PREDISPOSING FACTORS OF RECIDIVISM AS PERCEIVED BY PRISON OFFICERS IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELLING PRACTICE

ABSTRACT: Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study and a researcher-designed questionnaire tagged PFRQ (Predisposing Factors of Recidivism Questionnaire) was used to obtain relevant information. Multi-stage sampling technique was adopted to select 250 prison officers from all the five prison centers in Kwara State, Nigeria. Findings showed that prison officers perceived factors, such as non-availability of employment opportunities for ex-convicts, problem of where to start a new life after release from prison among others. The results, further, revealed significant difference in predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers based on years in service, but no significant difference was found based on gender. It was recommended that counsellors should endeavour to beam their searchlight into issues of crime, imprisonment, and recidivism; counsellors should also liaise with different NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations), including faith-based to assist released offenders to achieve ease of re-integration into the society.

KEYWORD: Predisposing Factors; Recidivism; Prison Officers; Kwara State in Nigeria.

ABSTRAKSI: “Faktor-faktor Predisposisi Residivisme yang Dipersepsikan oleh Petugas Penjara di Negara Bagian Kwara, Nigeria: Implikasi bagi Praktek Konseling”. Desain survei deskriptif diadopsi untuk penelitian ini dan kuesioner yang dirancang oleh peneliti yang diberi label PFRQ (Faktor-faktor Predisposisi Kuesioner Residivisme) digunakan untuk memperoleh informasi yang relevan. Teknik pengambilan sampel multi-tahap diadopsi untuk memilih 250 petugas penjara dari semua lima pusat penjara di Negara Bagian Kwara, Nigeria. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa petugas penjara memahami faktor-faktor; seperti tidak tersedianya kesempatan kerja bagi mantan narapidana, masalah dimana memulai kehidupan baru setelah dibebaskan dari penjara antara lain. Hasilnya, lebih lanjut, mengungkapan perbedaan signifikan dalam faktor predisposisi residivisme seperti yang dirasakan oleh petugas penjara berdasarkan tahun dalam pelayanan, tetapi tidak ada perbedaan signifikan yang ditemukan berdasarkan jenis kelamin. Dianjurkan agar konselor harus berusaha untuk memberikan sorotan mereka kedalam masalah kejahatan, penjara, dan residivisme; konselor juga harus bekerja sama dengan berbagai LSM (Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat), termasuk berbasis agama, dalam membantu pelanggar yang dibebaskan untuk mencapai kemudian integrasi kembali ke dalam masyarakat.

KATA KUNCI: Faktor Predisposisi; Residivisme; Petugas Penjara; Negara Bagian Kwara di Nigeria.
INTRODUCTION

One of the main functions of the prison system worldwide is the rehabilitation of prison inmates with the hope that they will not continue to live a life of crime after release. Unfortunately, there are some criminals, who commit crime habitually. This practice is known as “recidivism”, which is the recurrence of criminal activity after a criminal has served prison term for a prior crime (Dadashazar, 2017; UNODC, 2018; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

The Nigerian prison system is witnessing an enormous increase in recidivists, those who are relapsing into crime and criminality. Positivists argued that the causes of crime are inherent in the nature of the society (Durose, 2014; Otu, 2015; and Stephen & Dudafa, 2016). Once the factors responsible for crimes are known, it would be easy to design intervention programmes for offenders in order to prevent them from returning to prison (Borzycki, 2005; Duwe, 2017; and UNODC, 2018).

The rising rate of recidivists in the Nigerian prisons should be a matter of concern to various stakeholders. According to the NPS (Nigeria Prisons Service), in 2015, on Annual Reports, 2010-2015, the percentage rate of recidivism in 2010 was 56.5%, 26.5%, and 22.5%; and in 2011 rate was 17.8%, 12.9%, and 9.2%. The rate for 2013 was 17.1%, 10.7%, and 6.5%; the rate in 2014 was 9.8%, 15.5%, and 8.3%; while the rate of 2015 was 19%, 8.7%, and 4.3% for offenders, who returned into prisons once, twice, and thrice respectively upon the initial punishment and release (cf NPS, 2015; Oruta, 2016; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

Criminals, who return to prison for more than three times after the initial imprisonment and training, can be regarded as hardened criminals who are not ready for positive behavioural change. However, the percentage rate of recidivists that returned to prison up to three times after the initial release is still high, and drastic steps need to be taken to arrest the situation (Tripoli, Kim & Bender, 2010; Ganapathy, 2018; and Tegeng & Abadi, 2018).

