IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 25, Issue 9, Series 5 (September. 2020) 18-30
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Relationship between Aggression and Recidivism among Emerging Male Adults at Kamiti Medium Prison, Nairobi County, Kenya

Rose Agonya Avosa, M.A in Counseling Psychology Student; Lucy Njiru, Ph.D., Amref International University; Henryk Tucholski, Ph.D., Tangaza University College.

Abstract
Despite scholarly attention to 'prisoner' reentry, much remains unknown on successful transition from 'prison' to society due to high recidivism rate. The study was a cross sectional quantitative research design. It employed probability sampling techniques to identify the study sample of n=294. The study was guided by General strain Theory by Agnew and Social Control Theory by Gottfredson and Hirschi. Data was collected using Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire and a self-developed questionnaire. Data analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics. Pearson's *r* coefficient revealed a significant positive correlation between aggression and recidivism ($r = 0.243$, $p< 0.5$, $n = 294$). The t-test results of a high value of 22.798 indicated a significant difference on the mean of the current and original study. Linear regression results; $\beta = .243$, $t = 1.783$, $p < .005$, indicated the beta factor of the study was significantly different from 0 at β .243 and said to significantly predict the outcome; increasing aggression, increased recidivism. The linear regression descriptive statistics' mean of 2.93 rounded to 3 for recidivism variable indicated that on average, inmates at Kamiti Prison would be re-incarcerated 3 times in their lifetime. The finding should inform Counselors and psychotherapists on the implication of aggression for designing helping strategies.

Key terms: Aggression, Recidivism, psychological wellbeing, re-incarceration

---

Date of Submission: 29-08-2020 Date of Acceptance: 14-09-2020

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Recidivism is the reversion into unlawful activity after a person received sanction or underwent intervention for the previous offence (McKean, 2014). Recidivism leads to return to detention for any reason, as well as technical infringement, re-arrest (Benda, 2005); reconviction and re-incarceration (Law, 2004). Comer R, Gould E (2011) defines aggression in public psychosomatic terms as a classification of behaviors projected to injure others using bodily or verbal attacks. Aggression is unreceptive, unfriendly, destructive, and or brutal behavior intended to cause damage or pain with the immediate intent to harm (Griffin and Hepburn, 2007). Aggression is a personality disorder and consequently a psychological factor. White (2007) explains psychological factors as progressions that occur at a personal level and the interpretation that one attributes to the particular condition which in turn affects the intellectual state for example, low sense of worth and aggression.

Justice systems established confinement centers with an aim of creating rehabilitative approaches for prevention of future crimes, for punitive purposes as well as providing inmates with the sustainability and direction needed for reentry programs (Miller & Miller, 2015). Nevertheless, over the preceding time, the dilemma of high recidivism rate still weigh down the correctional structure when released inmates continue re-offending. This is a challenge to the State's value of secure confinement centers (James, 2014; Raphael, 2011; Apel & Sweeten, 2010). There is a great concern of the large numbers of emerging male adults returning to the justice system after corrective measures (James, 2015) or, when unable to reintegrate back to the general public after discharge from prison (Osayi, 2013). This has raised concerns and fine tuned research concerns in outlining the risk factors linked to recidivism.

There is lack of knowledge and understanding on addressing the psychological impact of aggression on emerging male adults who have engaged in crime, been incarcerated or remain unsupported. This could be a gap or an ultimate goal that when addressed could lead to the reduction of risky violent and repeated criminal behavior, and for protecting society (De Ruiter & Hildebrand, 2007). Aggression and aggressive behaviors are psychological factors that are linked to criminal thinking and re-engagement and thus serve to enhance the probability of a consequent offence. Recidivism problem is an alarm that needs to be dealt with since emerging male adult offenders represent a high-risk group in contrast to other offenders. It causes huge associated

expenditure in regard to communal safety, and in Kenya shillings spent to re-arrest, arraign in court and re imprison re-offenders, property losses, medical treatment, arbitration costs, and a massive amount of other legal payments (Cullen, Jonson, & Nagin, 2011). Recidivism has a great input to general collective criminality and brutality (Andersen & Skardhamar, 2014) activated by the emerging male adults who have a probability of graduating to hardened criminals or jailbirds.

Aggression and impulsivity significantly take part in the demonstration of violent and criminal tendency, thus posing huge expenses to the victims and the public (McCloskey et al., 2016). Kelly Hubble, et al, (2015) in their study in the Netherlands indicated that emotional acknowledgments can moderately be enhanced in emerging adults who indulge in extreme antisocial and unlawful conduct. The result proposed that amended emotional acknowledgement had the prospective to reduce the sternness of reoffending. Andrews, et al. (2006) stated that the criminology theory described aggression, lack of confidence, antisocial thoughts, personality, and criminal associates as the greatest risk factors to criminal behavior. Offenders tended to have distorted cognitions, including self assertion thoughts, dislodgment of guilt, and scarce decent reckoning (Lipsey, Landenberger, & Wilson, 2007). Walters (2012) states that illegal judgment embraced mind-set and viewpoint that downsize and validate criminal actions; preceding research associated illegitimate conviction to illicit past and envisaged recidivism.

Childhood aggression and criminal history were established as projecting later antisocial behaviors and actions in grownups (Tremblay & Le Marquand, 2001). Attention and hyperactivity tribulations were associated to later dangerous and more brutal offending conducts (Wasserman et al., (2003); antisocial conducts and mental problems in early childhood were markers for later delinquent activities. Earlier research proposed many teenagers and youthful offenders would persist in criminal behavior past their adolescence (Chen, et al, 2005), get dangerous for severe and constant antisocial behavior. When unsupported, many emerging adults exiting custody relapsed to their harmful peer connections, re-indulged in threatening unlawful behaviors, and eventually returned to prison. Landsford (2012) described aggressive conduct as consequences of frustration due to deterrents in goal achievement. Youthful antisocial conduct was related to negative results in maturity (Odgers, et al (2007).

