EFFECTIVENESS OF PRISON DECONGESTION PROGRAMS IN KENYA: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Mosoti D., * *Mbuba J. M.*[2] *and Kiboro C. N.*[1]
[1]*Department of Humanities, Chuka University, P.O. Box 109 Chuka*
[2]*2101 E Coliseum Blvd, Neff 260H Fort Wayne, Indian 46805, USA. +1-260-580-1618*
*[*]*denmosoti@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT
This paper analyses prison decongestion programs in Kenya and their effects on prison populations in the country. The analysis is based on primary data collected from a sample of 266 prison officers and 16 probation officers. The analysis shows that overall, prison decongestion programs contribute to a reduction of prison population. Based on the evidence generated, the paper recommends adoption of community-based sentences especially on petty crime offenders to reduce overcrowding in prisons.

KEY WORDS: Decongestion Programs, Prison, Population, Community Sentence,

INTRODUCTION

Prison overcrowding is one of the major problems facing correctional institutions in Kenya today. This situation has been attributed to delays in the dispensation of the criminal justice, increased recidivism, overdependence by the courts on imprisonment as the primary punishment, longer prison term sentences, and insufficient prison capacity. The problem of prison overcrowding is also attributed to issues related to the roles of prison sentences in the system of criminal sanctions and criminal sentencing (Irungu & Muchori, 2018). Excessive use of prison sentences has been cited as the key contributor to the increasing population in prisons (Blumstein & Piquero, 2007). World Prison Brief Data (2022) suggests that there are 134 established penal institutions in Kenya with a cumulative accommodation capacity of 34,000 prisoners. Yet the average inmates' population is 58,887, of which 34,744 are convicted offenders and 24,143 are remandees. This shows that prisons in Kenya are too congested.

In Kenya, people imprisoned as of 2020 totaled around 86,000 (Kamer, 2022). Ochien'g (2018) posits that of the total arrests conducted, 30 percent are converted to charges in court, and 70 percent are sentenced to a prison term. Notable among these imprisoned people is that most of the offenses committed are petty offenses that would otherwise attract a fine or be placed on probation. Kamer (2022) further alludes that majority of prisoners composed of those unconvicted totaling 56,813 people.

Overcrowding compromises accommodation standards for inmates, healthcare, and rehabilitative services. Another consequence of prison overcrowding is the budget constraints, which, in effect, affect the criminal policy that determines the course of criminal law and punishment. Prison overcrowding has led to poor health outcomes for inmates in prison. Anglin (2023) posits that the conditions in Kenyan prisons are horrible. The hygiene is wanting, high cases of starvation and inadequate or lack of health care, and re-socialization of minor offenders by hard-core criminals leading to high cases of violence in prison, all occasioned by increasing number of incarcerated inmates.

Problems posed by prison overcrowding have resulted in urgent calls for an effective solution, including proposals for alternatives to imprisonment to counter overcrowding in prisons (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2012). As a result, decongestion programs were institutionalized in the prisons

to bring a worthwhile solution in managing the prison population.

It is against this background that the government of Kenya introduced programs aimed at decongesting prisons. According to the Kenya Crime & Safety Report (2008), the decongestion program aimed at reducing the number of petty convicted offenders and remand inmates by 20 percent from 3,816 to 3 053 by December 2008. To decongest the prisons, non-custodial sentences such as community services and committal to probation hostels were proposed as alternatives to prison terms. The program involves revision of sentences of prisoners by the High Court, and it only affects the convicted offenders and not those in custody awaiting trial. Offenders serving a sentence of three years or less are eligible for this program, as well as a person serving a less than three years' balance of a longer sentence.

Literature Review

Decongestion programs are programs designed to manage the prison population. They are all known as Community Corrections Services. Decongestion programs are alternative sentences enforced on guilty adults either by a court instead of imprisonment or by a parole board after offenders' release from penal institutions (Rhine, Petersilia, & Reitz, 2017). Community correctional service has been introduced in Eastern Europe, different countries of the former Soviet Union, and Africa, and they are employed by courts to punish and rehabilitate non-serious offenders (PRI, 2015). Community service involves the lawbreaker working on an unpaid basis in the community as a way of retribution for the offenses committed. is aimed at profiting that community for a period equivalent to the imprisonment term an offender has been punished to serve (Community Service Orders Act, 1998). It involves implementing and managing non-custodial measures for offenders (Griffiths & Murdoch, 2009). Community correctional services provides a sentence outside the prison and the Community Service Orders Act, No. 10 of 1998

makes it possible for Courts to issue an order necessitating an offender to do some community service.

