

# Interplay Between Prison Environment and Self-Harm Urge: The Mediatory Role of Resilience Among Inmates in South-West Nigeria

Agesin Bamikole Emmanuel \*

Department of Pure and Applied Psychology, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State.

**\*Corresponding Author:** Agesin Bamikole Emmanuel, Department of Pure and Applied Psychology, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State.

**Received date:** January 20, 2023; **Accepted date:** January 31, 2023; **Published date:** February 10, 2023

**Citation:** Agesin Bamikole Emmanuel, (2023), Interplay Between Prison Environment and Self-Harm Urge: The Mediatory Role of Resilience Among Inmates in South-West Nigeria, *Psychology and Mental Health Care*, 7(1): DOI:10.31579/2637-8892/203

**Copyright:** © 2023, Agesin Bamikole Emmanuel. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## Abstract

The prevalence of Self-harm urge is frightening and disturbing in our world today. Unfortunately, there is a higher number of incidences of self-harm urge among prison inmates in our correctional facilities in Nigeria. This problem is under-reported in common place within the Nigerian correctional Service. This study examined the interplay between prison environment and self-harm urge: the mediating role of resilience among inmates in south-west Nigeria. This study was a correlational survey design. The population of study comprised representative of all prisoners from the six prison facilities in the south west part of Nigeria. Three major instruments were used to collect data from the respondents. They include; Prison Environment Inventory, Resilience scale and Self-Harm Urge Scale. Six prison institutions were randomly selected from the south western zone in Nigeria based on balloting. Eighty (80) prisoners were randomly selected through simple balloting from each of the chosen prison. Hence, a total of four hundred and eighty (480) prisoners were used for the study. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the socio-demographic variables. The study hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis. The result showed that Prison environment significantly predicted prisoners' self-harm urge ( $\beta$  -.13,  $t$  2.94,  $p$  < .01). Also, resilience significantly predicted self-harm urge ( $\beta$  -.22,  $t$  -4.95,  $p$  < .01). Finally, the test on the strength of mediation between Prison Environment and self-harm urge by resilience was significant ( $Z$  = -3.15,  $p$  < .01), thus confirming the formulated hypothesis. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommended that, government may need to take into consideration the significant roles of prison environment when designing programme toward providing a prison environment for psychologically well-adjusted prison inmates and reduce self-harm among them.

**Keywords:** prison environment; resilience; self-harm urge; inmates

## Introduction

The need to meet the challenges of reducing the reported incidence of self-harm and self-harm tendency within prison populations has become a matter of necessity among prison facilities (Beasley, 2000).

The current global level of suicide and self-harm in prisons could not be accurately described as anything other than a crisis (United Nations Prison Statistics Bureau, 2016). Prison staffs, policy makers, charity and non-governmental organisations, religious bodies and various stakeholders have condemned these shameful and extremely shocking circumstances (Hawton, et al., 2007). To buttress this claim, official global data published in January 2016, showed that 119, 976 prisoners died by self-

harm. There are more self-inflicted injuries and deaths in prison last year than in any other since records began over 25 years ago. The rate has doubled in the past five years alone (United Nations Prison Statistics Bureau, 2016). Global statistics suggest that someone takes their own life in prison every three days and people in custody are 8.6 times more likely to die by suicide than those in the general population. Self-harm has also reached a record high of nearly 40,000 incidents up nearly 7,000 compared to the previous year. (Fazel, Cartwright, Norman-Nott & Hawton, 2008).

The occurrence of self-harm within a correctional setting is a significant problem that poses various risks and challenges for all involved (Fazel et al., 2008). Self-harm behaviours threaten the mental and physical health of both offenders and staff, and results in staggering personal costs on the individual, their family, and health services and other allied institutions. In addition to the strong associations with mortality and morbidity, self-harm is costly to society, with excess costs being accrued through both increased health service use and the loss of productivity (Hawton, et al., 2007).

The pains of jail confinement affect all prisoners in different ways (Jeff, Levin & Amit, 2010). Prisoners are exposed to a new culture of deprivation, solitude and alienation which may elicit varying outcomes on the prisoner's adjustment pattern (Jimoh, 2007). The combined influences of solitude, the emotional imbalance of prison life, and the separation from loved ones often lead to state of depression among incarcerated individuals (Ashkar & Kenny, 2008). There are few and limited social or proactive activities in which prisoners can engage and interact with other prisoners. These and many more circumstances pervading prisoners may lead to a myriad of behavioral concerns in the lives of these individuals and those of their significant other. (Humber, Webb, Piper, Appleby, & Shaw, 2013). The increase in the number of cases self-mutilation in prison communities has agitated research interest and global concern (Africa Centre for the Prevention of Crime, 2010). Therefore, it becomes imperative that understanding behavioral mechanisms that underlie Self-harm tendencies in prison populations calls for research attention.

