteristics and also cases that have requisite and rich information concerning the study.

Table 3.2 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratus</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison officers</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3701</strong></td>
<td><strong>1110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)
The researcher targeted 30% of the prison officers and 70% inmates of the total population during the study. According to Kumar (2011), for a sample to qualify for a descriptive survey, it should be constitute at least 10% of the total population under study.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.5.1 Sampling Technique
The researcher used both probability and non probability sampling techniques. In order for the researcher to generalize findings adequately, the study employed stratified and simple random sampling to generate a sample size that was representative of the two study sites. The study hence achieved desire representation of the sub groups and also overcame biases hence reliable.

3.5.2 Sample Size Determination
The purpose of sample size is to make inferences about characteristics found in the entire target group. For the study a sample size of 10% was drawn from each strata of the researchers target population and was considered adequate for the study.

Table 3.3 Sample Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/no</th>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prison officers</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

The study sampled 20% of the target population. Simple random sampling was used to select 111 cases for analysis from the two strata which represents 10% for prison officers and 10% for inmates.

Table 3.4 Distribution of the Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Prison officers</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langata Maximum Security Prison</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiti Maximum Security Prison</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)
The researcher divided the sample size by two in order to equally represent the two study sites. The inmates who were chosen to participate in the study were requested to assemble in a hall while prison officers were requested to indicate their duty post so that the researcher could visit them and administer the research instruments.

For the qualitative part of the study, a sample of ten prison officers and ten inmates was randomly selected from the sample of the quantitative study. The selected participants in the quantitative study were asked if they would want to progress to the second phase of the study which was one-on-one interviews. Fifteen prison officers agreed to participate in the interview and ten of them were randomly selected to be interviewed. For the inmates, out of the 82 who had been selected for the first phase of the study, 42 agreed to participate in the interview phase. Out of the 42, ten inmates were randomly selected to participate in the interview.

3.6 Research Instruments

3.6.1 Questionnaire
These instruments include questionnaires and personal interviews guides. Questionnaires were used to obtain quantitative data for analysis which was further collaborated with analysis results from interviews. Data was collected through the administering of questionnaires (Appendix I) by the researcher to the respondents. The researcher was able to collect information requisite and credible information necessary for the study. The questionnaires enabled the researcher to gather data over a large sample while respondents were given adequate time to respond to the questions. Both unstructured (open) and structured (closed ended) questions were included in the questionnaire. Open ended questions gave respondents freedom and a platform to provide in-depth responses while closed ended questions enabled the respondents to tick their preferred choices from the ones provided by the researcher that best describes their situation or phenomenon under study.

3.6.2 Interview
For the interviews, data was collected through note taking and audio recording. Without the limitations that come with the rigidity of qualitative studies, the respondents were able to share their opinions, ideas and thoughts regarding to the questions under study in depth. However, the interview was times with each interview taking 20-30 minutes.
3.7 Pilot Study
A pilot study was done at Naivasha maximum security prison before the actual data collection. The research instrument were pre tested (piloted) with a small representative sample that were not considered during the actual study. Pre testing assured reliability and validity of research instruments. This enabled the researcher to ascertain whether the research instruments measure the phenomenon under study adequately or there was need to be revised.

3.8 Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

3.8.1 Validity of the research Instruments
Content validity adopted in this study was enhanced through pre testing during the piloting of the study. Responses obtained guided improvements. The pre-test was necessary to find out if the research tools accurately collect the required data. Any deviations enabled the researcher to modify the research instruments amicably. Piloting guaranteed that the study instruments are well stated and easy to understand, for the respondents. Deviations improvement and modification were made based on the appraisal and validation of experts in the field of study.

3.8.2 Reliability of the research Instruments
In order to determine if research instruments accurately measures what they are supposed to measure, a pre-testing was done on the research instruments in a sample of respondents who were not included in the actual study. Reliability in the study was determined through the test retest method where research instruments were administered twice after two weeks during the pilot study at Naivasha maximum security prison after which a reliability correlation was established. This aided in minimizing inconsistencies in measurement due to errors, such as inaccuracy of the research instrument, scoring or unexplained.
Further, in order to minimize chance errors and increase reliability, the researcher also used the split-half technique of assessing reliability. Thereafter scores of each was computed and correlated separately. A correlation coefficient was worked out. Data with the high split half reliability had a high correlation coefficient. A coefficient of 0.8 will be considered high enough to judge research instruments to be reliable. Spearman –Brown prophecy formula was used to obtain reliability of the research instruments.
3.9 Data Collection Techniques
The researcher visited and created rapport with Nairobi County Prison Commander, Officer in charge of Kamiti and Langata Prisons, inmates and prison officers convicted and stationed respectively in those prisons. This was in a view of briefing them on the purpose of the study. The procedure assured popular participation of the respondents during the study. The data collection process took one week due to dynamism of the study site. The research instruments were personally administered by the researcher himself. The issued questionnaires were collected at the closure of the day in order to spur up the return rate. The interviews were carried out by the researcher with the help of two other research assistants. Each interview took 20-30 minutes and data was collected by note taking and audio recording which was later transcribed for analysis.

3.10 Data Analysis
Data analysis is the breakdown of information into consistent parts in order to obtain answers to research questions (Kothari, 2004). The collected data was coded and analyzed after checking its completeness, clarity and accuracy. Quantitative data was analyzed scientifically by use of SPSS version 25 software and thereafter descriptive statistics was used to present summarized raw data in the form of frequencies, bar charts, graphs and percentages to present the results. Qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis by grouping similar data content in line with the research themes. Data was thereafter summarized, findings discussed, conclusion drawn, recommendation for further studies suggested.

3.11 Data Management and Ethical Considerations
The researcher sought authorization from the National Commission for science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), Kenyatta University’s Department of security and correction science at the School of diplomacy, peace and security studies and KPS headquarters in order to be granted permission to access the study sites. The researcher prior to the administration of research instruments explained to the respondents the benefits they may expect from the study. This aimed to motivate them to answer questions truthfully as well as overcome deception. Respondents were assured protection of their rights and general wellbeing. This spurred popular participation in the study and guarantee that respondents answered questions truthfully.
Before participating in the study, the participants were asked to give their consent by signing a consent form which indicated that they were participating in the study out of free will and voluntarily. Only those who gave their consent were allowed to participate in both the qualitative and quantitative parts of the study. Data collection instruments were designed in a manner that respondents in the study do not suffer psychological harm or discomfort, embarrassment or loss of privacy. To assure this, the researcher sought informed consent in order for the respondents to voluntarily participate in the study. Confidentiality of responses was assured by requesting respondents not to write their name in the questionnaire hence minimize response biases. Further, respondents were debriefed after participation in the study. In order to overcome respondents unethical behavior the researcher avoided being complacent and instead remain focused and objective. All the respondents were treated with utmost respect during the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction
This chapter is a presentation of findings for the study together with discussions arising from the data collected through administration of questionnaires and interviews. The researcher gathered adequate data thus answering the research questions and meeting the research objectives which were: to establish the prevalence of violent misconduct, and determine the impact of internal disciplinary procedures, early release and open door policy on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons. Statistical Package for Social Sciences and Microsoft Excel applications were used in the quantitative data analysis and content analysis in the analysis of quantitative data. Data presentation was done using tables and the results were interpreted.