Bushman and Huesmann (2010), attested to the fact that disruptive behavior in infancy and teenage years was linked to a variety of harmful result in maturity. It predicted prospective antisocial conduct, insistent health hitches, and psychiatric disorder (Ross, et, al. 2011). These undesirable consequences were expensive to society as well as to the persons themselves. They had high costs related to psychological and bodily health complications of disruptive behavior in maturity (Odgers, et al, 2007).

A study conducted by Marc T. Swogger, et al (2014) in New York on *Impulsive Versus Premeditated hostility* in the forecast of brutal illegal recidivism explained individual hostility as a complicated social and communal wellbeing problem (Kazdin, 2011), and recognized factors that forecasted aggression as a worldwide research priority (WHO, 2002). According to Swogger, et al. (2015), the figures of aggression increased among persons with accounts of criminal record, and thus increased illicit recidivism that included bodily aggressive acts, which was of particular concern given the probable harm to the victim, the individual, and the public. The study recommended that categorizing factors that led to brutal reoffending would lead to enhanced management of people intricate in the unlawful justice scheme (Wong, & Coid, 2010). Among the acknowledged variables, aggression was one of the highest predictor of potential aggression and dangers of violent recidivism (Fazel, et al, 2010).

According to Ruth, et al. (2008) in a study that evaluated the Aggression Replacement Training program as regards the re-condemnation of male violent offenders within the English and Welsh Probation Service, the relations showed a 13.3% decrease in re-condemnation in the experimental group in contrast with the comparison group. The programme non-completers were subject to reconviction compared to their matched comparisons and programme completers. The study involved a quasi-experimental plan which utilized dialogue matching on key criminogenic aspects between an investigational group and a contrast group. The investigational group consisted of convicted brutal offenders included in the programme by probation staff, while the contrast group was sampled from people who had been found guilty of violent offence and had afterwards received a society sentence but were not allocated to the stage.

Hostility and brutality are familiar tribulations and have an intricate background (Siever, 2008), that, hostility and criminal conduct to a particular level are hereditarily. Scientific phenotypes include psychopathy, unsociable traits and impulsivity. Mental disorders, particularly bipolar turmoil and schizophrenia, were commonly linked to aggression (Soyka *et al*., 2011). Co-morbid drug use was a significant threat factor for aggression in the turmoil (Fazel *et al*., 2009b). Vigorous data showed a considerable alliance amid alcoholism and violence (Miller *et al*., 2006; Duke *et al*., 2011), and impulsive aggression (Seo, Patrick & Kennealy, 2008).

Experimental verification showed that both teenagers and adult offenders had unbalanced personality traits (Trninic´ et. al., 2004), linked with disruptive traits turmoil, a trend to quality hostile plan to others (Sato et. al. 2009), and violence (Ostrowsky, 2010). When antisocial males (inmates) were obliged to interact, hostility in the immediate setting could certainly increase destructive behavior through emotional pollution

(Baumann & Desteno, 2010) and social learning. Faced with such circumstances emerging male adults, develop endless thoughts of anger, defenselessness, depression, anguish, dullness, and isolation (Van der Helm et, al. 2009); thus increased hostility, antagonism and violence to uphold control (Cheng et. al, 2010).

By addressing aggression, the researcher was able to understand the psychosomatic influence of crime on the individual and how it projected recidivism; through understanding the psychology of crime (criminal thinking). The study gained insights in a body of new knowledge to enhance the understanding of recidivism of emerging male adult offenders and the strategic development of specific psychological rehabilitation programs that would not only address specific psychosocial needs of offenders while in prison but would enhance reducing recidivism.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study was quantitative in nature and involved cross sectional survey design that provided a snapshot of the sample studied. This design facilitated the researcher to gather information from the emerging male adult offenders at one go (Oladipo,et al. 2015). The survey design was adopted as the study's structural design pre-planned so that the data collected would be statistically inferred on the population (Fluid Survey University, 2017). This method enabled the gathering of data, analysis, presentation and interpretation and gained insight into the general picture of the situation. The researcher also employed a correlational survey design to examine the relationship between aggression and recidivism variables. The study was conducted at Kamiti Medium Prison targetting 300 respondents aged between 18 to 35 years, out of a population of 860 inmates. The researcher used quantitative research questionnaires to collect numerical data which was analyzed using SPSS Version 23. The instruments of data collection were two: standard and self developed tools. The standard tool; Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire, a 29-item scale composed of 4 subscales to measure; physical, verbal, anger, and hostility aggression. The standard tool, Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire had good psychometric properties and defined excellent test-retest reliability consistency on previous studies, between 0.72 and 0.80; pilot studies with the overall result of 0.89. The self developed tool had 24 items measuring recidivism. The reliability of the instruments in the present study was performed using Cronbach Alpha test with Aggression scale scoring 0.917 (a) values while the self developed scale had 0.725 values. These values were more than 0.7 therefore excellent levels of reliability indicating good internal consistency of the data collection instrument. Data analysis was accomplished through well established statistical procedures using SPSS version 23 intended to communicate the findings. Instruments used in the current study allowed data collection from a substantial number of participants, representative of a larger population.