M.S. Otu & M.N. Uchenna (2014), and other scholars, stressed that the prison system is primal to inmates’ reformation and very instrumental to prevention and control of criminal recidivism. Prison is regarded as an organised, transitional, and total enclosure, where people who are convicted after trial are physically emasculated for rehabilitation with a view to making them law-abiding and acceptable citizens in the mainstream society upon release. It is also a place where crime suspects awaiting trial are detained until the determination of their case. The prison serves as an institution where inmates undergo reformatory and rehabilitative training to be law-abiding after release, thereby making reintegration easy and possible and, more importantly, to deter would-be offenders and released inmates from relapsing into crime and criminality (cf Phelps, 2011; Otu & Uchenna, 2014; and UNODC, 2018).

U. Chukwumerije (2012), and other scholars, stated that the rate at which released inmates repeatedly perpetrate crime and violence, and consequently get sent back to prison after release, has cast aspersions on the function and relevance of social reintegration or social support programmes in Nigerian prisons. U. Chukwumerije (2012), and other scholars, reopined that Nigeria prison is being used to breed criminals instead of using it for rehabilitation. The population that go in and out of prisons shows that there are some problems in the system and the it seems that Nigerian prison has not been able to live up to expectations of making positive impact on the lives and vocations of inmates (Chukwumerije, 2012; Otu, 2015; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

Various theories of crime have tried to give justifiable reasons into why people
commit crime. Rational Choice Theory asserted that an individual person is much aware of his/her choice to commit crime after critically or rationally considering the possible risks of being captured and, then, punished against the possible rewards if uncaught (Cornish & Clarke, 1987; Alexander & Ferzan, 2009; and Gul, 2009).

To other individuals, according to Social Disorganized Theory, criminal activity is a child of disorganized society; stresses or stressors might be responsible for other individuals to commit and even relapse into criminal activities. Some individuals commit crimes, because the significant persons in their life they try to imitate or model their lifestyles engage in criminal activities (Kubrin, 2009; WHO, 2015; and Wickes & Sydes, 2017).

According to Labeling Theory, some of the individuals who end up to be criminals in life have no prior intention of committing crime in the first instance, but if such persons are tagged “criminal”, even for the offence that is not intentional and should have been overlooked by the people in power, it could alter the person’s self-concept whereby he/she thinks of him/herself as a criminal; and, thus, promoting a self-fulfilling prophecy (Petrunik, 1980; Wahidin & Carr, 2013; and Paternoster & Bachman, 2017).

According to D.G. John (2012) and other scholars, prisoners are not being exposed to drug rehabilitation or psychiatric counselling; and only a few are exposed to valuable trades or vocational skills during imprisonment (John, 2012; Reich, 2017; and UNODC, 2018). In this context, D.G. John (2012) proposed to the idea of putting the mentally ill offender in prisons, but proposed that they should rather be referred to mental or psychiatric institutions. D.G. John (2012) claimed that 16% of prison inmates in the USA (United States of America) have notable mental problems (cf. John, 2012; Vanderloo & Butters, 2012; and John, 2016). D.G. John (2012) and other scholars, further traced the predisposing factors of recidivism to idleness and boredom, which are often interrupted by violence and rape. They stressed that ethically viable conduct is not encouraged and that prison officers do not trust prisoners to act responsibly. D.G. John (2012) and other scholars, asserted also that erroneous conduct in prison that is based on whether the inmates comply with prison rules and regulations, but not on whether they the inmates are capable of cohabit peacefully with others in the society is another cause of recidivism (John, 2012; Muthaphuli, 2012; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

D.G. John (2012) and other scholars, equally related the predisposing factors of recidivism to the fact that released inmates are being stigmatized and denied public housing, welfare benefits, food stamps, student loans, employment opportunities, and among others. Prisoners, according to D.G. John (2012) and other scholars, are no longer in contact with family and friends, especially during longer sentences, and then find out that things have changed while they were not around (John, 2012; Jarrett, 2018; and Wiltz, 2019).