4.1 Results and Discussion

4.1.1 Response Rate
The study involved data collection from prison officers and inmates drawn from Kamiti maximum prison and Langata women’s prison. A total of 111 questionnaires were administered to 29 prison officers of different cadres and 82 inmates. A high response rate of 100% was realized since all the 111 questionnaires that were distributed were received back and analyzed. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) and Saunders, et al., (2007) a response rate of 50 percent is adequate, 60 percent is good, above 70 percent is very good. Therefore, the response rate of 100 percent is excellent and hence acceptable for drawing conclusions on the current study on role of internal correction procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates. The results are shown in Table 4.1
Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Target Respondents</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
<th>Respondents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langata</td>
<td>Kamiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison officers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

Table 4.1 shows there was a total of 111 respondents. Of the 29 questionnaires given to prison officers, 100% responded while of the 82 questionnaires given to the inmates there was also 100% response. Therefore, the data collected was consistent with the population and hence generalizable.

4.1.2 Demographic Data

Information on the various social demographic attributes of the respondents was collected in this section. It included; gender, age, level of education, years in prison and marital status.

The target population in the study comprised of inmates and prison officers (both male and female). The inmate respondents were from Kamiti (male) and Langata (female) Maximum Security Prisons However, there were variations in the prison officer’s gender distribution at both study sites. Given that the gender of inmates did not dictate the gender of prison officer working in a give prison.

Figures 4.1 below shows the distribution of gender at Kamiti Maximum Security Prison

![Gender Distribution at Kamiti Maximum Security Prison](image)

Figure 4. 1: Gender Distribution of Prison Officers at Kamiti Maximum Security Prison

Source: Survey data (2019)
From the data illustrated in Figure 1, Majority 86.7 % (13) of the prison officers were males, while 13.3% (2) were females. The small number of female’s prison officers is attributed to the fact that Kamiti Maximum Prison confines male inmates and the role of the officers in the prison is technical and support as opposed to operations. The finding is supported by Ngugi, et al., (2014) who concluded that Kenya Prisons System confines convicted male and female offenders in different prisons.

The distribution of gender for prison officers at Langata Maximum Security Prison in this study is shown in Figure 2.

![Gender Distribution of Prison Officers at Langata Maximum Security Prison](image)

**Figure 4.2: Gender Distribution of Prison officers at Langata Maximum Security Prison.**

**Source:** Survey data (2019).

The study findings showed that, majority of the prison officers were female at 71.4 % (10) while male prison officers were 28.6% (4). The significant high number of male officers was attributed to the fact that male prison officers also support their female colleagues in running day to day operations in the female prison.

It was important for the study to find out Inmates respondents age distribution. This would give an indicator to the average age of convicted Inmates.
Table 4.2: Age group distribution for the inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data (2019)*

Table 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents from the inmates were between the ages from 36-45 years (39%), followed closely by respondents who were between 26-35 years (32.9). The average age of convicted inmate's respondents was 41 years. The findings indicated that majority of the convicted inmates are middle age. However, the trial process in the Kenyan criminal justice system takes time as a majority is charged with felonies.

The study sought to establish the role of internal correction mechanisms in management of violent misconduct among inmates. A sample size was drawn from the target population that had respondents with varying age groups. A total of 29 respondents participated in the study as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Age group distribution for the Prison Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data (2019)*
The study revealed that there was only one respondents between 18 and 25 years representing 3.4%. There were 4 (13.8%) between 26 and 35 years. 17.7% (5) represented age between 36 and 45 years while majority of the respondents were between 46 and 55 years. There were also 7 (24.1%) who were above 55 years. The study indicated that prison officers between age 46 and 55 years were preferred which is likely so because of their experience in processing, adjudicating and supervising inmate’s disciplinary processes hence acculturated into the prison violent misconduct.

The study sought to determine the level of education of Inmates and establish whether it has a bearing on violent misconduct and overall criminality. The table 4.4 below shows the education level of inmate’s respondents.

**Table 4.4 : Education Level of Inmates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.P.E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data (2019)*

The study established that 76.9% of the respondents had attained post primary education. The high level of post primary education could be linked to the inmate being of adult age meaning that there is a high chance that they had attained post primary education before they committed the felony. The findings supported by a report of Amnesty International (2016) that concluded that violent misconduct are more prevalent at maximum security prisons where long-term and death row inmates are confined.

Table 4.5 below shows the level of education for prison officers respondents.
Table 4.5: Education Level of Prison Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.P.E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data (2019)*

The study established that majority of the respondents had attained Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. This is probably because for one to be employed as a prison officer, having a KCSE certificate is the bare minimum qualification. (KPS, 2011)

The respondents who participated in the study came from different marital backgrounds; Figure 4.3 below shows the Marital Status of Inmates.

![Marital Status of Inmates](image)

*Figure 4.3: Marital Status of Inmates*

*Source: Survey data (2019)*

The study established that 25 (30.5%) of the respondents were single while 20 (24.4%) were married. A total of 37 respondents (45.1%) were either separated or divorced. The finding agrees with a study by Mumola (2000) that upon incarceration of a family member the family suffers psychological, economic and emotional instability, which is a precursor to separation or divorce.
Figure 4.4 below shows the distribution of respondent prison officer’s marital status.

![Marital Status of Prison Officers](image)

**Figure 4.4: Marital Status of Prison Officers**

**Source:** Survey data (2019).

Majority of the respondents at 75.7% (22) were married. Only 24.3% (7) were either separated or divorced. Most of the respondent had served in prisons for over fifteen years it is therefore safe to assume that based on their age group; a majority of them would be married and have families.

### 4.1.3 Prevalence of Violent Misconduct among Inmates.

The study aimed at establishing the rate at which inmates commit violent misconduct while in prison. The prevalence of violent misconduct were indicated by the rate at which inmates were charged for committing various prison offences and that is what was sought in the study. Respondents were requested to indicate whether they has been charged or not and for committing which prison offence. Tables 4.6 below shows inmates and officers tabulated response.