III. RESULTS

Social- Demographic Characteristics

The demographic features of the participants were presented by employing descriptive scheme that included age group, religious background, level of education and marital status. The result of the demographic factors implied that the study responses were representative and did not suffer from biases as the study respondents cut across different demographic characteristics as summarized in Table 1

Table 1 ***Social Demographic Characteristics***

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Age Group	18-20	39	13.3
	21-25	56	19.0
	26-30	112	38.1
	31-35	87	29.6
Religious Background	Catholic	58	19.7
	Protestant church	90	30.6
	Muslim	64	21.8
	Other Religion	55	18.7
	No Religious affiliation	26	8.8
Level of Education	Primary School	60	20.4
	Form 4	92	31.3
	Certificate	63	21.4
	Diploma/Bachelor	64	21.8
	Masters/PHD	14	4.8
Marital status	Single	115	39.1
	Married	118	40.1
	Separated/Divorced	61	20.7
Occupation before-imprisonment	Student	23	7.8

	Employed	57	19.4
	Self employed	88	29.9
	Unemployed	126	42.9
	Total	294	100.0

The results in Table 1 indicated that most of the participants were between the ages 26 to 30 with 38% (n = 112). Participants who were of Christian faith; protestants ranked higher at 30.7 % (n = 90) while Catholics were at 19.7% (n = 58). Muslims ranked second with 21.8% (n = 64). The results indicated that most of the participants were learned; form 4 levers 31.3% (n = 92), diploma 21.84% (n = 64), certificate holders 21.5 % (n = 63), primary school 21.4% (n = 60), and post graduate 4.8% (n = 14). The findings indicated that majority of the participants were married 40.1% (n = 118), followed by singles 39.12% (n = 115) and separated or divorced 20.75% (n = 61). Most respondents 42.9% (n = 126) had no occupation before imprisonment.

Prevalence of Recidivism among Emerging Male adults

The researcher used descriptive analysis to determine the prevalence of recidivism among emerging male adults at Kamiti Medium prison. The scores on prevalence analyzed in table 2

Table 2 ***Prevalence of Recidivism***

		Total (n=294) (f)	Percent %(f)
No. of previous offence	First time	14	4.8
	Second time	165	56.1
	Third or More	115	39.1
Times imprisoned	First times	13	4.4
	Two times	163	55.4
	Three times	69	23.5
	Four times	26	8.8
	More than four	23	7.8
Similarity of crime to initial	Yes	160	54.4
	No	133	45.2
Ever released at police station	Yes	253	86.1
	No	41	13.9
Duration before subsequent offence	Below 3 months	41	13.9
	6 months	113	38.4
	7 months- 1 yr	89	30.3
	1 yr- 2 yrs	50	17.0
Reasons for repeat offence	Prison rehabilitation	145	49.3
	Revenge	59	20.1
	Rejection by family	90	30.6

Majority of the respondents, 95.2% (n = 280) had repeated offences and re-imprisoned as follows; 56.1% (n = 165) had repeated offences twice while 39.1% (n = 115) had repeated offences three or more times. Data revealed that the respondents had been remanded at the Police stations severally (not charged in court) indicating that they were serial offenders; 55.4% (n = 163) remanded twice, 23.5% (n = 69) remanded thrice, while 8.7% (n = 23) remanded more than four times. The respondents had committed similar offenses to the initial crime at 54.6% (n = 160) against 45.4% (n = 133). All the respondents had committed subsequent offences within 3 years after release from prison and this fitted the description of recidivism; indicated by 38.6% (n= 113), had repeated offence within 6 month, 30.4% (n = 89) took 7 months to 1 year, 17.1% (n = 50) took 1 to 2 years whereas 14% (n = 41) reoffended within 3 months after release. Most respondents 49.3% (n = 145) deem poor prison rehabilitation led to recidivism while 30.6% (n = 90) viewed rejection and 20.1% (n = 59) revenge causing recidivism. It was evident recidivism prevailed among the respondents at Kamiti Medium Prison and that there were other factors that increased the recidivism prevalence rate. These factors were assessed in table 3 below.

Table 3 ***Factors Increasing the Recidivism Prevalence Rate***

		Total (n=294)	Percentage %
Type of Offence committed	Theft, Burglary	52	17.7
	Assault/ Grievous harm	46	15.6
	Robbery with violence	59	20.1
	Murder, Manslaughter	46	15.6
	Rape/ Defilement	33	11.2
	Drugs abuse	41	13.9
	Obtaining pretence	15	5.1
	Other offence	2	.7
Reasons for committing offence	Family problems	46	15.6
	No income, Poverty	78	26.5
	Provocation	75	25.5
	Peer influence	49	16.7
	Idleness / fun/hobby	46	15.6
Age at first offence	Below age 12	10	3.4
	Age 13 – 14	26	8.8
	Age 15 – 17	66	22.4
	18 and above	192	65.3
Prison rehab in prevention	Yes	158	53.9
	No	135	46.1

The findings indicated that aggression related offences scored highly on the type of crimes committed by robbery with violence ranking highly 20.1% (n = 59) followed by theft and burglary at 17.7% (n = 52), assaults/grievous harm 15.6% (n = 46), murder and manslaughter accounted for 15.7% (n = 46) respectively, drug abuse 13.9% (n = 41), while obtaining by false pretence were 5.1% (n = 15). Majority of the respondents cited unemployed, lack of income and poverty 26.5% (n = 78) as contributing factors to reoffending, while 25.5% (n = 75) provocation led to reoffending, 16.7% (n = 49) of respondents acted due to peer influence and 15.6% (n = 46) committed crimes due to idleness, hobby or fun. From the data, most respondents 65.3% (n = 192) were above 18 years when they committed their first offense, 22.4% (n = 66) committed offences between ages 15 to 17, while 13% (n = 36) of respondents were below age 15 when they committed first offence. Notably, 53.9% (n = 158) of respondents stated that prison rehabilitation could prevent future crime while 46.1% (n = 135) disagreed on that.