J. Schubert (2016), and other scholars, on the other hand, could not trace the
predisposing factors of recidivism after imprisonment to any factor, but rather suggested that lack of socialization, lack of job training, inability to obtain employment, inability to reintegrate into society after returning from prison, antisocial attitudes, restlessness, association with other criminals, impulsiveness, lack of education, lack of support, substance abuse, and neglect or abuse of parents or guardians, among others may be responsible for recidivism (Schubert, 2016; Tegeng & Abadi, 2018; and UNODC, 2018).

Lastly, O.O. Chenube (2009), and other scholars, traced the predisposing factors of recidivism to conduct problem, criminal tendencies, alcohol and drug use, criminal history, antisocial personality, antisocial associate, and family background (Chenube, 2009; Bonta, Blais & Wilson, 2013; and Cuervo & Villanueva, 2018).

Despite numerous studies on prison and recidivism couples with various prison’s reformation and rehabilitation programmes across the Federation of Nigeria, the rate at which the released offenders are relapsing into criminal activities and, consequently, returning to prison is alarming (Stephen & Dudafa, 2016; Duwe, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019). Therefore, the primal purpose of this study was to investigate the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

The research question is “What are the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria?”. Meanwhile, the research hypotheses are as following here:

$H_{01}$: There is no significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by male and female prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

$H_{02}$: There is no significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, based on years in service.

METHODS

The research design that was adopted for this study was descriptive survey, because it adopts the use of questionnaire as a tool to determine the perceptions of respondents on the predisposing factors of recidivism (Kelly et al., 2003; Locklear, 2012; and Dadashazar, 2017).

The population for the study comprised all the prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, estimated at 615 (cf Amuche, Mayange & Levi, 2013; NPS, 2015; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019). The sample selection was done using multi-stage sampling technique. Multi-state sampling technique divides large population into stages to make the sampling process more practical (Donald & Theresa, 2014; Alvi, 2016; and Martinez-Mesa et al., 2016). Thus, purposive, proportional, and stratified random sampling procedures were adopted.

Based on RA (Research Advisor), in 2006, about 250 respondents were selected for the study. This sample size was determined at 95% confidence interval and 5.0% margin of error (RA, 2006; Danh, 2014; and Sullivan, 2017).

All the prison officers in the five prison locations (four prisons and the State Headquarters) across the State were purposefully selected for the study at stage 1. At state 2, respondents were proportionally selected in the following order: Prison Headquarters (200/615 * 250 = 81); Oke-Kura Prison (160/615 * 250 = 65); Mandala Prison (150/615 * 250 = 61); Omu-Aran Prison (65/615 * 250 = 26); and Lafiagi Prison (40/615 * 250 = 17). At stage 3, all the respondents were stratified on their unique characteristics of gender, religious affiliation, and years in service (cf Given, 2008; Guerard et al., 2016; and Hayes, 2019).

The instrument used for data collection was a researcher-designed questionnaire tagged “PFRQ (Predisposing Factors of Recidivism Questionnaire)”. The questionnaire consists of 20 (twenty) items
The questionnaire was divided into two sections: A and B. Section A elicits information on respondents’ demographic data of gender, religious affiliations, and years in service; while Section B contains 20 items on predisposing factors of recidivism. The instrument (questionnaire) was validated by experts in counselling; while the reliability of the questionnaire was determined through test re-test method (cf. Sturup et al., 2016; Dadasahazar, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

The set of scores were subjected to Karl Pearson (1895)’s Product Moment Correlation; and a reliability co-efficient of 0.87 was obtained, indicating that the instrument is reliable for use (Pearson, 1895; Eisinga, TeGrotenhuis & Pelzer, 2012; and Vaz et al., 2013).

The questionnaire was in a four point of Rensis Likert (1932)-type rating scale pattern of: SA (Strongly Agree); A (Agree); D (Disagree); and SD (Strongly Disagree). The data were analysed using percentage; mean ranking; t-test; and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) statistical tools. All the null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance (Likert, 1932; Parab & Bhalerao, 2010; and Derrick & White, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results. About the research question: “What are the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria?”, the answer is shown in table 1.

The mean and rank order analysis of response on predisposing factors of recidivism, as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, shows that items 5, 15, and 10 ranked as the top 3. Item 5 (Non-availability of employment opportunities for ex-convicts) ranked 1st with a mean 3.22.
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Table 2:
Mean, SD and t-Value on Predisposing Factors of Recidivism as Perceived by Prison Officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, Based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Cal. t-value</th>
<th>Crit. t-value</th>
<th>p.-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>57.932</td>
<td>8.6510</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56.529</td>
<td>7.8232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3:
ANOVA Table on Predisposing Factors of Recidivism as Perceived by Prison Officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, Based on Years in Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>Calc. F-Ratio</th>
<th>Crit. F-Ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Service</td>
<td>1443.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>480.993</td>
<td>7.46*</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>15858.6</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>64.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17301.6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05.