**Table 4.6: Inmates Charged for Violent Misconduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Prison Officer</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)
The study established that 76.8% of prison officer indicated having charged inmates for violent misconduct. A total of 69.7% of inmates indicated having been charged for committing violent misconduct while in prison. The finding supports studies done by Muscat (2008) and Chelemu (2009) that inmates' violent misconduct rate is ever increasing at global and African prisons respectively. Further, Omboto (2013) did a study titled ‘the paradox of prison reforms in Kamiti and Langata prisons in Kenya’ where he established that KPS continuously faces myriad of challenges among them inmate’s violent misconduct while rehabilitating inmates.

The finding perhaps can be explained by increase in crime rate globally hence transcending to have a direct impact on prisoners populations. This concurs with Amnesty International (2000) when they stated that globally prisoner’s population continues to swell outnumbering the prison officer’s ratio due to upsurge of criminality. This finding was collaborated by UNODC (2012). Further, Armstrong (2005) in a study across three Califonia Prisons found out that re-offending rate of convicted inmates was quite high at 63-65 percent.

The study also sought to establish the most notable prison offence inmates commit against prison rules. The findings are illustrated in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7: Notable Forms of Inmates Violent Misconduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notable Forms of Inmates Violent Misconducts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Self Inflicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Inmates VS Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Inmates VS Prison Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Inmates VS Prison Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Prison Officers VS Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Prison Officers VS Prison Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)
As shown in table 4.7 the respondents were asked on the most notable form of violent misconduct. Majority inmates and prison officers (38%) and inmates at (45%) indicated inmates to inmates. This study’s finding is in agreement with the findings of a report by Howard league for penal reforms that concluded that globally inmate’s violence is against each other. Prison officer’s violence triggered in the course of bringing order in prisons. Further, UNODC (2012) report found out that overcrowding, limited resources, discrepancy between prison officers and inmates population offer inmates opportunities for settling scores through violence.

From the interviews, the prison officers indicated that violent misconduct among inmates was a challenge they deal with often and they were constantly looking for ways to address it as an issue. Seven officers indicated in one way or another that dealing with violent misconduct among inmates was a common occurrence in the prison while the other three were involved more in the administrative duties and therefore did not directly deal with the inmates. However, even with this being the case, they attested to violent misconduct among inmates being a problem prison officers often dealt with.

The inmates who were interviewed, on the other hand were asked what would trigger them to indiscipline. Most of them indicated that to survive in the prison system, you had to be tough or you would remain a slave to the other inmates identified as leaders within the prison. To acquire respect, you had to be tough and the only way to do so was through violence.

One of them stated that,

“Prison is tough in every sense of that word. The good ones especially have a hard time. Even if you are the kindest and noblest, you will have to toughen up to survive here.”

Another respondent indicated that,

“There are so many things that happen when you are imprisoned, there are so many changes in a short span of time and with them come a lot of anxiety, frustration and stress. You will therefore be a ticking time bomb and any trigger will result in you exploding violently in terms of the way you behave and react.”

This was the second objective in the study. During the study, the respondents were asked whether they had been reprimanded to face charges for indiscipline, and for committing offence against prison rules and regulations while they were serving their sentence in prison. This was aimed at finding out the prevalence of reprimanding as a type of internal disciplinary procedure commonly administered to deal with violent misconduct cases, and also find out if they were sufficient and fair. Moreover, the study sought to ascertain inmate’s level of compliance to prison rules.

The study sought to establish the common types of prison offences committed by inmates as shown in Table 4.8 below

Table 4.8: Common Prison Offences Committed by Inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Prison Offence committed by Inmates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurbodination</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobeying Orders</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Misconducts</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping</td>
<td>48.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smuggling Contrabands</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

From data illustrated above 48.3% of the respondents prison officers rated violent misconduct as the most notable prison offense committed by inmates, 16.9% of the prison officers rated disobeying lawful orders, 14.6 smuggling contraband 13.5% insubordination and 6.7% escaping. From the inmates majority rated violent misconduct and disobeying lawful disorders at 39.6%, 23.7% said smuggling 19% contraband and insubordination at 17.7%. The finding of
this study supports the study findings of a study by Muntingh (2009) which concluded that violent misconduct coupled with prison subculture resulted to inmate’s frustrations and deaths.

The study sought to find out the most common type of internal disciplinary procedure in prison for inmates as shown in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9: Common Types of Internal Disciplinary Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Types of Internal Disciplinary Procedures</th>
<th>Prison Officers</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological counseling</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confinement in a separate cell</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to another prison</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of remission</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)

The findings showed that majority of prison officers (40%), preferred transferring undisciplined prisoners to another prison while majority of inmates (32%) indicated that they were placed in a separate cell. The study also revealed that psychological counseling and alternative dispute resolution was unpopular among prison officers at 6% and 4% respectively. Bruhn, et al., (2010) did a study in Swedish prisons titled ‘professional representations among Swedish prison officers’ and found out that modern rehabilitation philosophy should be anchored on humane principles and that inmates non conformity behavior must be addressed using an inmate centered approach such as mentorship, psychological counseling, coaching and motivation. In order for prisoners to reform, they ought to perceive the disciplinary procedures as being fair and just.
Table 4.10: Inmates compliance to prison rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Prison Officers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

From these findings, it was clear that the inmate’s compliance to prison rules was poor. These findings support the work of Armstrong (2005) whose study on prison discipline across three California in USA prisons concluded that inmates failed to comply with prison rules because they perceived punishment for disciplinary violations as unfair and dependent on prison officer’s discretion. This finding also supported the findings in the KNCHR (2005) report in Kenya, which indicated that inmates failed to comply with prison laws, policies and procedures because of perceiving internal disciplinary process as unfair and unjust.

Table 4.11: Human rights being fostered in inmates’ discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Prison officers</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)
From the analysis a high of 27.6% of prison officers agreed that human rights promotion was fostered when carrying out discipline to inmates. This finding is contrary with the opinion of inmates who strongly disagreed (29.3%) that promotion of human rights are fostered during inmate disciplining. In terms of what needs to be done to manage prisoner’s indiscipline, majority of respondents said there was need for continuos inmates counseling and promotion of alternative dispute resolution. KPS (2007) ‘Handbook on human rights in Kenya Prisons’ highlighted human rights as fundamental in modern correction of inmates and state can only promote them.

The findings from the interview indicated that for a majority of prison officers reprimanding and punishment such as solitary confinement where the go-to mechanism when it came to dealing with violent misconduct.

One of them stated that,

“When an inmate joins the institution, they are informed about the rules and regulations of the prison and the consequences that come with not observing them. They know that violent misconduct will result in them being placed under solitary confinement … this and other forms of punishment are the strategies we use to manage such misconduct.”

