

Incarceration for Reformation or Deformation?

Sadiq Ewaoda Amali¹, Ephraim Kevin Sibanyoni² and Thompo Tshivhase^{3,*}

¹Department of Sociology, Federal University Dutse, PMB 7156, Dutse, Jigawa State, Nigeria

²Department of Criminology and Forensic Science, Kwa-Zulu Natal University, Durban, South Africa

³Department of Criminology, University of Fort Hare, P.Bag X1314, Alice 5700, South Africa

Abstract: The reason for imposing incarceration is to punish offenders for violating societal norms and values. As a means of punishment, it is deliberately inflicted on an offender, which serves as a deterrence to would-be offenders. This could help in inculcating good morals on offenders, thereby altering him or her from a nonconforming individual to a conforming one. Despite the good intention of imposing incarceration, it has contradicted its cardinal objective which has resulted in some unintended consequences such as inability to secure employment as a result of stigmatization, aiding the collapse of marriages among others. With the above-stated consequences of incarceration, penal institutions instead of instilling the positive goal of incarceration on inmates, on the contrary, it has served as a punishment ground with degrading treatment imposed on inmates by correctional officials coupled with the dehumanizing state of most penal institutions. This article concludes that incarceration has a long term effect on the positive life of offenders and recommends that concerted efforts should be made in reintegrating ex-offenders, discouraging the idea of tagging, and make ample efforts on how ex-offenders can secure payable jobs upon regaining freedom.

Keywords: Consequences, Convicted inmates, Incarceration, Offender, Punishment.

INTRODUCTION

Incarceration, as an approach of punishment, originated in the 16th century but became extensively widespread only in the 19th century (Agunbiade, 2010). Incarceration is not new to modern society in Nigeria (Alabi & Alabi, 2011). Incarceration is considered as a prescribed viewpoint of imposing soreness on an individual, which is seen as a trait of the traditional criminal justice system in different populations in Nigeria (Obioha, 1995). As previously defined, incarceration is the familiar form of punishment given to an offender for violating laws (Ekpe & Mammah, 1997). According to Mabuza and Roelofse (2013), "incarceration refers to the admitting, imprisonment and detention of a convicted person until his or her sentence expires" (p. 51). Incarceration is one of the commonly used criminal justice disposal approaches in Nigeria (Dambazau, 1999). Incarceration serves many widespread goals which include the fortification of the wider society, the deterrence of felony, vengeance against a felon, and the reintegration of inmates (Ikoh, 2011). Ideally, incarceration condenses the risk to the wider society. While the cardinal objective of incarcerating offenders was to punish them, which is likely to improve them, at the same time it guarantees social safety (Drake, 2012). Additionally, incarceration of felons may also discourage other persons from engaging in criminal behaviour due to the fear of chastisement.

However, the purpose of incarceration, as enshrined in section the Nigerian Correctional Service Act (2019), is an exertion to classify the reason for the anti-social actions of a wrongdoer, to educate, restore and revolutionize them to be law-abiding citizens. Felons should be supported in their quest for being reformed (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978). Succinctly put, "incarceration is a prescription, and *prisonization* is the process of living within confinement known as a correctional centre" (Chukwudi, 2012, p. 36). Ultimately, reoffending felons may be reduced if the objective of incarceration is attained by setting up and providing adequate rehabilitation of inmates (Uche *et al.*, 2011). Therefore, incarceration is intended for correcting offenders and altering their deeds, rather than just penalizing them for their erroneous deeds (Conklin, 2001). Lillyquist (1980) posits that the objective of incarceration involves correction and rehabilitation of offenders which can be achieved by exposing them to educational or therapeutic experiences and medical care (Davies, 1993). Offenders should be treated with respect as incarceration itself restricts their movement, which can lead to depression. To avoid depression, it is imperative to engage offenders in vocational training programmes (Ajayi, 2012). Therefore, offenders may learn a new craft or industrial expertise. Correctional centre, as a reformatory centre, is expected to rehabilitate offenders in custody; this can be achieved by providing all basic facilities for correctional centres (Ali, 2011). Offenders who partake in a correctional programme during incarceration should be more hopeful about their triumph and steer clear from

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Criminology, University of Fort Hare, P.Bag X1314, Alice 5700, South Africa; Tel: 040 602 2408; Fax: 086 628 2408; E-mail: tshivhase@ufh.ac.za

participating in crime upon regaining freedom from the correctional institution (Latessa & Holsinger, 1998). Therefore, offenders who are fully engaged in vocational programmes like carpentry and welding, are less likely to indulge in further crime after release from correctional centre facilities.

PUNISHMENT: QUESTIONS OF MORALITY OR LEGALITY

Across the globe, the cardinal objective of punishment is for restoration and alteration in deeds of felons and acts as a warning to would-be felons of such laws (Ogwezy, 2011). In earlier times, a punishment used to be imprisonment, and no one thought of reforming offenders to be good for the society at large upon liberation (Omoni & Ijeh, 2011). Quinne (1979) suggests that philosophies of punishment are reformation, retribution, and deterrence. A common agreement on the principle of punishment has not been attained among theorists; however, utilitarianism and retributivism schools of philosophers have materialized in this regard (Agunbiade, 2010). Haag (1985) defines punishment as deprivation or suffering imposed by law, while Jeffery (1965) defines it as the withdrawal of a reinforcing stimulus or presentation of an oversize stimulus. Lacey (1994) views it as the "state's imposition of unpleasant consequences on an offender for his or her offence" (p. 16). A legal explanation of punishment as attested by Rowls (1969) reveals that a person is believed to undergo punishment whenever he or she is lawfully deprived of certain normal rights which is as a result of a violation of rule of law. Usually, this deprivation is being recognized by the legal authorities of the state. In support of Rowls view (1969), Lillyquist (1980) affirms that punishment is not used "vengefully or retributively, but reasonably to the degree that it would have maximum utility as a deterrent" (p. 31). Glenn and Raine (1995, p. 23) clarify that "punishment may not necessarily be a deed of violence of one or numerous against a personal member of the society". Rather, true punishment is characterized by several factors, namely: (a) It is unpleasant; (b) It is inflicted on the offender because of the offence committed; (c) It is deliberate and not the unintended natural consequence of a person's action; (d) the unpleasantness is an essential feature and not merely a necessary coincidence (as in the case of the pains of a dentist's drill), and (e) It is imposed by an authorized agent (Bonn, 1984, p. 85).

