**OFFENDER AND CORRECTIONAL OFFICIAL’S PERCEPTIONS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION PROGRAMMES**

**A. OFFENDER PERCEPTIONS**

DEMOGRAPHICS OF OFFENDER PARTICIPANTS (MO1= MALE OFFENDER 1) and (FO1= FEMALE OFFENDER 1)

**Table 1: Age of male offenders**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MALE OFFENDER** | **AGE** |
| MO1 | 35 |
| MO2 | 29 |
| MO3 | 49 |
| MO4 | 39 |
| MO5 | 42 |
| MO6 | 46 |
| MO7 | 43 |
| MO8 | 44 |
| MO9 | 40 |
| MO10 | 50 |
| MO11 | 40 |
| MO12 | 55 |
| MO13 | 44 |
| MO14 | 42 |
| MO15 | 54 |

**Table 2: Age of female offenders**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FEMALE OFFENDER** | **AGE** |
| FO1 | 46 |
| FO2 | 42 |
| FO3 | 42 |
| FO4 | 35 |
| FO5 | 38 |
| FO6 | 41 |
| FO7 | 39 |
| FO8 | 33 |
| FO9 | 49 |
| FO10 | 40 |
| FO11 | 40 |
| FO12 | 37 |
| FO13 | 55 |
| FO14 | 52 |
| FO15 | 49 |

**Table 3: Average age of offender participants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AVERAGE AGE OF MALE AND FEMALE PARTICIPANTS** | |
| Age | 35-55 |

**Table 4: Offender common perceptions about rehabilitation and reintegration programmes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OFFENDER COMMON FINDINGS/PERCEPTIONS** | |
| Corruption (officials smuggling drugs, start fights, take bribes etc) | More support upon release to be offered to offenders |
| Objective of programmes are understood but most felt the way they implemented and taught does not assist them | Offenders felt they are not sure how to use skills learnt upon release |
| Programmes are general, cannot relate | Cells are overcrowded, bad food |
| Sessions with social workers and psychologists are better than other programmes | Duration of programmes is very short and limited making them less impactful |
| Environment is not conducive for rehabilitation | Upon release one must make ends meet |
| Unemployment, inability to readjust, stigmatisation, peer pressure and criminal record cause recidivism | Only attend programmes to qualify for parole and stay out of trouble |
| Change is a personal decision in the centres it is easy to get lost in everything happening, its bad in there | Content of programmes is outdated |
| Few rehabilitation officials | Lack of support from management |
| Variety of programmes offered but most are not structured | Programmes and correctional system not designed to help survive upon release |
| Lack of categorisation in cells | Assist with finding employment upon release, money to take care of our families is important to help us stay away from crime |
| We do criminal activities to make ends meet, life is tough we need money to survive | How do centres evaluate something (rehabilitation) that does not exist |
| Programmes should be offered to offender even after release to help them reintegrate successfully | Assessments are a rushed process, they do not look at the person before the crime |
| Rights are seen as a privilege | There is little/ no preparation on how to readjust upon release, most programmes do not equip us with the resources and strategies on how to survive and make an innocent living for ourselves |

**Table 5: Common themes and sub-themes established from offender perceptions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | **Sub-themes** |
| Rehabilitation | Implemented programmes |
|  | Rehabilitation is a myth |
| Effective implementation of programmes | Offender challenges |
| Recidivism | Causes of recidivism |
|  | Reducing recidivism |

**B. CORRECTIONAL OFFICIALS**

DEMOGRAPHICS OF OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS (OP1= OFFICIAL PARTICIPANT 1)

**Table 1: Positions of official participants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OFFICIALS POSITIONS** | |
| OP1 | Psychologist |
| OP2 | Educator |
| OP3 | Social worker |
| OP4 | Pastor |
| OP5 | Pastor |
| OP6 | Psychologist |
| OP7 | Nurse |
| OP8 | Educator |
| OP9 | Correctional Assessment Officer |
| OP10 | Social worker |

**Table 2: Duration of involvement in the implementation of rehabilitation and reintegration programmes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DURATION OF INVOLVEMENT IN IMPLEMENTATION** | |
| OP1 | 8 years |
| OP2 | 5 years |
| OP3 | 14 years |
| OP4 | 11 years |
| OP5 | 9 years |
| OP6 | 15 years |
| OP7 | 12 years |
| OP8 | 4 years |
| OP9 | 5 years |
| OP10 | 3 years |

**Table 3: Officials common perceptions on rehabilitation and reintegration programmes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OFFFICIAL’S COMMON PERCEPTIONS** | |
| The objectives of the programme are to rehabilitate offenders but they are offender dependent | Not certain if programmes are impactful |
| Variety of programmes are offered, psychologist, social worker, HIV/AIDS, health, vocational | Assessments are performed upon incarceration |
| Programmes are short-lived, performed towards half sentence for parole eligibility | Lack of support from management |
| Lack of tools of trade for rehabilitation | Shortage of manpower/staff |
| Policies do not accommodate rehabilitation sufficiently; most rules are not followed | More support upon release of offender should be provided |
| There are no real/ realistic strategies to help offender resist crime | New modern and well researched programmes that work should be introduced |
| New modern methods of rehabilitation should be implemented | Realistic evaluation systems to determine the release of the offender should be researched |
| Qualitative methods and evaluation forms are given to offender to evaluate programmes | Programmes assist other offenders but not all of them |
| Officials are optimistic, only hope that programmes will be impactful they do not have systems to evaluate impact | Unemployment, lack of housing, substance abuse, stigmatization, peer pressure contributes to recidivism |
| Offender participation is low. Offenders participate to get parole | The focus is more on the assessment of offenders, which is not actioned correctly rather than the actual rehabilitation of offenders |
| Environment is not healthy for rehabilitation | Training to be provided by management |

**Table 4: Common themes and sub-themes established from official’s perceptions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | **Sub-themes** |
| Rehabilitation | Rehabilitation is a myth |
| Effective implementation of programmes | Official’s challenges |
| Recidivism | Causes of recidivism |
|  | Curbing recidivism |
| Evaluating rehabilitation and reintegration programmes | |

**THEMES AND SUB-THEMES THAT EMERGED FROM THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY**

**Table 5: Themes and sub-themes of the study on the perceptions on rehabilitation and reintegration programmes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | **Sub-themes** |
| 1. Rehabilitation | Rehabilitation and reintegration programmes implemented |
|  | Rehabilitation is a myth |
| 2. Effective implementation of programmes | Offender challenges |
|  | Official’s challenges |
| 3. Recidivism | Causes of recidivism |
|  | Curbing recidivism |
| 4. Evaluating rehabilitation and reintegration programmes | |