Another one stated that

“We are constantly trying to create order in the prison… for me I believe that an idle mind is the devil’s workshop so I strive to keep the inmate engaged in productive activities most of the time. Unfortunately, there is still one or two who will still find time to fight.”

On the question of how the recidivating to violent misconduct can be effectively managing, most of the prison officers indicated that there was need to change from the punishment and reprimanding approach and take an approach that reinforced good behaviour and helped deal with issues leading to violent misconduct at an individual level.

One of them said,
“It is actually funny how inmates will fight over the most trivial matters. What it clear is that in most cases, there are underlying issues that need to be addressed, to get to the bottom of violent behaviour among inmates.”

A second prison officer added that,

“For a long time, every time we have had a rise in violent misconduct cases among inmates, we have made changes to the prison system by creating harsher rules and more severe punishment for violent misconduct. The violent misconduct cases die down for a while and then we are back to where we started. ... Come to think of it, we might have been doing it wrong the whole time.”

For the inmates, when asked what their thoughts about the current disciplinary procedures were, most of them indicated that the current procedures were in no way helping to deal with indiscipline and neither did they motivate them to be disciplined. In fact one of them stated that,

“I actually think the discipline procedures only lead to a person being more violent and aggressive. For example, if I am punished because of a fight with another inmate, chances are instead of reforming, I will be out for vengeance.”

On how impactful being confined in a separate cell was to deterring inmates from offending, the respondents indicated that at first it works but ones one gets used to it, it no longer makes a difference whether you are in a separate cell or not. For one of the respondents, he indicated that there was a time he conduct and offence just to be put in a separate cell.


This was the third objective of the study. It sought to find out whether the concept of early release in prison significantly contributes to management of violent misconduct among inmates. Respondents were asked questions to establish whether early release motivates prisoners to reform, decongest prisons, forms of early release and causes of prison violence. Whether prison rehabilitation programmes are sufficient and whether inmates are prepared for social reintegration were question poised during the study. Early release is a tool that prison officers use to encourage inmates to modify behaviour as well as motivate them, as illustrated in Table 4.12 below.
Table 4.12: Common forms of early release.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Forms of Early Release</th>
<th>Normal discharge</th>
<th>Presidential Power of Mercy</th>
<th>Earning remission of sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Officers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

A majority of the respondents indicated normal discharge at 72% for inmates and 67% for prison officers. Response of 4% and 2% for inmates and prison officers respectively on Presidential power of mercy was probably because it is still a new concept in Kenya Prisons that was created by article 133 of the COK 2010.

On prison early release mechanisms and its impact on management of prisons violent misconduct among inmates, 55.5% of the prison officers strongly agreed that early release motivates prisoners to reforms, 36% of the prison officers agreed. Based on the findings 29.6% of the inmates strongly agreed early release motivates prisoners to reform while 33.4% agreed. The study therefore concludes that early release motivates prisoners to reform. The findings of this research supports the study findings of a study by Singh (2016) which concluded that early release provides stronger incentives for behaviour modification hence inmates reform.

The study sought to establish whether anticipation for Early Release Reduces Re-offending among inmates hence benefiting from early release. The study found out that 48.1% of the prison officers respondents were in strong agreement that anticipation for early release reduces re-offending compared to 43.8% of the inmates who also rated the same. A total of 29.6% of the prison officers rated agreed, 18.5% of the prison officers disagreed. Around 24.7% of the inmates agreed 18% disagreed, 10.1% disagreed while 3.4% were undecided. Majority of the
respondents strongly agreed that early release of inmates reduces relapsing into offending while serving sentence in prison. The findings of this study concur with O’Hear (2015) who did a study titled “Early release for good behavior” in American States where he interviewed prison officers and inmates. He found out that early release as a prison reform agenda was continuously being adopted and cherished. It availed well designed inmates early release guidelines that helped to empower inmates thereby helping to improve discipline and reducing re-offending while in prison. Studies by Zapryanova (2014) and Owino (2015) concluded and supported the same.

From the interview findings on the question of the considerations for early release of inmates, a majority of the prison officers indicated the following. Good behaviour, the type of offence committed and evidence of reformation were the main considerations for early release. Violent misconduct and indiscipline were some of the main reasons why a person would not be qualified for early release. After the introduction of the Power of Mercy in prisons, the respondents indicated that there was a significant decline in the rate of violent misconduct among inmates.

A respondent stated that,

“The Power of Mercy in prisons is a great initiate and has been of great help when it comes to encouraging and motivating positive behaviour among inmates.”

The study also sought to establish the cause of prison violence thereby limiting inmates opportunities for early release. The findings are illustrated in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Causes of Prison Violence thereby Limiting Early Release.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of Prison Violence thereby Limiting Inmates Early Release</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overer</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insuffic</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compe</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)
As shown in Table 4.13 prison officers indicated competition over limited resources at 41% as and culture of disrespect at 39% as the two main cause of prison violence while inmates respondents indicted overcrowding at 29% and competition over limited resources as the main catalysts of prison violence thereby limiting their early release. Competition over limited resource attracted popular response from the respondents averagely at 33.5 %. This is supported by UNODC (2016) report on strategy to address the global prison crisis which pointed that overcrowding, disregard of human rights, weak disciplinary systems, competition over limited resources and insufficient staff training as the triggers of violence in prisons.

As to whether prisons rehabilitation programmes are sufficient to modify inmates behavior 85.2 % of the prison officers say yes since prisoners engage in a number of activities while in the prison. 14.8% of the prison officers did not agree and they sighted that the training the prisoners were receiving was not comprehensive enough. On the inmates 84.3% said yes while 15.7% said no.

The study also sought to establish whether Inmates are prepared to social reintegrate back to the society upon release. The findings are shown in 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Preparedness of Inmates to Social Reintegration back to the Society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Prison Officer Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Inmates Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2019)

As to whether inmates are prepared for social reintegration into the society upon release, 58.6 % of prison officers responded ‘yes’ while 52.4% of inmates responded ‘Yes’. Averagely majority of the respondents at 55.5 inmates as having been prepared to get back to the society and live a meaningful life.

To prepare inmates for social reintegration after release, the prison officers interviewed, indicated that they strived to equip the inmates with skills and support systems to enable them reintegrate into the society without difficulties. Initiatives such as engaging the community an
inmate comes from when they are release to reassure them that the inmate is now reformed have been adopted by most prison officers. The inmates on the other hand, stated that the prison system was doing a good job but engaging the community more would help make the transition easier once they were release. Programmes that involved inmates interacting with the community to show evidence of reformation could also help the community to be more open and welcoming to inmates who would be released.

One of the inmates said that,

“Being in prison marks you for life. But if the community is engaged more and they are able to understand that being in prison can help a person reform for the better can help with acceptance once you leave prison.”