Hart (1972) opines that punishment means the imposition of pain, in line with the traditional utilitarian

view (Carney, 1980). Hart (1995), coined a traditional model which defines the standard or a central case of punishment in terms of five elements, namely: (a) discomfort or other effects normally considered unfriendly; (b) has to be a crime contrary to lawful or permissible decree; (c) is served to an alleged criminal for his offence; (d) is deliberately meted out by persons other than the criminal, and (e) it is imposed and meted out by an establishment set up by a legal system against which the crime is committed. Agunbiade (2010) views the imposition of agony as a chastisement to be primarily different from the imposition of anguish on innocent and thus is not integrally erroneous. However, Bentham (1823) opines that punishment is a response to undesirable or unlikable acts of a person based on a reaction to actions considered erroneous by an individual or faction with the objective of revenge and restraining others from indulging in such acts. Furthermore, Murphy (1995) states that punishment is incorrect and can be vindicated only if it leads to a superior good. The above views have been portrayed as the punitive and utilitarian and have overshadowed and made easy the widespread acquiescence of correctional centre as a method of communal restraint. Ali (2011) submits that without punishment, the crime volume would move to as the point where it turns out to be destructive in society.

Holz and Azrin (1961) are of the view that chastisement may become a discriminative stimulus when it is followed by reinforcement. However, punishment is described as allowing the criminal the feeling of having made amends for their deeds while affirming societal rules (Pursley, 1977). Thus, persistent punishment may fail to control behaviour, when satiation takes place, similarly to a reinforcing stimulus. Garfinkel (1965) defines punishment as a public degradation ceremony even though the total eradication of punishment is not possible. Carney (1980) suggests that punishment is criticized because it is brutalized and sometimes unduly severe. Austere chastisement is irrational and its ferocious nature has failed unsuccessfully in discouraging crime (Alemika, 1987). It seems, from the features of the correctional centre populace in Nigeria that incarceration has been used as a channel of punishment by the courts even in trivial offences (Osibanjo & Kalu, 1990). Glasser (1965) states that so doing is ineffective: when an individual is being punished, his or her failure is further reinforced which is likely to lead to initial incarceration and more spend more time in custody. This may also imply that punishment may cause a person to alter his or her

behaviour and become rehabilitated, is entirely wrong. In line with the above quotation, it suggests that some inmates label themselves as criminals or deviants, which redirects their minds into committing a further crime that led to the initial incarceration (Esiri, 2016). Thus incarceration, which is a form of punishment, may not change deviant behaviour (Esiri, 2016). Punishment should be at least justified, which should be based on efficiency of the deterrence; that will help to prevent further misery in some cases (Carney, 1975). Conversely, Pepitone (1975) indicates that the purpose of punishment forwards a justification for the incarceration of adjudicated criminals. Such purposes are: (a) depriving offenders of freedom and satisfaction; (b) making them suffer in ways that will reform them, and (c) causing them to suffer for the scale of justice.

Lillyquist (1980) identified two categories: retributive justice and utilitarian justification. Depriving offenders of freedom and satisfaction and making offenders suffer in some ways that will reform them respectively justifies the application of a particular punishment because the criminal deserves it while the principle of justice requires it. However, punishment implies retribution, which is seen as a principle that maintains punitive action which is conceived as the pain to an offender, capable of deterring an offender from committing a further crime, thus being directed a law-abiding individual (Lillyquist, 1980). Incarceration as a form of punishment may successfully incapacitate an individual who creates a situation where he/she is less likely to indulge in crime-related acts. Furthermore, punishment is also seen as a deterrence that intimidates an offender, thereby restraining the offender from committing further crime. Lillyquist (1980) states that both incapacitation and deterrence are efficient only in a situation where there is an observation to assure that security of the correctional centre will be able to apprehend any offender who tries to gain unlawful freedom. Wilkins (1969) states that the actual probabilities of being punished for a particular crime may be below what a would-be offender thinks it is. If offenders know the consequences of being apprehended for crime commission, there are more tendencies that there will be a decline in the perpetration which may be due to knowing the fact that apprehension may lead to sanctions which may be unpleasant, hence abstaining from crime (Wilkins, 1969). Thus, Atere (1993) states that the correctional centre term stands proxy for about 80% of all punitive measures which give an offender a second chance to show that he or she is remorseful and ready to be a better person.

INCARCERATION FOR REFORMATION OR INCARCERATION FOR DEFORMATION? A GLOBAL REVIEW

One of the fundamental objectives of establishing correctional centres is to accommodate individuals who violated the law by an act punishable by law (Asokhia & Osumah, 2013). Hester and Eglin (1992) affirm that correctional centre serves the following purposes: (a) Detention of inmates with pending trial; (b) protected confinement of inmates pending sentencing or for investigation; (c) imprisonment of those penalized for illicit offences, non-payment of amounts outstanding and forfeiture, or disrespect of court.