Community service was initially designed to reduce the excessive use of imprisonment and emphasize the application of non-custodial means or fines for offenders who had committed less serious offenses such as non-violent acts, petty theft, and traffic violations (Jeffrey & Lisa, 2007). The scheme has provided the court with the power to command offenders to perform some duties within the community for a given period. In some parts of the world, community service orders schemes have been developed as an alternative sanction. For instance, the USA in North America, Ireland in Western Europe, and New Zealand in Australia have incorporated the schemes in their sentencing (UNODC, 2012).

The community based sentence does not involve the denial of the offender's liberty, who need not be put in prison either due to the conditions surrounding their offense, situation, or personality (Rob, 2015). Instead, the community corrections programs have multiple objectives: ensuring good rehabilitation services, economic efficiency, surveillance, and ensuring that offenders are made accountable for their offenses (Rhine, Petersilia, & Reitz, 2017). Serving a non-custodial sentence can aid to manage the prison populations and ensure that offenders positively payback to the community for the acts committed to the community (PRI, 2015). More importantly, it ensures that the problems that might have led the offender to offend are well treated.

According to the Centre on Sentencing & Corrections (2013), Community-based corrections supervision is inexpensive as compared to imprisonment, and this can be a basis of positive reformation for communities. The programs should be well-sourced with staff to incorporate efficient supervisory practices and be supported entirely by the Government.

By doing this, the safety of the public, which is mainly affected by the large numbers of people getting back to society from prison, can be improved, and criminals can be well prevented from reoffending in the neighborhoods.

Community-based correctional programs are expected to reduce the prison population, but this cannot occur instantly. The process can take a long time. American Academy of Paediatrics, (APP), (2008) points out that Community-based programs alongside community partners are more interested in evaluating the kind of work they do in their communities. Therefore, constant monitoring and evaluation are emphasized. Conducting a regular evaluation of the community-based supervision programs ensures that offenders are well-integrated into society, which is the crucial goal of entire supervision (American Legislative Exchange Council, 2015).

Rockville (2005) argues that regular evaluation of decongestion programs is essential in ensuring their suitability in meeting the wants of criminals serving a community-based sentence. The evaluation also ensures that maximum results are realized. However, the inadequacy of resources has amounted to the cancellation of the evaluation of the decongestion programs. APP (2008) alludes that the sustainability of the programs is propped up by a prudently planned and well-executed program evaluation. The study thus reveals that the programs have not been very efficient due to inadequacy in appraisal.

According to the Centre on Sentencing & Corrections (2013), supervising offenders in the community can be a sure way of responding to criminal behaviour for both communities, justice-involved and individuals. This can only be possible if the community correctional is adequately resourced and carefully planned. Therefore, the success of any community -based sentence as a non-custodial sentence depends on different efforts designed to reshape and meet the needs of of the correctional programs. The expectations of success may not be felt if there are no resources needed to accomplish the task. Also, the program should not be geared towards redirecting more offenders into existing systems. It should aim at offender reformation and prison population management. This may not guarantee to save on the cost of imprisonment or the safety outcomes of the public.

Community Based Sentence remain one of the most extensively used sanctions in the United States, as revealed by recent U.S. national estimates (Brandon, Hayden, Alicia & Nicolette, 2009). It remains the most frequently used service (American Correctional Association [A.C.A.], 2006). In 2006, the number of offenders serving a probation sentence throughout the U.S. was more than 4.2 million. This number increased to 5.1 million people in 2008, while 84 percent of the 5.1 million offenders were adults placed under community supervision. . Glaze and Bonczar (2007) further posits that the totals of the offenders placed under probation supervision were slightly higher than double the number of criminals imprisoned in U.S. jails and prisons. The probation service is widely used in the U.S. as an alternative to imprisonment, which remarkably decongests the prisons and saves on the State's economic resources. This is shown by the highest number of offenders serving a probation order. From the literature, it is evident that offenders placed on probation were many and reduced prison overcrowding. Nevertheless, in Kenya, statistics indicate that prisons are overpopulated despite the program's applicability.