This finding is supported by Halsey (2007), who concluded that reformed inmates integrate into the society effectively after release.

4.1.6 Open Door Policy Impacts on Management of Violent Misconduct among Inmates.

This was the fourth objective of the study. In order to find out the impacts open door policy had on management of inmates violent misconduct respondent were asked to indicate who are the notable prison stakeholders and their input. Whether prison visitation is crucial, does open door policy foster inmates social reintegration, minimize stigmatization and labelling as well as encourage inmates reformation.

Open door policy is a new concept in modern correction philosophy in Kenya Prisons. It is pegged on the fact that opening up prisons to other stakeholders will aid in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates. From the findings of the study, majority of the respondent’s prison officers at 42.7% and 47.9% inmates, indicated family as the most notable prison stakeholder in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates. This therefore means that family was the most notable stakeholder, for civil society, 13% were inmates and 20.3%. Rating on media was at 7.8% inmates and 6.1% prison officers, minority of the respondents were of the opinion that Non-governmental organization was the most notable stakeholder at 3.4% among the inmates and 2.5% among the prison officers. Periodic family visitation to an inmate reduced the pains of imprisonment (Martin, 2001). This studies finding concurred with findings of a study by Ndimu (2010) who did a study in Naivasha Maximum Security Prison titled ‘impact of prison reforms
on rehabilitation of offenders. He found out that opening prison empowers inmates to modify behavior and become law abiding.

Table 4.15 illustrates the Input of Prison Stakeholders in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates.

**Table 4.15: Most Notable Input of Prison Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notable Inputs of Prison Stakeholders</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Officers</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)

The respondents rated psychosocial support as the most notable input of stakeholders in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates with majority of inmates at 48.3% while prison officers rated 46.2%. Opinion that technical support was the most notable support was 40.4% among the inmates and 40.7% among the prison officers, minority of the respondents at 11.3% and 13.1% among inmates and prison officers respectively rated financial resources. As to whether remote parenting was crucial in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates both inmates and prison officers at 93.3% and 87.8% rated yes, therefore meaning it was crucial. The findings of the study concurred with a study by Tasca, et al., (2016), on ‘moving visitation’ that concluded that prison visitation encourage inmates reprieve pressure of prison life through psychosocial support from significant others. Moreover, Esposito (2014) agreed with the findings.

The study also sought to establish whether open door policy foster social reintegration of inmates back to society as illustrated in Table 4.16
Table 4.16: Open door Policy Foster Social Reintegration of Inmates Back to Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Inmates (%)</th>
<th>Prison Officer (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)

From the findings in table 4.4 a majority of the respondents strongly agreed that open door policy foster social reintegration. There was similar trend among the inmates and the prison officers with majority of the prison officers at 78.6% and inmates at 65.2% rating strongly agree, minority of the respondents rated strongly disagree with inmates rating 3.4% and prison officers 2.1% dissatisfaction. The findings of this study supports a study by Singh (2016) found that open door policy in prison had tremendously enhanced policing by reducing crime rate and re-offending while in prison, prison rehabilitation programmes became vibrant, lessened caseloads and minimized risks to prison officers that are associated with criminality.

The study sought to establish whether open door policy minimizes inmates stigmatization and labelling of inmates. The findings are illustrated in Table 4.17 below.

Table 4.17: Open door Policy Minimize Inmate’s Stigmatization and Labeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Inmates (%)</th>
<th>Prison Officers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data (2019)
From the findings in table 4.5 the respondents who rated strongly agree took a similar trend among the inmates and prison officers with both rating 52.8% and 68.6% strongly agree respectively, based on this still a minority of 5.8% and 2.1% inmates and prison officers respectively rated strongly disagree. The findings of this study concurred with the conclusion of a report by Raoul Wallenberg Institute and KPS (2017) ‘Human rights are good corrections’. The report resonated that the paradigm shift from a securely confining function of the prison to an accessible, all-inclusive and participative imprisonment facilitated inmates behavior change as it boosted family ties, restorative justice and inmate’s wellbeing. Also, Esposito (2014) studied Italian inmates and found out that prisons are enablers of inmates wellbeing that culminates to behaviour transformation, reduced re-offending and diminishing societal labelling.

On whether open door policy is key in inmates’ rehabilitation and reformation the findings were illustrated in Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
<th>Prison officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data (2019)*

On whether open door policy is key in inmate’s rehabilitation, the response took a similar trend with a majority of inmates 61.2% rating strongly agree and 81.6% rating of the prison officers rating strongly agree. Respondents overwhelmingly said that open door policy does not cause social psycho insecurity among inmates in family with respondents rating 79.3% among inmates and 67.3% among the prison officers. This study supports findings of studies on open door policy in Kenya that shows the policy as a prison reform agenda seeking to empower inmates to modify their behavior and become law abiding (Ngugi, et al., 2014; KPS, 2007).
A majority of the interviewed prison officers stated that open door policy showed a positive impact on the rehabilitation of inmates and the prison officers indicated that with this policy, the inmates where more motivated to conduct themselves properly and in line with the requirements of the prison.

The inmates on the other hand, indicated that the open door policy had positively impacted them and enhance their level of compliance to the rules and regulations of the prison. It was one of the reasons most of them chose to remain disciplined. They also stated that in addition to rehabilitation programs, self development, conflict resolution and counseling programs would go a long way in helping them modify their behaviour positively. Dismantling gangs and leaderships among inmates would also assure them of their safety are reduce the need of being tough and violent to be safe and respects within inmates circles.

During the interviews, the prison officers and inmates were asked to share the challenges faced when it came to managing violent misconduct among inmates. The prison officers identified inadequate resources in terms of finance and expertise to develop and implement mechanisms geared towards dealing with violent misconduct; and understaffing with the number of prisoners overwhelming the few prison officers as the man challenges. For the inmates, the main challenges were the approach that the prison officers used – most of the time a judgmental approach was used with reprimanding and punishment being the result; injustice and unfairness in procedures such as the early release procedure; internal systems creating an environment of violence (inmate gangs); lack of adequate involvement in developing management mechanisms and a focus on the prison or group rather than the individual.

4.2 Summary
The study established that; the response rate to the research instruments was high at 100% as the researcher administered them personally and also explained to the respondents the intention of the study. The gender distribution of the sample size spread across both male and female inmates and prison officers. Majority of the convicted inmates were of average age of 41 years while prison officers were of age 51 years. This can be explained by the fact that violent misconduct among inmates is managed by more experienced prison officers. On the level of education all prison officers had attained Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. For the inmates a significant number at 23% possessed Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. Probably the
finding can be explained by the fact that one of the rehabilitation programmes in KPS today is Formal and Informal training to address the gap (Hackett, et al., 2017).