To the other extreme, Foucault (1977) suggests that a small number of correctional centres were earlier used to accommodate capital punishment or paying fines or debts. Today, however, correctional centres are viewed as conventional internments for the protected custody of those legitimately behind bars waiting for trial (Omagbemi & Odunewu, 2008). Indeed, it is well understood that incarcerating a wrongdoer is not revenge. By isolating criminals from the rest of society, the correctional centre can effectively reform, rehabilitate, punish and deter offenders and protect the wider society (Fitzerald, 1977; Foucault, 1977; Cressey, 1965). Hartinger *et al.* (1973) observe that correctional centres are meant for incarceration, regarded as a less severe punishment and reformation and seen as a place for seclusion and reflection, thereby leading to regrets, repentance, and deliverance. To this degree, correctional centres in Nigeria, like others across the globe, are saddled with three essential roles of reintegration, improvement, and recuperation (Adeleke & Uche, 2015).

The NCoS is a government-maintained institution established to correct, punish, reform social deviants, and complement the processes of legal adjudication and law enforcement. According to NCoS (2011), the awareness of one the foremost goals of the correctional service - the reform and the reintegration of felons - is implemented through an intricate set of mechanisms consisting of, among others: recreational activities, skill acquisition programmes, religious services, educational development, and corrective enlightening programmes. Similarly, the NPS metes out punitive acts to mature offenders (Ugwumba & Usang, 2014). Despite this, Agomoh (1996) affirms that correctional centres in Nigeria were established to accommodate offenders in safe confinement to treat and prepare them to be law-abiding citizens upon

reintegration into liberated society and to produce income for administration through industries and correctional centre farms. In line with the philosophy of the NPS, which is management and restoration of a wrongdoer, this can be attained through a careful outline and well enunciated administrative, reforming, and reintegration programmes intended at instilling continence, and regard for law and order. Hence, a correctional centre implements an approach for the alteration of illegal acts of inmates; its culture is a vigorous one which normally consists of all categories of value assimilation (Obioha, 1995). According to Igbo (2007), the NPS has an obligation of guaranteeing the sheltered confinement of offenders for their improvement and recuperation or restoration. This emphasizes the idea of correctional centre institutions boosting the rehabilitation, reformation and reintegration of once incarcerated offenders. Reformation implies premeditated strategies to teach ethical correction in a person's character to be less persuaded to re-offend in the future (Ahire, 1990).

Society assumes that confining dangerous offenders will permanently safeguard society from them for the period of their correctional centre term (Ikoh, 2011). However, with the cramping of offenders in correctional institutions, Opara (1998) states that the general public is safeguarded when offenders are in correctional centre term, but that it remains impermanent because before long the offender will regain freedom and return to the wider society as the same predacious criminal if not adequately transformed and rehabilitated.

Correspondingly, the anticipation is that the correctional centre will make inmates apologetic for their criminal deeds, and when they are liberated will be reluctant to commit a further crime (Alemika & Chukwuma, 2001). Realistically, individuals are incarcerated for various acts that violate criminal law, but the essence of incarceration is a motive towards rehabilitation and modification of criminal behaviour through a series of correctional programmes. Thus, correctional centres should be able to mould the inmate's character instead of causing further destruction (Agunbiade, 2010).

Moreover, Yakubu (1999) states that correctional education (a) helps to or can redress the abnormal person already associated with the correctional centre; (b) gives equal opportunity in the acquisition of education, and (c) can encourage and help those who try to turn away from crime by rehabilitation.

Contradicting the above views, Reza (2011) opines that correctional centres have not been an efficacious instrument to return the offender to the wider society or that it has not reformed the offender status. Regardless the perspective, one commonality is that correctional centre is repeatedly alluded to as a correctional establishment where offenders are restricted or penalized to remove dangerous elements from the society because their continuous stay is a threat to existing peace (Chaturvedi, 2006; Omoni & Ijeh, 2011).

EFFECTIVENESS OF INCARCERATION

Rehabilitation of an offender should start from the very first day he or she has been absorbed into the correctional centre until he or she is discharged from the correctional centre (Igbo, 2007). The essence of imparting correction on an inmate is to reform him or her to fit into the wider society. Though incarceration deprives an inmate of certain things of life, it remains important. Concerning the effectiveness of correctional centre in rehabilitating and preventing recidivism, Paul and Beverly (2006) hold that most successful rehabilitation programmes are less likely if attention is not paid to certain practical resettlement needs of inmates which may be catered for through comprehensive programmes that have to do with adjustment counselling.

Obioha (1995) stresses that inmate who learns basic skills through education and training are more probable not to return to reoffending than inmates who are without basic skills. Calbertson (1977: 3a) states that "treatment and punishment are compatible reconstructive elements". Carney (1980) asserts that corrections commence when correction requires classification procedures to make sure that some responses to some treatment strategies shall be chosen and screened into treatment programmes. Furthermore, Carney (1980) states that corrections should be balanced and has a rational view of the actual place of punishment in the correctional endeavour. Part of the problem is that punishment is commonly linked with bodily pain and may not necessarily involve denial whereby restriction chastens but does not dehumanize and is a lawful and reasonable style of punishment (Carney, 1980).

Moreover, Lillyquist (1980) states that sending an individual to a correctional centre implies losing freedom which he tags as punishment itself. One can view the punitive aspect of incarceration, which is seen as seconding to a mere constructive aspect of

correctional centre life. Lillyquist (1980) thus posits states a convict could learn additional interpersonal expertise with the assistance of a therapist or can learn additional trade or job-related skills, also with the assistance of the therapist. Given the above, offenders are likely to adequately deal with stress-related problems and conflict instead of venturing into criminal ways. Because of the above, inmates may likely take advantage of the expertise assimilated in the process of rehabilitation to live as law-abiding citizens in society (Uche *et al.*, 2011). However, the main purpose of corrections is quite clear through the correctional system, yet is believed to have been saddled with some conflicting goals, such as deterrence, punishment, reform, rehabilitation (Bonn, 1984). The following sections comprise Bonn's (1984) outlines of the three major perspectives which influence thinking about corrections and studies of correction.