Prevalence of Aggression

To analyze the prevalence of aggression among the respondents, the researcher administered the Buss Perry Aggression tool of 29 items analyzed on the 4 subscales; physical, verbal, anger, and hostility. The respondents' were classified as either highly or lowly aggressive. Highly aggressive respondents scored above the respective averages while lowly aggressive respondents scored below the respective averages. Descriptive analysis was used to sum of scores.

Table 4 ***Prevalence of Aggression***

	Physical Aggression % (f)	Verbal Aggression % (f)	Anger Aggression % (f)	Hostility Aggression % (f)
High Aggressive	83.5%	77.3%	78.4%	84.6%
Less Aggression	13.8%	17.8%	14.8%	12.4%
Non decided	4.7%	5.4%	9.5%	3.4%

On physical aggression, the finding had an average score of 83.5% highly aggressive on 9 items scoring as follows; 77.5% of the respondents could not resist the urge to hit another person; 87.4% of the respondents would revert to aggression given enough provocation, while 89.8% could not control the urge to hit back at others. Notably, 79.2% would get into fights more often, while 88.8% indicated would react violently to defend or protect their rights. 89.1 indicated engaging in blows when provokes by people. Despite the majority of the respondents being physically aggressive, 82.6% indicated that there was no good reason that compelled them to strike someone. This data was obtained from item 7 (hitting others) which was worded in the direction opposite to aggression and reverse-scored. The respondents at 75.8% issued threats to people they knew while 80.1% admitted to getting so 'mad' (agitated) and breaking things. The finding on Verbal aggression had an average score of 77.3% on 5 items as follows; 81.3% respondents often had verbal disagreements openly with

their acquaintances. 81.3% respondents reported a habit of disagreeing with people while 72.2% often expressed their opinion and anger on their aggressors. 73.9 % of the respondents got into arguments when in disagreement with others while 78.4% indicated being regarded as quarrelsome among their peers.

The finding on anger aggressive had an average score of 78.4% on 6 items as follows; 87.4 % of respondents were prone to being enraged quickly although similarly calming down quick. 81.9% respondents expressed that whenever they displayed their frustrations, they let their irritation show. Respondents at 77.9% often felt internal pressure and the urge to detonate. Notably, 73.8% of respondents considered themselves evenly tempered while 78.9% of the respondents indicated that were known to their peers as 'firebrands' and regarded as dangerous. Data indicated that 79.2% admitted being filled with anger for no apparent reason (sometimes fly off the handle for no good reason) while 70 % indicated having trouble controlling their temper. Hostility aggression scored higher among the 4 subscales with an average score of 84.6%. This was an indication of how highly aggressively hostile (violent) and brutal the respondents were. The findings indicated that 95.6% of the respondents expressed that were troubled by jealously. Notably, 94.9% felt dissatisfied with life indicating that 'they got a raw deal out of life'. 83.3% of the respondents felt frustrated that other people were advantaged and better than them; 'others always seemed to get breaks'. Data indicated that 85.9% felt bitter about things while 78.6% felt uncomfortable that their friends discussed them in their absence. 76.7% respondents were suspicious with the people surrounding them therefore became hostile to them. Data indicated that, 82 % of the respondents were uneasy and occasionally felt others were backbiting them; 'laughing at them behind their backs'. 79.6% of the respondents were curious and suspicious with people especially when the people got so 'nice' and wondered what they were up to.

Aggression' Mean Score

Basing on the average scores from the original Buss and Perry (1992) the researcher compared the mean of the original study with the current study, According to Buss and Perry (1992), the average scores for men in the different subscales are 24.3 for physical aggression, 15.2 for verbal aggression, 17 for anger and 21.3 for hostility. The average total score for aggression on the original study was 77.8. The score for each scale is the sum of the ratings for its items. The total score for aggression is the sum of these scale scores. The current study's respondents' scores were summarized in Table 5.

Table 5 ***Aggression Mean Score***

	Physical Aggression (f)	Verbal Aggression (f)	Anger (f)	Hostility (f)	Aggression (f)
Highly Aggressive	244	229	238	247	241
Lowly Aggressive	50	65	56	47	53
Prevalence of Aggression (% highly aggressive)	83% (total score >24.3)	78% (total score >15.2	81% (total score >17)	84% (total score >21.3)	82% (total score >77.8)

The above findings indicated that the total percentage score of aggression on the current study was higher at 82% compared with the original study that scored at 54% with a mean score of 77.8 The scores on all the subscales were greater than that of the original study and this was an indication that respondents at Kamiti Medium Prison experienced aggression at a higher level..

Relationship between Aggression and Recidivism

To analyze the association between the aggression and recidivism variables, Pearson's correlation analysis was performed. The researcher first tested the association of each variable to the demographic features to determine the strength and how they were related.

Correlation between Aggression and Demographic Factors

Using Pearson's r correlation, aggression was tested to establish how it related to the following demographic factors; age, religious background, level of education, marital status, occupation before imprisonment and number of previous offences. The results of the correlation tests carried out are summarized in Table 6 below.