The prevalence of inmates to inmate’s violent misconduct was averagely high. Due to over reliance on cellular confinement, low adoption of psychological counseling when inmates offend the result was poor compliance to prison rules by inmates despite human rights being championed in prisons. Numerous studies supported the findings (KNCHR, 2005; Armstrong, 2005; Bruhn, 2010). The finding that the common form of early release was normal discharge at averagely 70% response can be explained by the fact that high violent misconduct has made inmates to loss remission and that presidential power of mercy is a new concept in prisons that is not clear to the inmates and prison officer alike. However, early release proved to be a worthy discourse as it motivates inmates to reform. On whether open policy impacts on management of violent misconduct among inmates a positive relationship was established. The present finding may be explained by the fact that stakeholders have a chance to help in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates. Ngugi, et al., (2014); Singh, (2016) and Tascha, (2016) are some of the proponents who concurred with the present study finding in their studies. Lastly, the present study revealed that internal correction procedures had a significant role in management of violent misconduct among inmates.

The findings of the quantitative data were supported by the findings from the interview. They indicate that there was a prevalence in violent misconduct among inmates in the prisons under study, some of the violent behaviours where imported while others were as a results of the prison system; internal correction mechanisms such as the early release, the power of mercy and the open door policy had the potential of helping with the effective management of violent misconduct among inmates if administered in a fair and just way; and that there were challenges such as inadequate resources, understaffing, lack of experts in areas such as counseling and conflict management, injustice and unfairness in executing some of the mechanism and overdependence on the approach of reprimanding and punishment.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents summary, conclusion and contributions of the study to knowledge, recommendations and areas for further research.

5.1 Summary
The study sought to establish the role of internal correction procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates. It specific objectives of the study were; to establish the prevalence of inmates violence misconduct, to assess how internal disciplinary procedures impacts on management of inmates violent misconduct, to evaluate how early release mechanisms impact on management of inmates violent misconduct and to assess how open door policy impacts on management of inmates violent misconduct. The study was undertaken in Nairobi County Prisons, Kenya. Data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings were presented through descriptive methods such as tables and charts.

In establishing the prevalence of inmate’s violent misconduct among inmates, the study concluded that the phenomenon was high. Evidently, violence amongst inmates themselves cannot be underscored. 76.8% of Prison officer’s respondents acknowledged having charged convicted inmates for violent misconduct while 69.7% of inmates agreed to having committed violent misconduct while serving custodial sentence.

The second objective sought to assess the nature of internal disciplinary procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County. The study findings showed that 76.8% of respondent prison officers acknowledged having experienced prisoner’s indiscipline only a pantry 23.2% had not experienced prisoner’s indiscipline. 48.3% of the respondent’s prison officers rated violent misconduct as the most notable prison offense committed by inmates 16.9% of the prison officers rated disobeying lawful orders, 14.6 smuggling contraband 13.5% insubordination and 6.7% escaping. From the inmates majority rated violent misconduct and disobeying lawful disorders at 39.6%, disobeying of lawful orders at 23.7%, 23% said smuggling contraband. 40% of inmate’s respondents said transfer to another
prison was the most common type of internal disciplinary procedure. Prison officers at 32% said confinement in separate cell was the most common form of internal disciplinary mechanism. Asked if the prison officers have control over inmates, majority at 77.8% said yes while 22.2% said no.

The third objective sought to evaluate how early release mechanisms impact on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons. From the analysis majority at 55.5% of the prison officer strongly believed that early release decongest the prisons, 36% rated Among the inmates majority at 29.6% strongly agreed that they are motivated by anticipation of early release to serve their sentence while 33.4% agreed on the same. Competition over limited resources and culture of disrespect were found to be the lead causes of prison violence among prison officers and inmates respectively. The study also found out that inmates are prepared for social reintegration upon release.

The fourth objective sought to assess how open door policy impacts on management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons. The study found that majority of the respondent’s 42.7% prison officers and 47.9% inmate’s respondents pointed inmate’s family as the single most notable prison stakeholder as it offers psychosocial support to inmates. Unanimously the respondents strongly agreed that open door policy fosters social reintegration of inmates back to the society and minimizes inmate’s stigmatization and labeling. Moreover, open door policy proved in the study to be key in inmate’s rehabilitation.

5.2 Conclusion
The study made the following conclusions based on the findings; both prison officers and inmates unanimously indicated that the rate of violent misconduct in prisons is high standing at averagely at 73.25%. Internal correction procedures proved to be statistically significant in management of violent misconduct among inmates. The study concluded that inmate’s indiscipline and high violent misconduct between inmates and inmates were evident in Kamiti and Langata maximum security prisons. The study made a finding that inmate’s compliance to prison rules was poor. There was also a significant relationship between early release mechanisms and rehabilitation of inmates though not anchored in the law. The study concluded that early release reduces inmates re-offending, motivate convicted inmates to be law abiding and endeavor to empower themselves as a way of assuring self-sustainability and
competitiveness upon release. The open door policy was also proven to be a worthy approach in rehabilitation of inmates.

5.3 Recommendations

The study pinpointed that the rate violent misconduct among inmates in prisons is relatively high as it stood at 73.25 percent. The violent misconduct was mainly seen from conflict between inmates and was commonly triggered by poor compliance to prison rules. As a result, the study recommends that all prison stakeholders should actively be involved in following up on convicted inmates rehabilitation and reformation endeavors. The policy makers should consider having counseling and alternative dispute resolution as modalities of correcting inmate’s indiscipline. This study recommends that Prison Department as a matter of priority should strategically increase the number of professionals prison officers such as teachers, medical doctors, psychiatrists, psychological counselors, sociologist, lawyers and criminologists.

Policy makers such as Power of Mercy Advisory Committee, Kenya Prisons Service and the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government should guide in formulating policies, procedures and guidelines on power of mercy. This study acknowledged the role of Power of Mercy Advisory Committee plays in crucial role in modifying inmate’s behavior out of anticipation for early release. This study suggests that all inmates and prison officers be trained on the power of mercy.

This study found out that open door policy was a major mechanism in preventing and managing violent misconduct among inmates where KPS is mandated to implement fully. It is recommended that policy makers such as KPS and the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government should consider revising the Prison Act (1977) so as to operationalize and legalize open door policy.

Kenya Prisons System focuses on rehabilitation and reformation of inmates through behavior modification. The success is not certain as hostile environments, mistreatment of inmates, failure to guarantee human rights and freedoms continue largely due to the fact that Kenya Prisons remain largely closed institution from public scrutiny. In order to assure public trust, professionalism and integrity among Kenya Prisons officers, this study recommends that KPS be subjected to a civilian independent oversight authority.
Counseling and alternative dispute resolution need to be factored in the disciplinary process of inmates as it will promote cohesion, peace and good relations culminating to low inmate’s violent misconduct.