In the Nigeria correctional facilities, amenities have been described as debasing and dehumanizing (Soyinka 1972), and regardless of the public outcry by human rights organizations, most correctional facilities in Nigeria are underfunded and overcrowded (Jimoh, 2007). The implication of these is that, prisoners often confront life threatening situations and self-harm becomes a coping behavior for many of the inmates. However, self-harm among inmates in Nigerian prison has been grossly under reported and understudied. This became evident through paucity of research work and nearly non-existing indigenous literature on the subject matter (Ineme & Osinowo, 2015). For example, having to be forcefully placed in the same cell with hardened criminals and being prevented from seeing loved ones, which may lead to low self-esteem and poor prisoner's sense of belonging may result to self-harm tendencies (Hinz A, et al 2017.). Since previous studies has been on the prevalence of self-harm among Prison inmates, its therefore becomes imperative to investigate self-harm urge which is a precursor to self-harm in order to bring it under control or prevent its occurrence if need be.

Self-harm urge is an important issue associated with self-harm. Self-harm urge is the thought about injuring oneself but without actually doing so, which may be regarded as a precursor to actual self-injurious behaviour (Hawton et al., 2007). The term self-harm covers a spectrum of behaviours and the most serious forms relate to suicide, while behaviours at the milder end of the spectrum merge with other reactions to emotional pain (Kenny, Lennings & Munn, 2008). Skegg (2008) defined self-harm as the deliberate destruction or alteration of body tissue without conscious suicidal intent. However, it is apparent that there is a lack of consistency in how self-harm is defined.

The phenomenon of self-harm is also known as self-injury, self-injurious behaviour, self-mutilation, deliberate self-harm, deliberate self-injury, self-mutilating behaviour and para-suicide (Kapur, 2005). The rate of self-harm among prison inmates tends to be on the increase globally, often

resulting in ultimate self-harm if not checked (Ineme & Osinowo, 2015). Such behaviours are often premeditated and may have been nursed as tendency in the mind for some time. It is a negative and self-destructive response to situations, experiences and conditions of the length of sentence by prison inmates. Self-harm is a behaviour could also include injury sustained either by hunger strike, burning, hanging, strangulation, scratching, banging, hitting or mutilating body parts or interfering with wound healing 'Self-poisoning or injury, done without suicidal intent (Finn, 2000).

More often more than none, it is believed that, the motive behind people' self-harm is mostly to relieve negative emotions (Gray, S. G et al 2003). This is consistent with the few population-based studies, which have suggested that young people who self-harm may have limited coping strategies to deal with emotional difficulties or may be exposed to elevated stress levels (Kirchner, Forns & Mohino, 2008). Most recent studies have investigated the role of stress-full life events in the etiology of NSSI (Cerutti, R. et al 2016). Among Chinese adolescents, for instance, Tang et al. (2016) found that adverse life experiences were associated with moderate and severe NSSI and a lesser risk of engaging NSSI in those who are resilient. Self-harm remains an important public health problem and one of the most common reasons for admission to hospitals. (Kapur, 2005). Non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) no doubt, is a serious health concern for prison inmates. As a result of the growing concern researchers have conjectured that several factors may be responsible and one of such variables, is prison environment.

Prison environment is a possible significant issue associated with prisoners 'self-harm Urge. The Nigerian prison environment with regard to amenities have been characterized as dehumanizing (Soyinka, 1972), and in spite of the public outcry by human rights organizations, most prison yards in Nigeria are overcrowded beyond capacity (Jimoh, 2007). Prisoners often face life threatening challenges and environmental situations such as overcrowding; having to be forcefully placed in the same cell with hardened criminals, being prevented from seeing loved ones which inevitably may lead to poor prisoner's adjustment that may result to self-harm tendencies (Jeff et al., 2010). The potential importance of measuring prison climate is central to understanding both what happens in prison, and what may happen on release. The statement that people are sent to prison as punishment, not for punishment, reflects the moral view that incarceration in and of itself is sufficient punishment for an offence. However, such a position tends to view prison as a kind of "black box" which is punitive just by virtue of the deprivation of liberty, and as such relatively equivalent in its impact across institutions for any given period of custodial sentence.