INCARCERATION: SOME PERCEIVED CONSEQUENCES

Inmates in correctional institutions or convicted offenders are sent to correctional centres by courts for different terms of incarceration, which results to be cut off from the wider society (Tenibiaje, 2010). Nigeria's correctional system, as a part of reform and penal agency, has lost its core value/purpose (Alabi & Alabi, 2011). Correctional centres do not differ much from other human communities that frequently experience some life-transient tasks (Arisukwu *et al.*, 2015). However, incarceration as a legal means of punishing wrongdoers is seen to have several consequences for the offender's life despite its objectives of providing treatment, education, and rehabilitation programmes to incarcerated inmates. Incarceration entails deprivation, which results in denial of freedom of thoughts, curtailing movement, and other basic rights (Osefo, 1990).

Odekunle (1981) opines that one consequence of incarceration is that correctional centres receive back almost a majority of felons they were expected to have rehabilitated and reformed. Moreover, inmates are stigmatized and rejected by members of their immediate communities. Logan (2007) feels that one consequence of incarceration is the irreparable damage it is seen to make on parents and likewise their legal status as parents when they are detained in correctional centres. Although inmates are accommodated for a purpose, due to their prolonged or brief stay in custody, some perceived consequences are seen to affect their personalities, their families, and

other economic activities of the offenders (Madaki, 2011). Petersilia (2003) explains that due to the stigma associated with incarceration, the majority of ex-offenders may find it difficult to secure jobs and decent housing. Also, as a result of stigmatization, most family members avoid making it public that they have a relative in correctional centre custody serving a jail term. This may be due to the shame associated with incarceration. Stern (1998) suggests that stigma causes humiliation, reduces or decreases self-worth, social acceptance, and can negatively affect the defamed person's inclination to criminal behaviour. Their capacity as human emotions is successfully blunted by the continual or persistent assault on their humanity (Clemmer, 1950).

Lippke (2002) indicates that incarceration successfully limits the enjoyment of any perceived rights. For example, by restraining or limiting the inmate's liberty of movement, incarceration makes it difficult or unfeasible for offenders to attain a profitable occupation. Lippke (2002) also states that incarceration often triggers the atrophy of important talent and character required to exercise or benefit certain rights. For example, seclusion usually prescribed on inmates erodes their competence to execute significant and positive contact or interaction upon release, which deters them from the impending enjoyment of the right of liberty (Durosaro, 2012). Such seclusion causes some inmates to engage in risky sexual behaviour, such as masturbation and having unprotected sexual intercourse with other offenders, which may due to a limited supply of male and female condoms, thus to widespread sexually transmitted diseases (Sykes, 1966; Agunbiade, 2010). Sometimes, inmates encounter medical neglect, sexual compulsion, and harassment in confinement facilities by correctional officials (Briedland *et al.*, 2009).

Potts (2000) found that sexually transmitted diseases amid inmates are 20 times higher than that of the overall populace. Regarding the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases among correctional centres in Nigeria studies found that in Agodi Correctional centre in Ibadan, Nigeria, both male and females were involved in perilous sexual behaviour which might lead to the spread of HIV/AIDS in correctional centres (Okochi *et al.*, 1991; Potts, 2000; Adesanya, 1997). Although HIV/AIDS is a common sexually spread disease in most Nigerian correctional centres, other communicable diseases are present too, such as tuberculosis (TB), staphylococcus, and hyperplasia (Egamberdi, 2006; Okwendi, Nwankwoal,

& Ushi, 2014). TB is ranked 9th in global health problems (United Nations Development Programme, 2000). Furthermore, most inmates are accommodated in filthy cells, which endangers their lives, and in some cases, may lead to casualties (Agunbiade, 2010). Watson *et al.* (2004), a range of additional health problems common among inmates include mental health, substance abuse, and transmissible disease. Most of these health problems have been established in some penal institution in Nigeria (Agbahowe *et al.*, 1998). Problems persist as some inmates are unable to afford the services of a lawyer, leading to prolonged incarceration and the consequence of congestion which endangers the inmates' lives. (Hassan, 2010).

However, a consequence of incarceration is seen to have a visible effect on incarcerated offenders (Ruddell, 2004). The idea of incarceration successfully strips an offender's support of his or her world (Gillespie, 2004). Stern (1998) found that inmates are less probable to be married; the marriages of those that are incarcerated for five to ten years mostly come to an end. Additionally, educational levels of inmates' children are low, with the majority ending up in correctional centres or jobless. Gaines and Miller (2008), states that when a parent is being incarcerated, his or her will over and over again experience financial difficulties, reduced parental supervision and discipline, and an overall decline of the family structure. It is believed that children whose parents are convicts are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour.

Given the above, Kitzinger (2003) opines that inmates who were detached from their spouses, children, and siblings developed symptoms of mental and physical problems which may be a result of being sexually abused, lack of educational background, coupled with the unsafe correctional centre environment. Inmates get a reduced amount of attention compared to hospitals and schools. In assessing the mental health guiding principle in Nigeria, Odebiyi (1991) exposed a general poor social viewpoint from the government of those who are of the mentally ill. It has been debated by mental health professionals that incarceration leads to psychosomatic punishment for offenders (Weinstein, 1998). Similarly, an astronomical percentage of mental and health problems such as post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety and an inclination to self-harm and suicide have been reported (Chukwuma, 1994). Brundt, (2012) states that "incarceration can exacerbate illness, increase the risk of suicide, and cause long-term psychological damage" (p. 541). Yet these sufferers

have insufficient access to health care services (Agunbiade, 2010). Similarly, children's parents serving jail terms experience adverse psychological development (Hairston, 1998).