5.4 Future studies

The present study has clearly established that internal correction procedures effectively manage inmate’s violent misconduct. The study site was Kamiti and Langata Maximum security prisons all geographically located in Nairobi County. Further, the study drew its sample size from a target population of adult male and female inmates. Researchers should also focus on carrying our research in Medium security and Minimum security prisons.

The present study has established that voluminous literature although drawn from western context has pointed a high rate of violent misconduct among inmates. Borstal Institution Act, (Chapter 92 Laws of Kenya) mandates KPS to lawfully confine Juvenile offenders in Borstal Institutions and Youth Correction Training Center for three years and four months respectively. In line with this, there is need for further research on management of violent misconduct among juvenile offenders using internal correction procedures.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I (A): QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRISON OFFICERS

This questionnaire is intended to gather data on the role of internal correction procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons. Kindly respond to the following questions as honestly as possible. Your response will be held confidentially and will not be divulged to any other person or entity. All data collected in this study is purely for academic purposes only and anonymity of response will be observed. Feel free to participate in the study.

SECTION A: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

a. Gender
   1) Male  
   2) Female

b. Age group
   1) 18 – 25 years  
   2) 26 – 35 years  
   3) 36 – 45 years  
   4) 46 – 55 years  
   5) Above 55

c. Level of education
   1) Bachelor’s Degree  
   2) Diploma  
   3) Certificate  
   4) KCSE  
   5) KCPE

d. Position
   1) Gazetted officer  
   2) Senior officer  
   3) Junior officer

e. Marital status
   1) Single  
   2) Married  
   3) Separated/divorced

SECTION B: PREVALENCE OF VIOLENCE MISCONDUCT

a. While in prison have you ever experienced inmates’ violent misconduct?
   1) Yes  
   2) No
b. Which is the most notable form of violent misconduct?
   1) Self-inflicted
   2) Inmates versus inmate
   3) Inmate versus prison officer
   4) Prison officer versus inmates

SECTION C: INTERNAL DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

a. Have you ever charged inmate for indiscipline?
   1) Yes
   2) No

b. Which is the most notable prison offence committed by inmates against prison rules and regulations?
   1) Smuggling contrabands
   2) Escaping
   3) Violent misconduct
   4) Disobeying lawful orders
   5) Insubordination

c. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided(UD), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>In prisons there are sufficient internal disciplinary procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Prisoner’s internal disciplinary procedure is fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Prison officers encourage inmates to be disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. In your opinion which is the most common type of internal disciplinary procedure?
   1) Psychological counseling
   2) Confinement in a separate cell
   3) Alternative dispute resolution
   4) Transfer to another prison
   5) Loss of remission of sentence

e. In your opinion how can you describe the inmate’s compliance to prisons rule?
   1) Excellent
   2) Very good
   3) Good
   4) Poor
   5) Very poor
   6) Bad

f. Has promotion of human rights improved inmate’s discipline?
   1) Disagree strongly
   2) Disagree
   3) Neutral
   4) Agree
   5) Agree strongly
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g. In your opinion, what need to be done in order to manage prisoner’s indiscipline?


SECTION C: EARLY RELEASE MECHANISM

a. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided(UD), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Early release motivate prisoners to reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Early release decongest prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anticipation of early release reduces re-offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Which is the most common type of inmate’s early release mechanism from prison?
   1) After earning remission of sentence
   2) On power of mercy.
   3) Normal discharge


c. What causes prison violence thereby limiting inmate’s opportunity for early release?
   1) Overcrowding
   2) Insufficient staff training
   3) Culture of disrespect
   4) Competition over limited resources
   5) Excessive use of force by officers


d. Are prison rehabilitation programmes sufficient to modify and transform inmate’s behaviour?
   1) Yes
   2) No
   If No, Explain........................................................................................................................................


e. Are inmate’s prepared for social reintegration into the society upon early release?
   1) Yes
   2) No
   If No, Explain........................................................................................................................................


SECTION D: OPEN DOOR POLICY

a. Who is the most notable prison stakeholder in correction of inmate’s behaviors?
   1) Religious organizations
   2) Civil society
   3) Media
   4) Non-governmental organization
   5) Oversight bodies
   6) Family

b. What is the input of stakeholders in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates?
1) Financial resources  2) Technical support  3) Social-psycho support

c. Is Prison visitation crucial in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates?
   1) Yes  2) No
   If No, Why…………………………………………………………………………………………

d. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A),
   Undecided(UD), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Open door policy foster social reintegration of inmates back to the society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Open door policy minimizes stigmatization and labeling inmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Open door policy encourage inmates to get reformed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. In your own opinion does open door policy cause social psycho insecurity among
      inmates family………………………………………………………………………………………

   Thank for your participation.
APPENDIX I (B): QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INMATES

This questionnaire is intended to gather data on the role of internal correction procedures in management of violent misconduct among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons. Kindly respond to the following questions as honestly as possible. Your response will be held confidentially and will not be divulged to any other person or entity. All data collected in this study is purely for academic purposes only and anonymity of response will be observed. Feel free to participate in the study.

SECTION A: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

a. Gender
   1) Male  2) Female

b. Age group
   1) 18 – 25 years  2) 26 – 35 years  3) 36 – 45 years  4) 46 – 55 years  5) Above 55

c. Level of education
   1) None  2) KCPE  3) KCSE  4) College  5) University

d. Type of custodial sentence serving
   1) Life sentence  2) Death sentence  3) Short sentence  4) Long sentence

e. Marital status
   1) Single  2) Married  3) Separated/divorce

SECTION B: PREVALENCE OF VIOLENCE MISCONDUCT

c. While in prison have you ever been charged for violent misconduct?
   1) Yes  2) No

d. Which is the most notable form of violent misconduct?
   1) Self-inflicted  2) Inmates versus inmate  3) Inmate versus prison officer  4) Prison officer versus inmate
SECTION C: INTERNAL DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

h. Have you ever been charged for indiscipline while in prison?
   1) Yes  
   2) No

i. Which is the most notable prison offence you have ever committed against prison rules and regulations?
   1) Smuggling contrabands  
   2) Escaping  
   3) Violent misconduct  
   4) Disobeying lawful orders  
   5) Insubordination

j. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided(UD), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>In prisons there are sufficient internal disciplinary procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Prisoner’s internal disciplinary procedure is fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Prison officers encourage inmates to be disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k. In your opinion which is the most common type of internal disciplinary procedure?
   1) Psychological counseling  
   2) Confinement in a separate cell  
   3) Alternative dispute resolution  
   4) Transfer to another prison  
   5) Loss of remission of sentence

l. In your opinion how can you describe the inmate’s compliance to prisons rule?
   1) Excellent  
   2) Very good  
   3) Good  
   4) Poor  
   5) Very poor  
   6) Bad

m. Has promotion of human rights promoted inmate’s discipline?
   1) Disagree strongly  
   2) Disagree  
   3) Neutral  
   4) Agree  
   5) Agree strongly

n. In your opinion, what need to be done in order to manage prisoner’s indiscipline?
   .................................................................................................................................
SECTION C: EARLY RELEASE MECHANISM

f. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Early release motivate prisoners to reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Early release decongest prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anticipation of early release reduces re-offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Which is the most common form of inmate’s early release mechanism from prison?
   1) After earning remission of sentence
   2) On power of mercy.