Table 4:
DMRT on Predisposing Factors of Recidivism on the Basis of Years in Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Duncan’s Grouping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Years and Above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

score of 3.22; followed by item 15 (Problem of where to start a new life after release) with the mean score of 3.14; while item 10 (Inability to deny uncontrollable urge that is propelling one to commit offences after release) ranked 3rd with the means score of 3.11.

Since the mean scores of all the items are greater than the mid-mean score of 2.50 except item 14 (2.44), it can thus be inferred that the items were perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, as the predisposing factors of recidivism (cf Osayi, 2013; Dadashazar, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019). 

**About Hypotheses Testing.** Hypothesis One: “There is no significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, on the basis of gender”. See table 2.

The testing of hypothesis one shows that calculated t-value of 1.31 is less than the critical t-value of 1.96 with a corresponding p-value of 0.36, which is greater than 0.05 level of significance. Since the p-value is greater than the level of significance, the null hypothesis is therefore not rejected. This implies that male and female respondents were of the same perceptions regarding predisposing factors of recidivism (cf Stahler et al., 2013; Dadashazar, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

Hypothesis Two: “There is no significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, based on years in service”. See table 3.

The testing of hypothesis three indicates that years in service has influence on respondents’ perception on the predisposing factors of recidivism with (F3,246 = 7.461, p < 0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. However, DMRT (Duncan Multiple Range Test) was carried out as a post-hoc
test on table 4 to determine the variable with more contribution to the difference noted in table 3 (cf Duncan, 1955; Shaffer, 1999; and Allen, 2017). See again table 4.

The DMRT (Duncan Multiple Range Test) reveals that all the groups differ in their perceptions. However, it can be inferred that group 1 (1-5 years in service) with the highest mean score of 61.08 contributed most to the difference noted in the ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) table (Duncan, 1955; Shaffer, 1999; and Gelman, 2005).

**Discussion.** Finding revealed that non-availability of employment opportunities for ex-convicts; problem of where to start a new life after release from prison; and inability to deny uncontrollable urge that propels one to commit offences after release are perceived predisposing factors of recidivism. The reason for this finding could be traced to the wrong perceptions of the societal about the reformation and rehabilitation roles of prisons (Cullen & Gilbert, 1982; Osayi, 2013; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

Some people do not see the prisons as correctional home and never believe that anyone could go and come out of prison and be better and useful in the societal. These set of people see the prisons as homes for the condemned and that the prisoners, no matter the offense, should not be allow to co-exist with others in the society, because they are prone to criminal activities; hence, the release offenders have no place in the society, they find it extremely difficult to get employment opportunities, earn living, and start new lives as penitent members of the society (Services UD, 2004; Lattimore, Steffey & Visher, 2010; and Stansfield et al., 2017).

Friends, family, and even the society at large are hostile to them and treat them with disdain, because no one wants to take the risk of associating with “ex convicts”. The released offenders, who constantly experience rejections, neglects, stigmatisations, victimisations among others, are likely to recidivate. The reason for the finding could be further traced to the fact that some individuals are habitual criminals. To such individuals, there is no amount of therapeutic intervention or correctional treatment that is suitable and appropriate in desensitising them from engaging in unethically viable conduct, because criminality is their nature and such people recidivate easily (Johnson, 2011; Lockard & Rankins-Roberston, 2011; and Brand, 2016).

The finding of this study is in tandem with E. Tahmincioglu (2010), and other scholars, who claimed that some prison inmates face a tight job market and few employers are willing to hire someone with a criminal record. E. Tahmincioglu (2010), and other scholars, then stressed that many former inmates have the likelihood of ending up in cells (Tahmincioglu, 2010; Decker et al., 2014; and Gonzalez & Connell, 2014).