When ex-offenders are contrasted with other people from the wider society, ex-offenders are the most disheartened and harassed when they are incarcerated for the very first time (Porporino, 1988). Additionally, inmates are economically inefficient, bodily unoccupied, passionately distressed, or traumatized (Damabazau, 1999; Oshodi, 2010). Adeola (1999) opines that incarceration is likely not to do any good for the offender as it is used as a concluding alternative through punishing the offender and keeping the society away from them. Enuke (2001) found that some offenders in Nigeria were admitted into the correctional centre in shackles and chains, which suggests degrading treatment. Lillyquist (1980) stresses that denying people of their liberty for an appreciable period and otherwise treating them poorly during incarceration is believed to be counterproductive.

A study conducted by Sabbath and Cowles (1992) outlined the impact of the long-term incarceration of inmates. The results divulge that the majority of challenges of long-term incarceration include: lack of visitation, distance from loved ones, and lack of concealment within the correctional centre vicinity. Alemika (1983) depicts correctional centre life as involving loss of freedom and significant social relationships and responsibility, loss of contact with the wider society, compulsory enslavement, feeling a sense of futility, tedium, oppression, loss of decision-making, and imposed lethargy. As a result, offenders find themselves reduced to a stage of living near exposed survival and whatsoever physical pain this denial may involve (Grasham & Sheldon, 1970). Grasham and Sheldon (1970) further submit that ostensibly this has "deeper psychological significance as a basic attack on the inmate's conception of his own personal adequacy" (p. 15). These problems point to the various forms of deprivation found within the correctional centre system which applies to the inmates in Nigerian correctional centres (Solomon *et al.*, 2014). Concerning the unique encounter of inmates, Alabi, and Aalbi (2011), attest that offenders may be cramped in the same circumscribed place, nevertheless, each of them has a unique encounter and problems.

Alabi and Alabi (2011) observe that the discomfort of incarceration goes further than mere imprisonment or reintegration of the criminal to include indescribable

adversity, loss, reconsideration, displeasure, and sadness. Because of the above, Flanagan (1983) categorized five forms of deprivations that felons encounter during incarceration. These include missing somebody; missing social life; being worried about ways to cope when they regain freedom; an opinion that their lives are being wasted and feeling sexually unfulfilled. Ahn-Redding (2007) posits that a correctional centre encounter is injurious to one's sense of self-esteem and endangers inmates, thus leading to physical depreciation. Ahn-Redding's study (2007) further revealed that most felons experience loss of security. This implies that incarcerated inmates may be made to live in the same cell with other inmates who have a history of mental illness or still suffering one, thereby endangering their lives. Also, Uche *et al.* (2011) posit that adjustment of inmates in Nigeria is a major problem which is largely due to the fact society views such released offenders as non-conformists who are not acquiescent to correction. Thus, "such discharged person inmates are, therefore, stigmatized and treated as social pariahs" (Uche *et al.*, 2011, p.15). Furthermore, ex-inmates experience several challenges in securing occupation, education, and housing in their community (Clear, 2007; Petersilia, 2003; Pager, 2003; Western *et al.*, 2001). For example, in Nigeria, these problems persist as training in most correctional centres in Nigeria cannot prepare them for productive employment or even secure employment upon release due to their records (Tenibiaje, 2010). Additionally, inmates face alienation from the political process as they are disenfranchised (Laub & Sampson, 2003; Western, 2006).

Hautaluoma and Scott (1973) reveal that during incarceration, inmates are incarcerated for a long phase of time, and achievement, values of honesty, kindness, and religious devotion are decreased. Sometimes during incarceration, inmates are exposed to harsh regimes designed to discipline them. Hester and Eglin (1990) postulate that are consequences of solitary confinement is seen as permanently disabling. Mallery (2005) suggests that inmates are denied certain things which include liberty of movement, but it should be taken into consideration that denial beyond this is open to moral evaluation. Experience in the correctional centre is seen to have various consequences which largely depend on the kind of individual who has been deprived of certain rights such as liberty (Novo-Corti & Barreiro-Gen, 2015). Logan (2007) states that incarceration has some perceived stigmatization of inmates which erodes social unity and

likewise undermines the civil liberty of the inmates, and may harm family relations, social networks, and inmates' positions before offending (Novo-Corti & Barreiro-Gen, 2015). Incarceration also may punctuate key life transitions in early adulthood, leaving ex-inmates to "suffer both legal and social stigma" (Pettit & Lyons, 2002, p. 51).

Relative to the above, Latessa and Holsinger (1998) state that inmates who have spent an extensive amount of duration in the correctional centre are more likely to recidivate than those who stayed less in correctional centre.

Hester and Englin (1990) state that inmates are well aware that they will be labelled as despicable pariahs by members of the community they are expected to reintegrate into. Once an individual is incarcerated, he/she practically becomes isolated from friends and family, employer, and also immediate community (Gillespie, 2004). In Nigeria, incarceration is generally humiliating and implies absolute parting from family members and loved ones (Durosaro, 2002). Knoll (2006) states that the environment in the correctional centre leads to destruction in self-initiative and autonomy, thereby leading to long-term damage to psychological health. Administrative segregation is a persistent representation of negative effects in a correctional centre population (Rhodes, 2005). This results in degradation of the image which includes situations like wearing institutional clothing rather than personal clothing, being locked in cells, and not called by name but rather by numbers (Bowker, 1982). As a result of the above, an ex-inmate is likely to indulge in reoffending behaviour due to poor rehabilitation in the correctional centre due to the absence of vocational training and formal education during incarceration (Curtis, 2005).

Further, incarceration is likely to have an undesirable consequence on the social capital inmates, to a situation where inmates establish connections with other offenders, hence leading to a possibility of engaging in further crime due inability to secure payable jobs as well as weakening of job referral networks and employer discrimination (Lyon *et al.*, 2001). According to Logan (2007), "most ex-felons end up homeless and have no option than roam the streets, which creates a situation for further re-offending thereby leading them back to jail" (p. 41). Many inmates have attested to how the diverse rubric and code of practice from correctional administration have humiliated their qualities and self-worth (Heney, 1990).