g. What causes prison violence thereby limiting inmate’s opportunity for early release?
   1) Overcrowding
   2) Insufficient staff training
   3) Culture of disrespect
   4) Competition over limited resources
   5) Excessive use of force by officers

h. Are prison rehabilitation programmes sufficient to modify and transform inmate’s behaviour?
   1) Yes
   2) No
   If No, Explain……………………………………………………………………………………

i. Are inmate’s prepared for social reintegration into the society upon early release?
   1) Yes
   2) No
   If No, Explain……………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION D: OPEN DOOR POLICY

j. Who is the most notable prison stakeholder in correction of inmate’s behaviors?
   1) Religious organizations
   2) Civil society
   3) Media
   4) Non-governmental organization
   5) Oversight bodies
   6) Family

k. What is the input of stakeholders in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates?
   1) Financial resources
   2) Technical support
   3) Social-psycho support
l. Is Prison visitation crucial in rehabilitation and reformation of inmates?
   1) Yes  2) No
   If No, Why………………………………………………………………………………………………………. 

m. Kindly tick in the appropriate box. (Key; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A),
   Undecided(UD), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree (SD))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s/no</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Open door policy foster social reintegration of inmates back to the society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Open door policy minimizes stigmatization and labeling of inmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Open door policy encourage inmates to get reformed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n. In your own opinion does open door policy cause social psycho insecurity among inmates family………………………………………………………………………………………………………. 

   Thank for your participation.
APPENDIX II (A): INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PRISON OFFICERS

I request that you respond to the following questions to clarify important concepts.

1. How can inmates’ discipline procedures be strengthened in prison?
2. Comment on your response to cases of violent misconduct among inmates
3. How can inmates recidivation to violent misconduct be effectively managed?
4. What are the major considerations before early release of inmates?
5. Comment on the frequency of violent misconduct among inmates after the introduction of power of mercy in prisons.
6. How do you prepare inmates for social reintegration after release?
7. What is the impact of open door policy on inmates rehabilitation?
8. What are the challenges associated with management of violent misconduct among inmates?

APPENDIX II (B): INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INMATES

I request that you respond to the following questions to clarify important concepts.

1. What triggers inmates’ indiscipline?
2. What is your perception towards inmates disciplinary procedures?
3. Can confinement in a separate cell deter you from offending?
4. Has anticipation of early release encouraged you to modify and change behaviour?
5. Are inmates early release procedures fair?
6. Other than rehabilitation programmes what else can correct your behaviour?
7. How can prison officers prepare you for social reintegration after release?
8. How has open door policy enhanced your compliance to prison rules and regulations?
9. Does open door policy have an impact on inmates rehabilitation?
9. What are the challenges associated with management of violent misconduct among inmates?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing &amp; Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of research proposal at Post Graduate School &amp; Authorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of revised project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of draft project for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX IV: BUDGET FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount (Ksh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary, printing</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing reading materials</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/telephone</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer services</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: STUDY SITE MAP (NAIROBI COUNTY)
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MINISTRY OF INTERIOR AND COORDINATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
KENYA PRISONS SERVICE

Telegram: "COMPRISONS" Nairobi
Telephone: +254 02 2722900-6
E-mail: Commissioner.prisons@gmail.com
When replying please quote

REF: PRIS 1/112 VOL XXII/65

September 19, 2019

Eric Munuhe Kimondo
P.O. Box 183 - 10105,
NAROMORU

RE: APPLICATION FOR AUTHORISATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH.

We acknowledge receipt of your letter requesting approval to conduct an academic research titled: "Role of internal correction in management of violent misconducts among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons".

It is noted that the research will assist the Prisons Department in improving our rehabilitation programmes. This is therefore to inform you that your request has been approved. You are allowed access to the following prisons for purposes of your research; Kamiti Main and Langata Women Maximum Security Prisons. Your research should run between 8th to 10th October 2019.

You are expected to adhere to the institution rules and regulations during your research period. You are also required to provide the Prisons headquarters with a copy of your research findings at the end of your research.

By a copy of this letter, The Officers in Charge Kamiti Main and Langata Women prisons are requested to accord you the necessary assistance during your research period.

Mary Khaemba, OGW
Director Offender, Correction, & Rehabilitation
FOR: COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF PRISONS

Cc. 1. Officer In Charge Kamiti Main Prison
2. Officer In Charge Langata Women Prison
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KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: dean-graduate@kku.ac.ke
Website: www.kku.ac.ke

FROM: Dean, Graduate School
TO: Eric Munuhe Kimondo
     C/o Security and Correction Science Dept

DATE: 11th September, 2019
REF: C159/CTY/PT/32882/2015

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROJECT PROPOSAL

This is to inform you that Graduate School Board at its meeting of 4th September, 2019 approved your Research Project Proposal for the M.A Degree Entitled, Role of Internal Correction Procedures in Management of Violent Misconducts among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons, Kenya”. Subject to clearance with the office of the Director, Ethical Committee, Kenyatta University.

You may now proceed with your Data Collection, Subject to Clearance with Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation.

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,

HAMNET SA ROKI
FOR DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

c.c. Chairman, Department of Security and Correction Science

Supervisors:

1. Dr. Eunice Githae
   C/o Department of Psychology
   Kenyatta University
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Website: www.ku.ac.ke

DATE: 11th September, 2019

Director General,
National Commission for Science, Technology
and Innovation
F.O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR ERIC MUNUHE KIMONDO REG. NO.
C159/CITY/PT/32882/2015.

I write to introduce Eric Munuhe Kimondo who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. The student is registered for M.A degree programme in the Department of Security and Correction Science.

Eric intends to conduct research for a M.A Project Proposal entitled, “Role of Internal Correction Procedures in Management of Violent Misconducts among inmates in Nairobi County Prisons, Kenya”.

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

PROF. EISHIBA KIMANI
AG. DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL
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