Table 6 ***Correlation between Aggression and Demographic Factors***

		Age	Religious Background	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation before imprisonment	Number of previous offenses	Aggression	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-.051	.182**	.576**	.088	.230**	.224**	27.55	4.867
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.381	.002	.000	.132	.000	.000		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Religious Background	Pearson Correlation	-.051	1	-.054	.114	.116*	.145*	.025	2.66	1.238
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.381		.357	.051	.048	.013	.668		
	N	293	293	292	293	293	293	293		
Level of Education	Pearson Correlation	.182**	-.054	1	.071	-.200**	-.003	-.178**	2.59	1.175
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.357		.227	.001	.956	.002		
	N	293	292	293	293	293	293	293		
Marital Status	Pearson Correlation	.576**	.114	.071	1	.043	.260**	.125*	1.82	.753
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.051	.227		.459	.000	.033		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Occupation before imprisonment	Pearson Correlation	.088	.116*	-.200**	.043	1	.262**	.003	3.78	.966
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.132	.048	.001	.459		.000	.962		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Number of previous offenses	Pearson Correlation	.230**	.145*	-.003	.260**	.262**	1	-.017	2.34	.567
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.013	.956	.000	.000		.775		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Aggression	Pearson Correlation	.224**	.025	-.178**	.125*	.003	-.017	1	123.88	20.137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.668	.002	.033	.962	.775			
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The Pearson correlation for aggression and age was r = 0.224 which was a positive correlation and significant (p = .000). This meant age had an impact on how aggressive an inmate could be. For religious background, there was a weak positive correlation of r =.025 with aggression which was not statistically significant due to the sig. (2-Tailed) value that was above 0.05 (r = .668). Therefore, despite religious background having some impact on aggression in the inmates, this conclusion could not be applied to the overall prison population. The correlation between aggression and level of education was negative at r = -.178 and statistically significant (p = .002). This implied that the higher an inmate's level of education, the less likely they were aggressive.

The correlation between aggression and marital status was positive (r = .125) and significant (p = .033) indicating that marital status had an effect on aggression although the effect was small (weak positive correlation). The correlation between aggression and occupation was positive but very weak at r = .003. As for the number of previous offences, there was a weak negative correlation with aggression (r = -.017). This implied that repeat offenders were slightly less aggressive. However, the sig. (2-Tailed) value of r = .775 meant it was not statistically significant.

Correlation between Recidivism and Demographic Factors

On the other hand, recidivism was also tested against the demographics of age, religious background, level of education, marital status, occupation before imprisonment and number of previous offences. The results were as in Table 7

Table 7 ***Correlation between Recidivism and Demographic Factors***

		Age	Religious Background	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation before imprisonment	Number of previous offenses	Recidivism	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-.051	.182**	.576**	.088	.230**	.209**	27.55	4.867
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.381	.002	.000	.132	.000	.000		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Religious Background	Pearson Correlation	-.051	1	-.054	.114	.116*	.145*	.180**	2.66	1.238
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.381		.357	.051	.048	.013	.002		
	N	293	293	292	293	293	293	293		
Level of Education	Pearson Correlation	.182**	-.054	1	.071	-.200**	-.003	.040	2.59	1.175
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.357		.227	.001	.956	.498		
	N	293	292	293	293	293	293	293		
Marital Status	Pearson Correlation	.576**	.114	.071	1	.043	.260**	.236**	1.82	.753
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.051	.227		.459	.000	.000		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Occupation before imprisonment	Pearson Correlation	.088	.116*	-.200**	.043	1	.262**	.222**	3.08	.966
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.132	.048	.001	.459		.000	.000		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Number of previous offenses	Pearson Correlation	.230**	.145*	-.003	.260**	.262**	1	.810**	2.34	.567
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.013	.956	.000	.000		.000		
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		
Recidivism	Pearson Correlation	.209**	.180**	.040	.236**	.222**	.810**	1	2.6	.989
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.498	.000	.000	.000			
	N	294	293	293	294	294	294	294		

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The Pearson correlation for recidivism and age was r = .209 which was a weak positive correlation. It was also significant (p = .000). This meant age had a small effect on the recidivism of inmates. Religious background also had a weak positive correlation of r = .180 with recidivism and was statistically significant with a sig. (2-Tailed) value of p = .002. Therefore, religious background had a small effect on the recidivism of inmates. The correlation between recidivism and the level of education was also a weak positive one at r = .040 but was not statistically significant with a sig. (2-Tailed) value of p = .498. Despite the level of education having a small effect on recidivism in the inmates under study, this conclusion could not be applied to the general inmate population. The correlation between recidivism and marital status was positive (r = .236) and significant (p = .000) indicating that marital status had an effect on recidivism although the effect was small. The same could be said for correlation between recidivism and occupation which was at r = .222 with a sig. (2-Tailed) value of p = .000. As for the number of previous offences, there was a strong positive correlation with recidivism (r = -.810). This implied that intimates who were repeat offenders were highly likely to go back to prison. The sig. (2-Tailed) value of p = .000 was statistically significant and thus this conclusion could be said to be true for the general inmate population as well.

Correlation between Aggression and Recidivism

Pearson correlation was conducted to ascertain the type and extent of correlation if any, between aggression and recidivism. The results were analyzed in Table 8

Table 8 ***Correlation between Aggression and Recidivism***

		Recidivism	Aggression
Pearson Correlation	Recidivism	1.000	.243
	Aggression	.243	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Recidivism	.	.000
	Aggression	.000	.
N	Recidivism	294	294
	Aggression	294	294

The results showed that r = 0.243. The relationship between aggression and recidivism was thus a positive one with a unit increase in aggression leading to an increase in recidivism by a factor of r = 0.243 for the sample studied. This was a significant contribution which indicated that the likelihood of recidivism increased as an inmate's prevalence to aggression increased. This significance was explained by the sig. (1-tailed) value; p = .000 and was less than 0.05 thereby affirming that aggression increased recidivism. The finding could be generalized to population.