Petersilia (2003) states that inmates continue to be illiterate, unskillful, inexperienced, and most lack any form of support from members of their family. Overall, interaction with the criminal justice system which results in incarceration reduces a person's ability to apply and compete for a steady occupation. However, Kling (2006) points out that research in the past on the implication of incarceration on labour market outcomes has revealed a huge implication of incarceration which has laid more emphasis on the effect of serving some period in a correctional centre versus serving no time.

The above view is supported by Apel and Sweeten (2010), who suggest that an ex-inmate has difficulty securing employment, thereby jeopardizing their work prospects of the post-incarcerated population. However, ex-offenders can be successfully hired for public sector jobs (Henry & Milovanovic, 1999). This means that discrimination against ex-offenders by private employers will be tagged as unreasonable, wicked, and discriminatory. Thus, insufficient consideration and kindness to inmates can only upsurge the rate of recidivism instead of controlling it (Imhabekhai, 2002). Braman (2002) indicates that the negative consequences of incarceration sometimes go beyond the incarcerated inmate. This may be due to factors like the inability to secure paying jobs or elective positions (Udoh, 2011). Conclusively, incarceration in Nigeria contributes diminutively to the wrongdoer and their family (Atere, 2000).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The reason for imposing incarceration is to punish offenders for violating societal norms and values. As a means of punishment, it is deliberately inflicted on an offender, which serves as a deterrence to would-be offenders. This could help in inculcating good morals on offenders, thereby altering him or her from a nonconforming individual to a conforming one. Despite the good intention of imposing incarceration, it has contradicted its cardinal objective which has resulted in some unintended consequences such as inability to secure employment as a result of stigmatization, aiding the collapse of marriages, loss of self-esteem, inability to seek elective positions and high moral decadence amongst the progeny of inmates. These problems are further compounded as several ex-inmates are frustrated with their desire of finding a legitimate means of livelihood. More often than none, it has lured ex-inmates returning to crime as the only means of survival. Due to this, most convicted inmates ended up being a recidivist leading to frequent apprehension and

incarceration. Despite some of these problems experienced by convicted inmates, it has attracted minimal consideration from the government, penal institutions, and the wider society. With the above-stated consequences of incarceration, penal institutions in collaboration with the government should adequately inculcate the positive goal of incarceration on inmates, on the contrary, it has served as a punishment ground with degrading treatment imposed on inmates by prison officials coupled with the dehumanizing state of most penal institutions. This article concludes that incarceration has a long term effect on the positive life of offenders and recommends that concerted efforts should be made in reintegrating ex-offenders, discouraging the idea of tagging, and make ample efforts on how ex-offenders can secure payable jobs upon regaining freedom.

REFERENCES

- Adegbam, A., & Uche, C. I. (2015). Good Governance and Prison Congestion in Nigeria: The Case of Maximum Security Prison, Ilesa. *Public Policy and Administration*, 3(2), 27-35. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ppar.v3n2a3>
- Adesanya, A., Ohaeri, J. U., Ogunlesi, A. O., Adamson, T. A., & Odejide, O. A. (1997). Psychoactive substance abuse among inmates of a Nigerian prison population. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 47(1), 39-44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716\(97\)00067-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716(97)00067-7)
- Agbahowe, S. A., Ohaeri, J. U., Ogunlesi, A. O., & Osahon, R. (1998). Prevalence of psychiatric morbidity among convicted inmates in a Nigerian prison community. *East African medical journal*, 75(1), 19-26.
- Agomoh, U. (1996). Decongesting the Nigerian prisons and police cells: A handbook of practical strategies for the remand population. *Prisoners Rehabilitation and Welfare Action*.
- Ahire, P. T. (1990, June). The Nigerian prison system: A social history. In *National Seminar on Prison Reform in Nigeria, Abuja FCT* (pp. 18-20).
- Ahn-Redding, H. (2007). *The Million Dollar Inmate: The Financial and Social Burden of Nonviolent Offenders*. Lexington Books.
- Ajayi, J. O. (2012). Nigeria prisons and the dispensation of justice. *AFRREV IJAH: An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1(3), 208-233.
- Alabi, T., & Alabi, S. O. (2011). The pains of imprisonment: a sociological analysis of the experiences of inmates in Ilorin and Kirikiri prisons. *Journal of Research in Peace, Gender and Development*, 1(8), 235-241.
- Alemika, E. E. (1983). The smokescreen, rhetorics and reality of penal incarceration in Nigeria. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 7(1-2), 137-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.1983.9688770>
- Alemika, E.E.O. (1987). Professionalism in the Nigerian prison service in the Nigerian prison service and the public. Abuja: *Nigerian Prison Service*.
- Alemika, E.E.O., & Chukwuma, I. C. (2001). *Juvenile justice administration in Nigeria*. Philosophy and practice. Lagos: Centre for Law Enforcement Education.
- Ali, G. (2011). Challenges of the convicts' rehabilitation process in Nigeria: A case study of Goron-Dutse and Central Prison, Kano State. *Knowledge Review*, 23(3), 122-129.
- Apel, R., & Sweeten, G. (2010). The impact of incarceration on employment during the transition to adulthood. *Social problems*, 57(3), 448-479. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2010.57.3.448>