However, actual prison conditions will vary in terms of the physical fabric of the institution, the harshness of the regime, and its social organization, by jurisdiction and the political perception of offenders, and by the perceptions of those associated with the prison. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that variation in prison climate (or perception of prison climate) may also influence the impact of imprisonment on self-harm urges during incarceration. While conditions may be relatively favorable given the low incarceration rate, there have been various austerity measures in recent years, as well as a differentiation in privilege levels. Considering prison environment, budget cuts involved the closure of many prisons and an increase in double cell capacity from 2,500 (number of beds, 20% of total capacity) in 2013 to 6,146 (52% of total capacity) in 2017, of which 1,460 beds were actually occupied in their double cell capacity (De Loeff J., Van de Haar M., Van Gemmert N., Bruggeman M. 2018). With reference to previous research, it was found that psychological well-being, in

general, is lower among individuals incarcerated than among the general population (Fazel S., Ramesh T., Hawton K. (2017).

The issue has received attention from Lanza-Kaduce, Parker & Thomas (1999) who argued (in the context of differences in recidivism outcomes between private and public prisons in the US) that it is reasonable to expect, given the stated objectives of many correctional programs to reduce self-harm and improve inmates' adjustment to prison. From a theoretical perspective, studies of prison climate rely on Murray's (1938) Environmental Press theory, which holds that environmental conditions, in interaction with individual characteristics, will influence behavior.

Prison environment is equally characterized, with victimization, within the context of a prison environment where little or no programming exists; incarcerated individuals are often unable to immerse themselves in meaningful and productive activities. Inmates no longer feel purposeful and that can lead to a diminished sense of self over time (Haney, 2001). Inmates often utilize hyper-masculinity to victimize and exploit others in order to validate themselves and to gain control over something in their environment (Haney, 2001). Hyper-masculine prisoners affirm their existence by dominating others who are equally vulnerable. Similarly, Kupers (2005) discusses the notion of toxic masculinity in prison as a combination of domination, wanton violence, and a non-display of emotion. This type of masculinity manifests itself in a tough-guy posture, outbursts of temper, and poor impulse control. Despite the fact that the majority of inmates are incarcerated for non-violent crimes, Kupers (2005) study of several hundred prisoners in 15 states showed that even men who were not especially aggressive and misogynistic when they entered prison confided that they believe they must become versed in hyper-masculine posturing and violence merely to stay alive and protect their honour. However, Shuwei Hao, Wei Hong, Honghong Xu, Lili Zhou, Zhongyao Xe (2015) reported that resilience played a partial mediating role between work stress and burnout, that is, work stress had both a direct and an indirect, via resilience, impact on burnout. Work stress played a partial mediating role between resilience and burnout; thus, resilience could prevent the development of burnout by relieving work stress, in addition to directly relieving it. Hence, it is believed that resilience if introduced as mediating variable could mitigate the negative impact of prison environment on self-harm urge among inmates.

### Statement of Hypotheses

1. Prison environments will significantly predict self-harm urge among inmates in South-West Nigeria.
2. Resilience will significantly mediate the relationships between perceived prison environment and self-harm urge among inmates in such a way that, the introduction of resilience as mediator will reduce self-harm urge among inmates in South-West, Nigeria.

## Method

### Research Design and Participants

The study adopted correlational survey design. The researcher is interested in knowing the predictive effect of the independent variables (prison environment) on the dependent variables (self-harm urge). And the mediating role of resilience.

The population of study comprised representative of all prisoners from the six prison facilities in the south west part of Nigeria. They are as follows, Akure Medium Prison Olokuta Akure, Ondo State, Ilesha Prison,

Osun State, Abeokuta Prison, Ogun State, Agodi prison, Ibadan, Oyo State, Kirikiri Maximum prison, Apapa Lagos State, and Ado-Ekiti Prison, Ekiti State.

### Measures

Three major instruments were used to collect data from the respondents. They include;

**Biographic Information Questionnaire:** This contains the personal details of participants such as gender, age, religion, academic qualification, marital status, length of sentence.

**Prison Environment Inventory:** I consider multiple dimensions of prison climate as opposed to one score, using a questionnaire with high psychometric validity. This is made up of self-reported 48-items developed by Wright (1985). It has eight (8) sections namely, activities (1-6), emotional feedback (7-13), freedom (14-19), privacy (20-25), safety (26-31), social (32-37), structure (38-42) and support (43-48). The PEI-48 is a 4-item Likert format scale ranging from (that 0 = Never, 1 = Seldom, 2 = Often, and 3 = Always.) and some of the sample items include (1) There is at least one movie each week, (2) An inmate obtains training if he wants (3) Inmates have something to do every night. (4) The guards tell inmates when they do well. (5) The guards ask inmates about their personal feelings. The pilot study shows Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha$ ) = .83, but Cronbach ( $\alpha$ ) = .83 was reported for the present study. Composite scores above the mean score means supportive Prison While scores below the mean indicate non-supportive prison.