It is evident from this study that the U.S.A. widely embraces the use of CBS as an alternative to custodial sentences. According to the Bureau of Justice, in 2016, 4,537,100 offenders were placed on probation in the United States. This figure makes up 84 percent of the population supervised in the community (Archambeau, 2011).

The number of inmates serving a non-custodial sentence is higher than those in prison, thus cutting the cost of prison sentences and reducing the population. This is an indication that if well utilized, the program can help manage the prison population. Despite its use in Kenya, the populations are high, which calls for the need to assess how they effectively reduce the prison population.

In Europe, non-custodial sentences such as community service orders as an alternative to the incarceration period are likely to be used (Muliluvuori, 2001). For instance, in Ireland, most offenders sent to prison are for short periods, and therefore, CBS programs are an effective measure to imprisonment. The prison population has reduced to a definite number. It is noted that in 2014, 90.2 % of offenders sentenced for imprisonment totaled 11,596 and were for less than twelve months (Irish Prison Service, 2015). Following this massive number of short-period sentences, the Criminal Justice Community Service Amendment Act 2011 was introduced in Ireland. This Act required courts to consider a committal of all petty offenders to serve Community Service Orders (CSOs). This seemed very appropriate for all offenders sentenced to an imprisonment of twelve months and below (O'Hara & Rogan 2015). The committals were supposed to work in the community unpaid instead of a prison term completing between 40 and 240 hours. Thus, from the past to almost current, the prison population has been reduced, thus addressing the overcrowding challenges as alluded in the literature. This is, however, contrary to Kenya, where the prisons are overpopulated despite the sentencing of the offenders to CSO.

Community correctional services is considered the main penalty in the penal code of Tunisia. This service can be obligated on all lawbreakers and misdemeanors punishable by incarceration of less than one year but not for recidivism cases (PRI, 2015). The offender has a right to be informed by the court that they have a right to either accept the community service or refuse it. The court should well record the offender's response. This measure is directed towards reducing clogging the prisons with inmates. Overcrowding the prisons with inmates undermines the rehabilitation programs. Therefore, petty offenders are sentenced to non-custodial sanctions, thus limiting competition of the rehabilitation facilities with those serving long-term sentences. However, in Kenya, there is scanty information on how the community correction services have helped reduce the overpopulated prisons despite its application, which informs this study.

Tanzania is cited as one of the countries that impose community service orders on offenders who had already served their prison term beforehand. Although the move to divert more offenders from prison to community services appears to decongest the prisons, the Tanzanian prisons prefer to retain those offenders eligible for a CS to provide labor in the prison farms (PRI 2015). Thus, they consider committals, irrespective of whether they meet the threshold for an alternative sentence or not, first to serve a prison term before they can finally allow them to serve community service. There is a likelihood of the offenders to experience the adverse impacts of imprisonment. It is further argued that the sentencing magistrates felt that the offenders must feel the pinch of prison as a deterrent and that they can appreciate the CS once there.

In practice, the Kenyan government observed that prison congestion did exist, and consequently, imposition of non-custodial sentences was recommended. The establishment of the community sentences was recommended by the commission as a more humanitarian measure and could address the prison overcrowding (Ndombi, 2014).

The emphasis on the CSO Program stems from its perceived benefits which involve rehabilitation of less severe offenders within the community they were drawn from. Most of these offenders are poor and marginalized and cannot afford imposed court fines (UNAFRI, 2011). The CSO Program has an economic benefit to the country since it saves the taxpayers money spent on petty offenders in prisons (PRI & NCRC, 2015).

The program, if well implemented, is advantageous in both social and economic benefits. The CSO projects have raised revenue for Kenya's Government. Despite these vast advantages of CSO and its applicability as an alternative sentence, it is not clear whether the courts decide to sentence the inmates to serve a custodial sentence for provisions of services in prisons that leads to overcrowding.

An overview of the Probation Services in Kenya conducted by Okech (2015) reveals that Kenya experiences a severe problem of prison congestion. The study suggests that the solution to decongesting prisons lies outside the prisons; thus, C.S.O. is emphasized. According to the World Prison Brief Data (2018), the records from Kenya Prison indicate that in 2000, the total number of prisoners on pre-trial and those convicted was 40,010 inmates, and in 2002, there were 35,157 inmates. In 2004, the total number of prisoners on pre-trial and those convicted were 52,000 inmates, and in 2006, the population was 47,036 inmates.