Linear regression analysis test conducted revealed that, the beta coefficients indicated the degree of change in the dependent variable in response to a unit of change in the independent variable. The significance of the beta coefficients was assessed by the t-test. The beta coefficients obtained from the linear regression analysis was done to predict the variables as per the objectives of the study in order to determine if the assumed independent variables (aggression) influenced the dependent variable (recidivism) as summarized in the Table 9 below:

Table 9 ***Coefficients[a] (Regression Analysis with Predictive Variables)***

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.783	.274		6.497	.000	1.243	2.323
	Aggression	.010	.002	.243	4.284	.000	.005	.015

a. Dependent Variable: Recidivism

The results in Table 9 indicated how the variable (aggression) predicted the variable (recidivism). The beta value, β of .243 at a sig. level of p =.000, and t = 4.284 was positive and indicated that the chance of recidivism increased by a factor of β = .243 whenever aggression increased by a single unit. Since p < .005 the beta factor was significantly different from 0 at β .243 and could be said to significantly predict the outcome. Using the values in the B column under the unstandardized coefficients, the linear regression equation was expressed as: Recidivism = 1.783 + 0.01(Aggression).

The researcher used descriptive statistics to check the association and prediction between the two variables statistically, that is, whether recidivism could lead to aggression and vice versa, a linear regression analysis of descriptive statistics was done. The findings were summarised in Table 10.

Table 10 ***Descriptive Statistics***

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Recidivism	2.93	1.142	294
Aggression	114.97	27.956	294

The above table summarized the descriptive statistics obtained from the linear regression. The 2.93 mean for recidivism indicated that on average an emerging male adult inmate at the Kamiti Medium Prison would be re-incarcerated 2.93 times, which could be rounded up to three times in their lifetime. This was quite

high given that prisons were meant to be correction facilities with an ideal situation resulting in no recidivism at all for at least a majority of the inmates who were set free after serving their sentences.

The researcher used the average scores from the original Buss and Perry (1992) study, BPAQ that had an average total score of 77.8 to compare with aggression average score of the present study using the same scoring scale. The current study secured 114.97 aggression mean of the average total score for the respondents on the Buss-Perry Aggression scale. This was quite a high score given that the average mean for men in the original study was 77.8. A one sample t-test was carried out to compare this study's mean for aggression with that of the original Buss-Perry study to determine whether the sample mean was statistically different. The results of the t-test done were summarized in Table 11.

Table 11 ***One-Sample Test (T-Test)***

	Test Value = 77.8					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggression	22.798	293	.000	37.169	33.96	40.38

The test value for the one sample t - test was 77.8 which were the average score from the original study in which the Buss-Perry Aggression Scale was used. This was compared to the mean score obtained in this study (114.97) and a mean difference of 37.169 obtained. The t statistic value of 22.798 was high and indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean of the study sample and that of the original study. The sig (2-tailed) value which was our p value < 0.05 was the significance level for the 95% confidence interval used. This meant there was a significant difference between the sample studied and the original Buss-Perry study. These findings could be applied to the general inmate population as an indication of how highly aggressive the inmates were in the current study.

IV. DISCUSSION

The study secured a 98% (n =294) response rate and this can be justified as per earlier studies conducted in other institutions like military barracks that had similar groups of entities studied and 100% response rate recorded due to the disciplinary procedures within such institutions. Accordingly, the response rate was expected to be higher having been conducted in a controlled environment (prison) with many respondents expected to respond. The response rate of 98% (n =294) was therefore justified. The study did not raise issues on gender disparity since it was conducted in an all male prison.

The findings on age indicated that majority of the respondents in the study were youths between eighteen years and thirty-five years who were prone to criminal activities. This was expected to be due to a number of societal issues including age, employment capacity, peer influence among others. This finding agreed with Chen, et al. (2005) who proposed many teenagers and youthful offenders would persist in criminal behavior past their adolescence, get dangerous for severe and constant antisocial behavior (Watt, Howells, & Delfabbro, 2004). Bushman and Huesmann (2010), attested to the fact that disruptive behavior in infancy and teenage years was linked to a variety of harmful result in maturity. It predicted prospective antisocial conduct, insistent health hitches, and psychiatric disorder (Ross, et, al., 2011). These undesirable consequences had high costs related to psychological and bodily health complications of disruptive behavior in maturity (Odgers, et al, 2007).

The study revealed that the age of the offender, marital status, prison rehabilitation program and number of relapse increased aggression and recidivism. Correlation analysis revealed positive relationship between the study variables and demographic features; and that increasing aggression increased recidivism and vice versa. The finding revealed aggression was significantly associated to recidivism. Pearson correlation indicated a significant correlation ($r = 0.243$, $p < 0.5$); sig. (1-tailed). It was noted that not every person imprisoned left prison fully rehabilitated. Most respondents stated that had left prison when not emotionally rehabilitated and not prepared enough for the encounter with the real world in the society. This finding agrees with Swogger, et, al. (2015), that the toll on aggression was elevated among persons with criminal conduct histories, and therefore reducing criminal recidivism that entails bodily aggressive acts (violence) is of great alarm given probable harm to the casualty, the antisocial person, and the society. According to Swogger, et al. (2015), the figures of aggression increased among persons with accounts of criminal record, and thus increased illicit recidivism that included bodily aggressive acts, which was of particular concern given the probable harm to the victim, the individual, and the public. The study recommended that categorizing factors that led to brutal

reoffending would lead to enhanced management of people intricate in the unlawful justice scheme (Wong, & Coid, 2010). A positive correlation between the study variables clearly indicated that aggression and recidivism were interrelated.