**Resilience scale:** This was assessed using a resilience scale (RS-25) developed by Wagnild & Young (1993) to provide clinicians and researchers a shorter instrument to reduce participant burden. The RS-14 is a 7-item Likert format scale ranging from (1- strongly disagrees to 7- strongly Agree) and some of the sample question include (1.) I usually manage one way or another. (2) I feel proud that I have accomplished things in life (5.) I feel that I can handle many things at a time. Wagnild and Young (1993) reported reliability co-efficient of .91 the original RS. A Cronbach Alpha of ( $\alpha$ ) = .78 was reported for the present study. The scores above the mean indicate resilient Prisoners, while scores below indicate non-resilient Prisoners.

**Self-Harm Urge Scale:** This is a 19-item scale – IS-HUS developed by Ineme and Osinowo (2015). It is made up of three sub-scales: Sub-scale 1 (items 1 to 11) measuring urges for physical harm with Cronbach's coefficient of .93, Sub-scale 2 (items 12 to 15) measuring urges for verbal harm with Cronbach's coefficient of .84, and Sub-scale 3 (items 16 to 19) measuring urges to transfer harms to others with Cronbach's coefficient of .76. This implies that at end, 19 items were valid and reliable with the general Cronbach's coefficient of the scale is .83. The mean score of the scale is 35; norm was established at standard deviations above the mean; scores below the norm show low self-harm urges while scores above the norm showed high self-harm urges. Specifically, scores from 1 to 37 show low self-harm while scores from 38 to 76 shows high self-harm. Ineme and Osinowo, reported a Cronbach Alpha of .91 and obtained a Cronbach Alpha of ( $\alpha$ ) = .94 for the present study.

### Procedure

Six prison formations were randomly selected from the south western zone in Nigeria based on balloting. The choice of even numbers was arrived at via the ballot technique. That is odd and even were wrapped differently and all put together in a box. Individual prisoners were asked to pick one and he or she picked a wrapped paper upon which even

numbers were written. Prisons facilities labeled even numbers on the list were selected. Approval was earlier obtained from the department of Psychology, Ekiti State University; that introduced me to the Prison facilities for the research purpose, with this approval; I was able to visit different prisons that were selected in the study. With permission and approval obtained from the respective prison authorities, the researcher used systematic sampling technique (i.e., odd and even numbers) on the list of prison inmates provided by each prison officials of the selected prisons to choose participants among the inmates that were involved in the research work.

Eighty (80) prisoners were randomly selected through simple balloting from each of the chosen prison. Hence, four hundred and eighty (480) prisoners were used for the study. However, two (2) questionnaires were not adequately completed, hence the reason for not including them in the processing of the result. Finally, four hundred and sixty-eight (478) questionnaires were adequately completed and returned questionnaire were used for the processing of the result of this study. Male=249 (52.1), Female =229(47.9), Christianity 397(83.1) Islam 81(16.9), Age mean=23.55, SD=3.49, N=478 Gender= mean=1.52, SD=500, N=478, Sentence Period mean=9.44, SD=12.68, N=460, Religion mean=1.17, SD=376, N=478, Prison Environment mean=60.61, SD=16.557, N=478, Religiosity mean=69.04, SD=18.094, N=478, Resilience mean=79.09, SD=13.254, N=478, Prisoner's Adjustment mean=43.89, SD=9.667, N=478, Self-Harm Urges mean=33.29, SD=12.767, N=478.

The three instruments were packaged together as a questionnaire with 3 sections where section A seeks demographic information, Section B while section C, centers on Self-Harm and section F focus on prison Adjustment scale. These were administered to the participants by the researcher after necessary permissions have been sought which will give the researcher access into the yards. The instruments were collected immediately after completion. The exercise lasted for the period of six weeks with a week allocated for each prison. However, only one day in the week was used for each prison but no one could predict the very day permission would be granted to interact with the prisoners in the yards, possibly for security reasons.