In 2009, there were 19,936 inmates on pre-trial, 29,032 convicted, giving a total of 48,668 inmates. In 2008, there were a total of 46,150 inmates.

In 2010, there were 15,092 offenders on pre-trial, 33,259 convicted, giving 48,351 incarcerated populations. In 2012, there were 20,140 pre-trial, 36,040 convicted, giving a total of 53,000 incarcerated populations. In 2014, the total number of offenders on pre-trial and those convicted was 54 579 incarcerated populations. In 2016, the total number of prisoners on pre-trial and those convicted was 50,900, while in 2018, the number was 56,000. From these records, it is clear that the number of inmates in Kenyan prisons is still very high. Therefore, there is a need for alternatives to imprisonment to reduce prison congestion. This includes orders for probation and C.S.O

Ndombi (2014), argues that the CBS program has set itself to decongest the overcrowded Kenyan prisons. The program enables the offenders to do unpaid community work for the community's benefit to retribution for the crimes committed. The CBS aims to rehabilitate the offender and make him/her become a better person in the community. This ensures that the less-serious offenders are not taught how to commit more serious crimes. Literature shows that CSO alternatively decongests the overpopulated prisons if the concerned personnel well utilizes the program.

From the literature, it is evident that a large body of empirical research has focused on using the CSO program as non-custodial sentences with the objective of sentencing petty offenders to offer services to the community for the offenses committed. However, research on the extent to which these programs have helped to reduce the prison population has rarely been tested since it is widely used, particularly in Kenya. The prison population also still remains to be very high. No study has focused on whether the CSO is meeting the intended purpose of managing overcrowded prisons. This is by ensuring that the petty offenders are sentenced on a non-custodial basis, thus alleviating the wastage of rehabilitation resources on these offenders, which could otherwise be used on the offenders serving long-term sentences.

Objective
To assess the extent to which the prison decongestion programs have helped to reduce prison population in Kenya.

Methodology
The study adopted descriptive survey research design. Purposive sampling was used to sample three prisons from all the decongested prisons. The sample size was determined by Slovin's formulae at 95% confidence level and 0.05 population variable.

$$n = \frac{N}{(1 + Ne^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{800}{(1 + 800 \times 0.05^2)}$$

$$n = 266.67$$

$$n = 266$$

The three prison officers total sample was 266. Stratified sampling was used to classify the prison officers' population into Embu GK prison, Eldoret GK prison, and Kakamega GK prison. Using Kothari's formulae, proportionate sampling was used to sample 267 prison officers from the three prisons.

$$n_1 = n \times \frac{N_1}{N}$$

$$n_1 = 267 \times \frac{250}{800}$$

$$= 83.44$$

$$= 83$$

The sample size of Embu, Kakamega and Eldoret GK prison officers was 83, 100, and 83. Simple random sampling was then used to pick respondents from each of the three strata. Purposive sampling was used to select a sample of 16 probation officers. Closed ended questionnaire was used for data collection which was edited for completeness using SPSS prior to data analysis. Descriptive statistics and inferential linear regression analysis were used in data analysis.

RESULTS
Response Rate and Descriptive Analysis

There were 282 questionnaires administered to the respondents and 256 were successfully filled out and returned. Table 1 below presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables		Frequency	Percentages
Respondent Categories	Eldoret officers	67	80.72
	Embu officers	65	65.0
	Kakamega Officers	61	73.50
	Probation officers	9	56.25
Age	18-25 Years	56	27.7
	26-35 Years	65	32.2
	36 -45 Years	61	30.2
	46 -55 Years	20	9.9
Level of Education	Secondary level	86	42.6
	Bachelors	108	53.5
	Master's degree	6	3.0
	Any other	2	1.0
Rank of Officers	Officer in charge	1	0.5
	Senior prison officer	62	30.7
	Prison warders	120	59.4
	Any other	19	9.4

From Table 1, the response of Eldoret, Embu, Kakamega officers was 80.72%, 65.0%, 73.50%, and 56.25%, respectively. This implies that the response level of 71.63% was appropriate and commendable for analysis, making deductions, and recommendations. From the results, there exist significant differences between the age profiles of respondents. As presented in Table 1 above, most of the respondents who provided information were of the age bracket of 26-45 years. While prison and probation officers of all ages are present in the prisons and probation department, youths continue to be over-represented. Youths appear to be over-represented because they have completed secondary education, tertiary education, and some college education which is a minimum requirement for joining the prison and probation services. The study further established that the majority (53.5%) of the prison and probation officers had attained a bachelor's degree qualification, 38.1% of the officers had a secondary level of education. In comparison, only 3% of the sample population had a master's degree qualification.