The finding of the study is equally in line with J. Schubert (2016); Z. Christopher (2017); and other scholars, who stressed that recidivism is caused by factors, such as lack of socialization, lack of job training, inability to obtain employment, inability to reintegrate into society after returning from prison, antisocial attitudes, restlessness, association with other criminals, impulsiveness, lack of education, lack of support, substance abuse, and neglect or abuse of parents or guardians, may be responsible for recidivism (cf Stahler et al., 2013; Otu, 2015; Schubert, 2016; Christopher, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

O.O. Chenube (2009), and other scholars, traced the predisposing factors of recidivism to factors, such as conduct problem, criminal tendencies, alcohol and drug, criminal history, antisocial personality, antisocial associate, and family background (Chenube, 2009; Tuvblad & Beaver, 2013; and Timko et al., 2017).

S. Simmon (2016), and other scholars,
also posited that the legal procedure and the barriers in the society could not allow the ex-convicts to easily integrate and free associate with the general populace and find a gainful employment, secure a consistent source of housing, and generally function in society. S. Simmon (2016), and other scholars, stressed further that when prisoners are released, they face an environment that is challenging, hostile, and actively deters them from becoming productive members of society, because of stigmatization and neglect (Brand, 2016; Simmon, 2016; and UNODC, 2018).

Another finding revealed no significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, on the basis of gender. This means that prison officers do not differ in their perception on the predisposing factors of recidivism on the basis of gender (cf Johnson, 2011; Dadashazar, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

The study, however, was in contrast to the finding of L. McKean & C. Ransford (2004), and other scholars, who claimed that men recidivate at a higher rate than women. L. McKean & C. Ransford (2004), and other scholars, further stated that 24.3 percent of the male recidivate; while 75.5 percent do not recidivate. Only 13.7 percent of female recidivate; while up to 86.3 do not recidivate (McKean & Ransford, 2004; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009; Stahler et al. 2013; Duwe, 2017; and Tegeng & Abadi, 2018).

The reason for the result could be because of the general assumption that experience is the function of age and years. It is generally believed that experience matters and that the longer one lives, the more expose and more experience one becomes. Therefore, prison officers with various years in service hold different perceptions on predisposing factors of recidivism (Phelps, 2011; Cecil, 2017; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

Finding also revealed a significant difference in the predisposing factors of recidivism as perceived by prison officers in Kwara State, Nigeria, based on years in service. This means that prison officers with various years in service are not of the same perception about the predisposing factors of recidivism (Osayi, 2013; Stephen & Dudafa, 2016; Dadashazar, 2017; UNODC, 2018; and Adegboyega, Idowu & Idowu, 2019).

The finding is in line with the finding of PCT (Pew Charitable Trust), in 2013, that stressed that longer prison terms seek to reduce crime through incapacitation and deterrence. The finding, further, revealed that incarceration is necessary to discourage criminal activities by putting criminals in situations, in which crime against the public is not possible. It is equally a mean by which various attempts to prevent potential criminal activities, or recidivism is dissuaded (cf Bushouse, 2009; Loughran et al., 2009; PCT, 2013; and Stemen, 2017).

The reason for the finding could be because the general assumption that experience is the function of age and years.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study have some implications for counsellors. It was discovered that recidivism is predisposed by non-availability of employment opportunities for ex-convicts; problem of where to start a new life after release; inability to deny uncontrollable urge that is propelling one to commit offences after release; among others. Therefore,
it is pertinent that counsellors beam their searchlight into issues of crime, imprisonment, and recidivism.

Counsellors-in-training should be trained on how assessment strategies to be able to probe further and uncover other hidden root of maladaptive behaviours to prevent prison recidivism. Counsellors, in conjunction with different faith, based organisations to assist released offenders to achieve ease of re-integration into the society so as to prevent recidivism. Counsellors can equally collaborate with prison officers in providing rehabilitation and reformation services to assist prison inmates in order to reduce recidivism.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that, firstly, counsellors along with various prison rehabilitation stakeholders should follow released offenders and help them to integrate back into the society without any form stigmatization. The released offenders should be properly placed in the world of work or vocation of which they are capable.

Secondly, the released offenders should be monitored closely and be discouraged from staying in any environment that can instigate criminal activities. Thirdly, counselling units should be created and empowered to function in prisons. Professional rehabilitation counsellors should be employed in various counselling units in prison.

Fourthly, counselling rehabilitation programmes in prisons should be reviewed to see if it upholds the aim of imprisonment. Lastly, fifth, evidence-based prison rehabilitation programmes should be encouraged by government, prison service, counsellors, psychologists, social workers, faith-based organisations, and all prison rehabilitation stakeholders.
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