- Arisukwu, O. C., Adejumo, Y., & Asamu, F. (2015). Causes and Effects of Violence in Nigerian Prisons. *Journal of Social science and humanities*, 1(4), 368-373.
- Asokhia, M. O., & Agbonluae, O. O. (2013). Assessment of rehabilitation services in Nigerian prisons in Edo State. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(1), 224-230.
- Bentham, J. (1996). *The collected works of Jeremy Bentham: An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Clarendon Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198205166.book.1>
- Bonn, R. L. (1984). *Library of congress cataloguing in publication data criminology*. McGraw-Hill.
- Bowker, L. H. (1982). *Corrections, the Science and the Art*. New York: Macmillan.
- Braman, D. (2002). Families and incarceration (*Doctoral dissertation*, Yale University). <https://doi.org/10.1037/e513872006-001>
- Brandt, A. L. (2012). Treatment of persons with mental illness in the criminal justice system: A literature review. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51(8), 541-558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2012.693902>
- Briedland, D., Cushin, B., & Atherto, C.R. (2009). *Contemporary social work*: New York: Macmillan.
- Calbertson, R. C. (1977). Corrections: the state of the art. *Journal of criminal justice*, 5 (1), 3a. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(77\)90023-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(77)90023-X)
- Careson National Research conference on adult education community held at the University
- Carney, L. P. (1980). *Corrections, treatment and philosophy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chaturvedi, J. C. (2006). *Penology and Correctional Administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chukwudi, F. (2012). Challenges of reforms in the Nigerian Prison System: lessons from the USA and South Africa. *Journal of social science and public policy*, 4(9), 35-46.
- Chukwuma Sr, C. (1997). Environmental lead exposure in Africa. *Ambio*, 399-403.
- Clear, T. R. (1997). Ten unintended consequences of the growth in imprisonment. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 12.
- Clemmer, D. (1950). Observations on imprisonment as a source of criminality. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, 41, 311. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1138066>
- Conklin, J. E. (2001). *Criminology* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cressey, D. R. (1961). *The prison: Studies in international organization and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Curtis, P. (2005). MPS Condemn Prison Education. Retrieved on, 11(07), 2014.
- Dambazau, A. B. (1999). The growth of crime, its prevention and control in Nigeria. *Issues in crime prevention and control in Nigeria*, 1-9.
- Davies, M. (1993). *Punishing criminals: Developing community-based intermediate sanctions*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Drake, D. (2012). Prisons, punishment and the pursuit of security. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137004833>
- Durosaro, I. A. (2002). Counselling needs of female prisoners in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 8(1), 154-161. <https://doi.org/10.4314/njgc.v8i1.36961>
- Eglin, P., & Hester, S. (1992). Category, predicate and task: The pragmatics of practical action.
- Ekpe, C. P., & Mamah, S. C. (1997). *Social work in Nigeria: A colonial heritage*. Unik Oriental Prints Limited.
- Enuku, U. E. (2001). Humanizing the Nigerian prison through literacy education: Echoes from afar. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 18-22.
- Esiri, M. O. (2016). The upsurge of recidivism and the penitentiary institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Journal Business and Social Sciences*, 184-193.
- Fitzgerald, M. (1977). *Prisoners in revolt*. Penguin.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1983). Correlates of institutional misconduct among state prisoners: A research note. *Criminology*, 21(1), 29-40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1983.tb00249.x>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Tr. A. Sheridan. London: Allen Lane Penguin.
- Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality therapy*. New York: Macmillan.
- Grasham, M.S., & Sheldon, A. W. (1970). *The inmate social code*. In M.E. Wolfgang al. *Sociology of punishment and correction* (pp. 15). NY: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Haag, V. D. G. (1985). *The crime of punishment*. New York: The Viky press.
- Hairston, C. F. (1998). *The forgotten parent: Understanding the forces that influence incarcerated fathers' relationships with their children*. Child welfare, 77(5), 617.
- Hart, L. (1972). *Punishment and responsibility*. Sage Publisher. Prentice-Hall
- Hartinger, W. et al. (1973). *Corrections: A component of the criminal justice system*. California: Good year publishing Company, Inc.
- Hassan, F. (2010). *The agony of Nigerian prison inmates*. Retrieved May 31, 2015.
- Heney, J. (1990). *Report on self-injurious behaviour in the Kingston Prison for Women*. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Holz, W. C., & Azrin, N. H. (1961). Discriminative properties of punishment 1. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 4(3), 225-232. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.1961.4-225>
- Ibadan Ibadan Nig. 5 – 8 December.
- Igbo, E. U. M. (2007). *Introduction to Criminology*. Nsukka. University of Nigeria Press.
- Ikoh, M. U. (2011). The Nigerian prison system and the failure of rehabilitation: An examination of incarceration alternatives. In *The Nigerian Academic Forum* (Vol. 20, pp. 1-20).
- Imhabekhai, C. I. (2002). An appraisal of prison services in Edo State Nigeria. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 5-8.
- Issa, A. A., & Akinfenwa, O. S. (2018). Prison Reformation, Observation and Rehabilitation of Convicts in Oke-Kura Prison, Ilorin. *Kwasu Journal of Humanities*, 1(1), 87-97.
- Jeffery, C. R. Criminal behaviour and learning theory. (1965). *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 231-234. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1140514>
- Justice, C. (2006). Section News. *Criminal justice*, 63.
- Kling, J. R. (2006). Incarceration length, employment, and earnings. *American Economic Review*, 96(3), 863-876. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.3.863>
- Lacey, N. (1994). State punishment: political principles and community values. *Psychology Press*.
- Latessa, E. I., & Holsinget, A. (1998). Programs: Assessing outcome and quality. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 2, 22-29.
- Latessa, E. J., & Latessa, E. J. (2001). *Correctional Contexts: Contemporary and classical readings*. Roxbury Pub.
- Lillyquist, M. J. (1980). *Understanding and changing criminal behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lippke, R. L. (2002). Toward a theory of prisoners' rights. *Ratio Juris*, 15(2), 122-145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9337.00201>
- Mabuza, A., & Roelofse, C. (2013). A study of contributory factors towards recidivism among incarcerated youth in the Barberton Youth Development Centre, South Africa. *Acta Criminologica: African Journal of Criminology & Victimology*, 26(1), 49-70.
- Madaki, M. (2011). A Study of the Legal Rights of Convicted Prisoners and the Unintended Consequences of Incarceration in Kano Central and G/Dutse Prisons, Nigeria. unpublished *PhD dissertation* submitted to the Department of Sociology, Bayero University, Kano.
- Melvin, A. O. (2013). Prison health in Nigeria: A sociological discourse. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 7(2), 38-41. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR08.009>