Findings

The study sought to investigate the extent to which the decongestion programs have helped reduced prison population. The responses were recorded in the table below.

Table 2: Prison and Probation Officers' Responses on the Extent to which the Decongestion Programs have helped Reduced Prison Population

Statement	S.A		A		N		D		SD	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
The prison population was high before introduction of the decongestion programs	35	17.0	103	50	42	20.4	22	10.7	0	0
Application of CBS reduces over use of the custodial sentences	67	32.5	116	56.3	14	6.8	3	1.5	1	0.5
The use of CBS is a rapid response to crime and social disorders.	47	22.8	104	50.5	39	18.9	12	5.8	0	0
The judicial services emphasizes on the application of the CBS programs.	57	27.7	121	58.7	21	10.2	3	1.5	0	0
The Government has reduced ambiguity on the decongestion programs provisions.	45	21.8	136	66	12	5.8	7	3.4	2	1.0

The programs have improved the rehabilitation process	77	37.4	111	53.9	10	4.9	2	1.0	1	0.5
There is reduced criminal resocialization	67	32.5	119	57.8	7	3.4	7	3.4	2	1.0
The restorative justice has been improved	56	27.2	108	52.4	24	11.7	12	5.8	2	1.0

The results indicate that majority (67.0%) of the prison officers strongly agreed and agreed that the prison population was high before the introduction of the decongestion programs, 20.4% of the prison officers were neutral, while 10.7% of the sample population disagreed.

The study sought to investigate on whether application of CBS reduces the overuse of the custodial sentences that undermine human rights. The result revealed that majority (90.6%) of the prison and probation officers strongly agreed and agreed that CBS reduces the overuse of the custodial sentences. In comparison, 6.9%, 1.5%, and 0.5% were neutral, disagreed, and strongly disagreed. On whether the CBS has been a rapid response to crime and social disorder, the majority of the sample population, (72.8%) agreed and strongly agreed while 18.9% and 5.8% were neutral and disagreed. The result in Table 1 above further indicates that 58.7% of the sample population agreed that the judicial services emphasize the application of the CBS programs. 10.2% were neutral while 1.5 disagreed. With regard to whether reduced ambiguity on decongestion program provisions by the government has been effective as a measure to reduce the prison population, (66.0%) of the sample population strongly agreed and agreed while 4.4% strongly disagreed and disagreed.

The results in Table 2 above also reveals that majority (65.5%) of the prison and probation officers also strongly agreed and agreed that an intensive order set by the court to meet offenders' needs has been effective as a measure to decongest pris-

ons, 23.8% were neutral while 8.9% of the sample population disagreed. On whether an improved rehabilitation process has been effective as a measure to decongest prisons, most (91.3%) of the prison and probation officers strongly agreed and agreed, 4.9% were neutral while 1.5% of the sample population strongly disagreed and disagreed. From the results in Table 1, (90.3%) of sample population strongly agreed and agreed that decongestion programs have effectively reduced criminal re-socialization. 3.4% of the officers were neutral while 4.4% strongly disagreed and disagreed. With regard to whether the decongestion programs have improved restorative justice in the Criminal justice system, majority (79.6%) of the officers strongly agreed and agreed while 11.7% of the sample population were neutral. In comparison, 6.8% strongly disagreed and disagreed.

Inferential Analysis and Hypothesis Testing
To complement the descriptive results, the researcher conducted inferential analysis involving Karl Pearson Moment Correlation analysis, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and regression analysis. The researcher used a correlation matrix to test for the correlation between the variables. The dependent variable in this study was prison population while the independent variable was decongestion programs.

Karl Pearson Correlation Analysis

Karl Pearson Moment correlation helps test the relationship between the explanatory variable so that the strength of the variables can be determined. This test is essential because it informs which variable best explains the relationship between decongestion programs and prison population.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements about the extent to which the decongestion programs have helped reduce prison population. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Correlations between prison population and Decongestion Program

Variables	Correlations	Prison Population	Decongestion Programs
Prison Population	Pearson Correlation	1	.837
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.020
Decongestion Programs	Pearson Correlation	.837	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.