The Linear regression descriptive statistics' finding indicated that offenders at Kamiti Medium Prison were likely to reoffend up to 3 times in their lifetime. The current study had all the participants having repeated crime and imprisoned three or more times. Linear regression statistic clearly indicated that inmates at Kamiti are likely to be re-imprisoned three times in their lifetime. Gathu (2012) indicated that released male offenders have a 75% probability of engaging in another crime and a 50% probability of going back to prison 2 years after discharge from custody; likewise Igbo and Ugwuoke (2010) and Osayi (2013) reported an upheaval in the pace of reoffending. This finding can be compared to the study conducted by Marc T. Swogger et al (2014) in New York on *Impulsive Versus Premeditated hostility* in the forecast of brutal illegal recidivism explained individual hostility as a complicated social and communal wellbeing problem (Kazdin, 2011).

The high average mean of 114 on aggression variable obtained in the study was an indication of how highly aggressive the respondents were. This finding agreed with Fazel, et al. (2010) who stated that among the known variables, aggression was the highest predictors of potential acts of aggression and risk for violent recidivism. This finding is further supported in the study by the indication that the most crimes committed by the respondents were of aggression (eg robbery with violence, rape, defilement, grievous harm and assault). The finding of the high aggression mean of 114 is also supported by Swogger, et, al. (2015) who indicated that aggression was exaggerated among persons with criminal histories; Mooney and Daffern (2015); Swogger, et al. (2014) underlined aggression to be interrelated with criminal thinking and that repeated, aggressive behavior enhanced the probability of a consequent offence.

GST (theory) emphasized that aggressiveness encouraged persistent unsociable behavior and difficult temperament that made aggressive persons irritable and intolerance to frustration. According to GST, this causes strains and the inability to control their emotions SCT (theory), resulting to repeat offence; Yang, Wong and Coid (2010) stated that offenders lacked emotional address on aggressive actions to determine the individual's risk for prospective brutality. Drago et al (2011) explains strains by elaborating that that the ruthless jail condition, seclusion, parental rejection, being denied civil rights and unwillingness of absorbing ex-prisoners into the community predisposes offenders to go back to crime. Studies reviewed recognized the energetic risk and criminogenic need features that influenced recidivism among ex-convicts.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study offered a methodology for understanding criminal activity within the psychological context created by strains, and the inability to cope increasing aggression and reoffending; a growing concern for public safety. The present study suggested that psychological interventions need to address aggression and unconstructive influences that cause strains; and this could eventually apply in reducing recidivism and promote reintegration within the society. This revelation was based on the study that recidivism was highly prevalent among the inmates at Kamiti Prison (many respondents were repeat offenders who reverted to crimes they had committed prior to imprisonment). The finding further validated that recidivism was caused by prevalence in aggression and aggressive acts. Based on the study findings, there was an existing relationship between aggression and recidivism and each relied on the other. It is imperative that other predisposing factors that trigger aggression and increases recidivism rate be addressed by enhancing the psychological wellbeing of prisoners. This also implied promoting a study culture and counseling or psychological programs that restructure distorted thoughts and adopting a safe and conducive environment for change.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The outcome of this study should provide guidelines to the Cabinet Secretary (CS) in the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National government to initiate policies on psychosocial intervention as mandatory for Kenyan prisons to counter the negative influence of aggression on recidivism. The CS and Commissioner of Prisons should incorporate intensive counseling as a major prison program covering the entire period of inmates' imprisonment, as well as extend the services to the community on ex-prisoners' follow up programs. Professional counselors should be employed and deployed to all prisons to conduct these services. The findings should inform Psychologists, psychotherapists and Counselors on the implication of aggression on youth, prisoners and crime in general. This would enable intensive scholarly research, develop manual, design counseling and training programs. The counselors could also use the findings to assist youth and communities struggling with aggression-related issues to reconstruct their mental capability and deter crimes. Another study should be conducted on an all female prison to establish whether the finding can be replicated and therefore generalized to the general prison population in Kenya.

REFERENCES

[1]. Andrews, D., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. (2006). The recent past and the near future of risk assessment. Crime & Delinquency, 52, 7-27.

[2]. Andersen S, N., Skardhamar, T. (2014). Pick a number: Mapping recidivism measures and their consequences. Oslo: Statistics Norway Discussion Papers.

[3]. Apel and Sweeten, (2010). "The impact of incarceration on employment during the transition to adulthood," 57(3), 448-479.

[4]. Baumann, J, & DeSteno, D. (2010). Emotion guided threat detection: Expecting guns where there are none. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99, 595–6

[5]. Benda, B. (2005). Gender differences in life-course theory of recidivism: A survival analysisInternational Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49(3), 325-342.

[6]. Cheng, J.T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. J. Evolution and Human Behavior, 31, 334–347.

[7]. Comer R, Gould E, (2011). Psychology Around Us. John Wiley & Sons, Inc Cullen, F. T, Jonson, C. L., & Nagin, D. S. (2011). Prisons do not reduce recidivism: the high cost of ignoring science. Prison Journal 91:48S–65S.

[8]. Duke, A. A, Giancola, P. R., Morris, D. H., Holt, J. C, & Gunn, R. L. (2011). Alcohol dose andaggression: another reason- drinking more is a bad idea. J Stud Alcohol Drugs 72:34–43.

[9]. Fazel, S., Gulati, G., Linsell, L., Geddes, J. R., & Grann M. (2010). Schizophrenia and violence: systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS Med 6:e100012.