- Murphy, J. (1995). *Punishment, and rehabilitation* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wardsworth.
- Nigerian Correctional Service Manual (2019). About the service. *Government Press, Abuja, Nigeria*.
- Novo-Corti, I., & Barreiro-Gen, M. (2015). Walking from imprisonment towards true social integration: Getting a job as a key factor. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54(6), 445-464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1055036>
- Obioha, E. E. (1995). Prison culture in Nigeria; A study of life within Agodi Prison Community, Ibadan (*Doctoral dissertation, M. Sc Dissertation*, Unpublished. Ibadan: Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan).
- Odebiyi, A. (1991). Appraisal of the mental health care policy in Nigeria. *Ibadan Development Policy Centre*.
- Ogwezzy, M. C. (2011). From reformation to deformation: An approach towards sustainable development of the defective prison system in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(7), 269-283.
- Okochi, C. A., Oladepo, O., & Ajuwon, A. J. (2000). Knowledge about aids and sexual behaviours of inmates of Agodi prison in Ibadan, Nigeria. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*, 19(4), 353-362. <https://doi.org/10.2190/CJLC-DGMM-ME43-FDXN>
- Omagbemi, C. O., & Odunewu, A. O. (2008). An appraisal of library services provision to prison inmates in Nigeria. *Information, society and justice journal*, 1(2), 245-254. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sijs.v7i2.40604>
- Omoni, G., & Ijeh, S. (2009). Qualitative education for prisoners: a panacea to effective rehabilitation and integration into society. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, 2(1), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ejc.v2i1.52651>
- Opara, A. I. "Criminology and penology." Owerri: Cel-Bez & Co. Publishers (1998).
- Osefo, N. F. (1990). The Need for Counsellors in Correctional Institutions in Nigeria. *The Counsellor*, 10(1), 40-47.
- Osinbanjo, F., & Kalu, C. (1990). The constitutionality of the death penalty under Nigeria law. *Federal Ministry of Justice, Nigeria*, 6.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American journal of sociology*, 108(5), 937-975. <https://doi.org/10.1086/374403>
- Pepitone, A. (1975). Social psychological perspectives on crime and punishment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(4), 197-216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb01021.x>
- Pettit, B., & Lyons, C. (2002). *The consequences of incarceration on employment and earnings: Evidence from Washington State*. Unpublished, University of Washington.
- Porporino, L. (1988). *Criminal justice*. London: Macmillian.
- Potts, J. (2000). HIV/AIDS in federal prisons. Canada's response. *HIV prevention plus!*, 2(2), 1.
- Pursley, R. D. (1997). *Introduction to criminal justice*. California: Glencoe Press.
- Quinney, R. (1979). *Criminology* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Little Brown and Company.
- Ramsborham, D. (2004). The shocking state of Britain's prisons and the need for visionary change.
- Recher, L., Tanaka, T., Sykes, J. A., Yumoto, T., Seman, G., Young, L., & Dmochowski, L. (1966). Further studies on the biological relationship of murine leukaemia viruses and kidney lesions of mice with leukaemia induced by these viruses. *National Cancer Institute monograph*, 22, 459.
- Rhode, L. *What is wrong with prison? Heart and minds*. (2005), Network. Oaks Publishers
- Rowls, J. (1969). "Two concepts of rules." (Ed.), *The philosophy of punishment*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Ruddell, R. (2004). *America behind bars: Trends in imprisonment, 1950 to 2000*. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Sabbath, M.J., & Cowles, E.L. (1992). Problems associated with long-term incarceration. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 4 (2), 9-11.
- Solomon, O. J., Nwankwoala, R., & Ushi, V. (2014). The plight of female prisoners in Nigeria and the dilemma of health rights violations. *Asian J Soc Sci Humanit*, 3, 152-161.
- Stanko, S., Gillespie, W., & Crews, G. A. (2004). *Living in prison: A history of the correctional system with an insider's view*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Stern, V. (1998). *A Sin Against the Future: Imprisonment in the World*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of criminology*. Altamira Press.
- Tenibajae, D. J. (2010). Counselling for productive employment of prisons inmate. *European journal of educational studies*, 2(3), 193-202.
- Thomas, J., & Milovanovic, D. (1999). *Revisiting Jailhouse Lawyers: An Excursion into Constitutive Criminology*. Henry, S., and Milovanovic, D. (1999), 227-246.
- Uche, I. B., Uche, O. A., Ezumah, N. N., Ebue, M. O., Okafor, A. E., & Ezege, B. N. (2015). Effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in Nigerian prisons: A study of the perception of inmates in Enugu prison. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 164. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p164>
- Udoh, N. (2011) *The adjustment counselling and prisoner rehabilitation in Nigeria: Towards effective penal community development*.
- Ugwumba, N. C. F., & Usang, E. E. (2014). The challenges of rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-convicts from Nigerian prisons. *Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 3(2), 59-64.
- Watson, R., Stimpson, A., & Hostick, T. (2004). Prison health care: a review of the literature. *International journal of nursing studies*, 41(2), 119-128. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489\(03\)00128-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489(03)00128-7)
- Weinstein, S. P. (1998). Community prosecution: Community policing's a legal partner. *FBI L. Enforcement Bull.*, 67, 19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e312992004-005>
- Western, B. (2006). *Punishment and inequality in America*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Yakubu, I.L. (1999) Prison education in a democratic society. *Paper presented at the 5th annual*.

Received on 10-08-2020

Accepted on 14-09-2020

Published on 22-02-2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.65>

© 2021 Amali et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.