These results from Table 3 above show a significant relationship between Prison population and decongestion programs. The findings showed a positive correlation between the Prison population and Decongestion programs with a correlation coefficient of 0.837 (p-value 0.02 < 0.05), which is significant at a 5% significance level. These results imply that for every unit change in decongestion programs, there is a positive change in the prison population (decongestion).

These results are presented in Table 3 below.

Coefficient of Determination

The model summary below portrays the coefficient of determination for the model. The coefficient of determination R-square measures the explanatory power of the model. It shows the degree of association between the explanatory and explained variables.

Table 4: Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R-Square	Std. Error of the estimate
1	.797	.835	.269

From the model summary in Table 4 above, the model had an R-square of 0.840, which implies that 84% of the changes in prison population can be explained by the changes in predictor variable; decongestion programs. This implies that the explanatory variable is a good predictor of the model since only 16% of the changes in prison population can be explained by other factors not captured in the model and are taken care of by the error term. This is also in agreement with a study by Simon (2009) that decongestion programs and prison reforms greatly influence the prison population.

Analysis of Variance

The Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there was a regression relationship between decongestion programs, constraints to decongestion programs, prison reforms, and prison population. The F-ratio in the ANOVA table tested whether the overall regression model was significant and fit for inferences. The results obtained are presented below.

Table 5: ANOVA results

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	7.58	4	7.51	3.972	0.000
Residual	203.08	198	3.52		
Total	210.66	202			

Dependent variable: Prison Population
Independent variables: Decongestion Programs

The results indicate that F-statistics of 3.972 are significant since p-value 0.00< 0.05 at 5% significance level, implying that the overall model is significant for making inferences. This, therefore, shows that the model is fit for finding out the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

Regression Coefficients

To assess the effect of decongestion programs on the prison population, an OLS linear regression model was run with decongestion programs as explanatory variable while prison population was included as the explained variable. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Regression Coefficients Table

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value	t-prob
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.580	.189		3.079	.004
Decongestion Programs	.489	.093	.227	2.034	.000
F-statistics	2.912				[0.000]**

Table 6 presents the OLS regression results for the model. The F-statistic is 2.912 with a p-value of 0.000 < 0.05 at 5% significance level, implying the overall significance of the model. This means that decongestion program significantly influences the prison population. The regression coefficient (β) value of the computed scores of effect of decongestion programs on the prison population was 0.227 (t-prob 0.004< 0.05). The results show that decongestion programs positively contribute to a unit change in the prison population (β= -0.227). This means that ceteris paribus, a unit increase in decongestion programs like maximum utilization of the decongestion programs, adequate financial allocations by government, human resources, reduced ambiguity on its provisions, leads to depreciation of prison population by 22.7%. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant effect of decongestion programs on the prison population in Kenya was rejected, and thus the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Summary and Conclusion

The aim of this study was to determine the effectiveness of decongestion programs on the prison population in Kenya. The null hypothesis was that there was no statistically significant relationship between prison population and decongestion programs. The study affirms a statistically significant relationship between decongestion programs and the prison population. It was confirmed that the decongestion programs not only reduce prison population but also improves on the human rights of the inmates. Moreover, the programs rapidly respond to crime and disorder, thus ensuring that there are no or lessened cases of recidivism cases.

Recommendations

Drawing from the study findings discussed herein, the following recommendations were made:

The judiciary may emphasize the application of community-based sentences to reduce clogging prisons with petty offenders.

The government may allocate adequate finances to meet the decongested populations' needs; this lowers recidivism and cuts the cycle of prison overcrowding.

The government may need to deploy more prison officers in proportion to Prison administrative & management needs with priority given to areas with high prison populace to ensure adequate rehabilitation of inmates and thereby the reinforcement of decongestion programs.