[10]. Gathu, J. (2012). Three thousand march for CBI in Kenya. Retrieved from http://www.cbi.fm/wp.content, April, 2019.

[11]. Griffin, M. L., & Hepburn, J. R. (2007). Inmate population characteristics, administrative controland the level of prison misconduct. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta Marriott Marquis, Atlanta, Georgia.

[12]. James, N. (2014). Bureau of prisons (BOP): Operations and budget (R42486). Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from: http://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42486.pdf.

[13]. James, N. (2015). Offender reentry: Correctional statistics, reintegration into the community, and recidivism. Retrieved on 15/6/2019 from https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL34287.pdf

[14]. Kazdin, A. E. (2011). Conceptualizing the challenge of reducing interpersonal violence. Psychology of Violence, 1, 166–187.

[15]. Kelly, H., Katharine, L.. Bowen, S. C., Moore, Stephanie, H. M., & van Goozen. (2015)

[16]. 'Improving Negative Emotion Recognition in Young Offenders Reduces Subsequent Crime'. Public Library of Science. PLOS ONE | DOI:10.1371/ journal.pone.

[17]. Lambie, I., & Randell, I. (2013). 'The impact of incarceration on juvenile offenders; Clinical Psychology Review, 33(3), 448-459.

[18]. Law, M. (2004). Federally Sentenced Women in the Community: Dynamic risk Predictors. Forum on Corrections Research.

[19]. Marc T. Swogger, Zach Walsh, Michael Christie, Brittany M. Priddy, and Kenneth R. Conner,(2014). Impulsive Versus Premeditated Aggression in the Prediction of Violent Criminal Recidivism. Aggressive behavior, Volume 41, p 346–352.

[20]. McKean, (2014). Effectiveness of a mental health court in reducing criminal recidivism and violence; American journal of psychiatry 164 (9), 1395-403.

[21]. Miller, H. V. & Miller, J. M. (2015). A promising jail reentry program revisited: Results from a quasi-experimental design. Criminal Justice Studies, 28(2), 211–225.

[22]. Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H, et al.2007.

[23]. Prediction of differential adult health burden by conduct problem subtypes in males. Arch Gen Psychiatry, 64: 476–484.

[24]. Oladipo, R, Ikamari, L, Kiplanagti, J, & Barza, L, (2015). General Research Methods Nairobi. Oxford University Press.

[25]. Osayi, K. K. (2013). Socio-cultural factors affecting reintegration of discharged prisoners in Anambra State, South East, and Nigeria. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4 (10), 775-780.

[26]. Ostrowsky, M. K. (2010). Are violent people more likely to have low self-esteem or high self-esteem? Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15, 69–75.

[27]. Raphael, S. (2011). Incarceration and prisoner reentry in the United States. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 635(1), 192–215.

[28]. Ross, A., Duckworth, K., Smith, D. J., Wyness, G., & Schoon, I. (2011). Prevention and Reduction: A review of strategies for intervening early to prevent or reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour. Centre for Analysis of Youth Transitions, Department of Edu.

[29]. Ruth, M., Emma, J. Palmerb, James McGuire, Juliet C. Hounsomed, Charlotte A. L. Bilbye and Clive R. Hollin. (2008). Aggression replacement training with adult male offenders within community settings: a reconviction analysis. The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, Vol. 19, No. 4, 517–532.
[30]. Sato, W., Uono, S., Matsuura, N., & Toichi, M. (2009). Misrecognition of facial expressions in delinquents. Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 3, 27–39.
[31]. Seo, D.,Patrick, C. J. & Kennealy, P. J. (2008).Role of serotonin and dopamine system interacti-ons in the neurobiology of impulsive aggression and its comorbidity with other clinical disorders. Aggress Violent Behav 13:383–395.
[32]. Swogger, Marc T., Zach Walsh, Michael Christie1, Brittany M. Priddy, & Kenneth R. Conner, (2015). Impulsive Versus Premeditated Aggression in the Prediction of Violent Criminal Recidivism. Aggressive behavior Volume 41, 346–352.
[33]. Tremblay, R.E., & LeMarquand, D. (2001). Individual risk and protective factors. In R. Loeber & D.P. Farrington (Eds.), Child delinquents: Development, intervention, and service needs (137–164) (pp. 137–164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
[34]. Trninic, V., Baran_cic´ , M., & Nazor, M. (2008). The five-factor model of personality and aggressiveness in prisoners and athletes. Kinesiology, 40, 171–182.
[35]. Ugwuoke (2010). Recidivism in Enugu State Prison- Nigerian. Journal of Research and production (NIJOREP), 3: 33-34.
[36]. Van der Helm, G.H.P., Klapwijk, M., Stams, G.J.J.M., & van der Laan, P.H. (2009).'What works' for juvenile prisoners: The role of group climate in a youth prison. Journal of Children's Services, 4, 36–48.
[37]. Walters, G. D. (2012). Criminal thinking and recidivism: Meta-analytic evidence on the predictive and incremental validity of the psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17, 272–278.
[38]. Wasserman, G.A., Keenan, K., Tremblay, R.E., Cole, J.D., Herrenkohl, T.I., Loeber, R.,& Petec- huk, D. (2003). Risk and protective factors of child delinquency. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, US Department of Justice.
[39]. White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31, 357–370.
[40]. World Health Organization. (2002). World Report on violence and health. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Rose Agonya Avosa, et. al. "Relationship between Aggression and Recidivism among Emerging Male Adults at Kamiti Medium Prison, Nairobi County, Kenya." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(9), 2020, pp. 18-30.