References

American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) (2008). Evaluating Your Community-Based Program. www.aap.org/EvalResources

American Correctional Association. (2006, August 16). *Public correctional policy on probation*. Retrieved January 20, 2019, from http://www.aca.org/government/policy resolution/view.asp? ID=34

American Legislative Exchange Council, (2015). *Recidivism Reduction: Community-Based Supervision Alternatives to Incarceration*. https://www.alec.org/app/uploads/2015/04/ Recidivism-Reduction.pdf

Anglin Y., (2023). Prison Conditions in Kenya. https://borgenproject.org/prison-conditions-in-kenya/ Accessed on 4th May 2023

Archambeau, B. (2011). *"Factors that contribute to success of probationers: Probation officers' point of view"* (2011). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology

Blumstein, A. & Piquero, A.R. (2007): *Restore Rationality to Sentencing Policy. Criminology & Public Policy* 6 (2007), pp. 679-688.

Brandon, K. A, Hayden P. S, Alicia H.S, &Nicolette F. S, (2009). From the Inside: The Meaning of Probation to Probationers. *Criminal Justice Review* 2009 34: 80 originally published online 24 November 2008 DOI: 10.1177/0734016808325036

Centre on Sentencing & Corrections (2013). *"The Potential of Community Corrections to Improve Safety and Reduce Incarceration."* Vera Institute of Justice. July 2013. Available: http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources /downloads/potential-of-community-corrections.pdf

Community Service Orders Act, 1998.

Glaze, L. E., & Bonczar, T. P. (2007). *Probation and parole in the United States*, 2006. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Griffiths, C. T. & Murdoch, D. J. (2009). *Strategies and Best Practices against Overcrowding in Correctional Institutions.*

Irish Prison Service (2015). *Irish Prison Service Annual Report 2014*, Dublin: Irish Prison Service

Irungu. K.S., & Muchori. M.S. (2018). Embracing the New Technologies to Decongest KenyanPrisons.www.researchpublish.com/download.php? file=Embracing%20the%20 New%20Technologies-5581.pdf&act=book.

Jeffrey A.B, & Lisa R.M., (2007). The Effectiveness of Community Service Sentences Compared to Traditional Fines for Low-Level Offenders.

Kamer L., (2022). Number of convicted and un-convicted prisoners in Kenya 2010-2020. https://www.statista.com/statistics/1241807/number-of-convicted-and-unconvicted-prisoners-in-kenya/ Accessed on 7th May 2023.

Kenya Crime & Safety Report, (2008). *Overseas Security Advisory Council.* https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/kenya/safety-and-security. Accessed on 18th Dec 2018.

Muliluvuori, M. L., (2001). Recidivism among people sentenced to community service in Finland. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 2(1), 72-82.

Ndombi, C.S., (2014). Impact of Prison Rehabilitation Programs on Recidivists: A Case of Prisons in the North Rift Region of Kenya.

Ochien'g, A., (2018). 5,000 petty offenders set to leave jail. The Daily Nation. Published on Wednesday April 4 2018. Accessed on 24th January 2019.

O'Hara, K. & Rogan, M., (2015). Examining the Use of Community Service Orders as Alternatives to Short Prison Sentences in Ireland. *Irish Probation Journal,* 12, 22-45. http://www.iprt.ie/files/Irish_Probation_Journal.pdf.

Okech, C. (2015). The Evolving Probation Practice in Kenya: Past, Present and Prospect. http://www.cep-probation.org

Rhine, E. E., Petersilia, J., & Reitz, K. R. (2017). The future of parole release. *Crime and Justice*, *46*(1), 279-338. https://doi.org/10.1086/688616

Rob A., (2015). *On probation: models of good practice for alternatives to prison*. Penal Reform International.
Penal Reform International. (2015). *Global Prison Trends.* London: Penal Reform International.

Penal Reform International & National Crime Research Centre (2015). *The Delivery of Community-Based Sentences*: The Case of Community Service Orders in the Meru High Court Administrative Jurisdiction, Kenya.
Rabe K., (2012). Prison structure, inmate mortality and suicide risk in Europe. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*. 2012; 35(3):222–230. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2012.02.012. [PubMed] [CrossRef].

Rockville M. D., (2005). Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US);

Stephanie E., (2018). Slovin's Formula Sampling Techniques. https://sciencing.com/slovins-formula-sampling-techniques-5475547.html

United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFRI). (2011). *Evaluation of the Community Service Orders Programme in Kenya*. Makerere University Printers. Kampala.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2012). *Handbook on Strategies to Reduce Prison Overcrowding*.

World Prison Brief, (2022). https://www.prisonstudies.org/country/kenya. The data used in this proposal were accessed from the database on 20.11.2022.