**Statistical Analysis**

Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the socio-demographic variables. The study hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis

**Results**

**Test of Relationship among the Study Variables**

Pearson Product Moment correlation (PPMC) was used to inter-correlate the study variables in order to ascertain the extent and direction of relationships among them. The result is presented below.

|                       |        |        |       |        |        |        |       |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| 1. Age                | 1      |        |       |        |        |        |       |
| 2. Gender             | -.34** | 1      |       |        |        |        |       |
| 3. Sentence Period    | -.01   | -.19** | 1     |        |        |        |       |
| 4. Prison Environment | .07    | .15**  | .05   | 1      |        |        |       |
| 5. Prison Adjustment  | -.01   | -.07   | -.09  | .29**  | .19**  | 1      |       |
| 6. Self-Harm Urge     | -.10*  | .16**  | -.04  | -.19** | -.19** | -.35** | 1     |
| Mean                  | 23.55  | -      | 9.44  | 60.61  | 59.04  | 43.89  | 33.29 |
| SD                    | 3.49   | -      | 13.68 | 16.56  | 18.09  | 9.67   | 12.77 |

**Table 1.1:** Correlation Matrix showing the mean, SD and the Relationship among the Study Variables.

Perceived religious af. = Perceived religious affiliation \*\*. Note: \* p<.01, \* <. 0.5, N 478. Gender was coded male 0 female 1.

The result in table 1.1 shows that age significantly correlated with self-harm urges [r = (476) =-.10\*, p <.05]. This means that as age increases, self-harm urges decrease and vice versa. Gender also significantly correlated with self-harm urge [r = (476) =.16\*\*, p <.01]. Sentenced period significantly correlates with self-harm urge [r = (476) = -.04, p <.01].

environment is supportive the prisoner is better adjusted vice versa and equally correlated with self-harm urges [r = (476) =.19\*\*, p <.01], such that when prison environment is supportive the, the prisoners less experience self-harm urge. Also significantly correlated with self-harm urge [r = (476) = -19, p <.01] and significantly negatively correlated with self-harm urge [r = (476) = -22\*\*, p <.01].

Also, Prisoners environment significantly correlated with Inmates' adjustment [r = (476) =.29\*\*p <.01], such that, when the prison

| Variables          | β    | t       | R   | R <sup>2</sup> | df     | F       |
|--------------------|------|---------|-----|----------------|--------|---------|
| Prison Environment | -.13 | -2.94** | .29 | .08            | 3, 474 | 14.35** |
| Resilience         | -.15 | -3.26** |     |                |        |         |

**Showing Prison Environment, Resilience Predicting Self-Harm Urge**

\*\* p< 0.01, N=478

Prison environment significantly predicted prisoners' self-harm urge (β - .13, t 2.94, p< .01) such that, the prisoners who perceived prison environment to be conducive and supportive do not have self-harm urge

or are less likely to have self-harm urge. Resilience significantly predicted prisoners' self-harm urges β-.15, t 3.26, p< .01 such that, resilient prisoners do not have self-harm urges or are less likely to have self-harm urges, than those who are less resilient.



| Dependent Factor | Predictors         | $\beta$ | t       | R   | R <sup>2</sup> | df     | F       |
|------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|-----|----------------|--------|---------|
| Self-Harm Urge   | Prison Environment | -.19    | -4.10** | .19 | .03            | 1, 476 | 16.80** |
| Self-Harm Urge   | Resilience         | -.22    | -4.95** | .22 | .05            | 1, 476 | 24.51** |
| Resilience       | Prison Environment | .22     | 4.86**  | .22 | .05            | 1, 476 | 23.63** |
| Self-Harm Urge   | Prison Environment | -.14    | -3.16** | .26 | .07            | 2, 475 | 17.47** |
|                  | Resilience         | -.19    | -4.19** |     |                |        |         |

**Table Showing Resilience mediating the relationship between Prison Environment and Self-Harm Urge**

\*\* p< 0.01, N=478

Prison environment significantly predicted self-harm urge ( $\beta$  -.19, t -4.10, p< .01) resilience significantly predicted self-harm urge ( $\beta$  -.22, t -4.95, p< .01). Prison environment significantly predicted Resilience ( $\beta$  .22, t 4.86, p< .01). Prison environment significantly predicted self-harm urge

( $\beta$  -.14, t -3.16, p< .01). When Resilience was introduced, the  $\beta$  reduce to  $\beta$  -.14, why the resilience is -.19. From the result of the analysis, it is therefore clear that there is partial mediation of resilience in the predictive influence of prison environment on the self-harm urge in the study. From these findings, hypothesis 2 is confirmed.

| Variables  |                    | Z     | Std. Error | p     |
|------------|--------------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Predictors | Prison Environment |       |            |       |
| Mediator   | Resilience         | -3.15 | .010       | < .01 |
| Dependent  | self-Harm Urge     |       |            |       |

**Sobel Summary Showing the Strength of Mediation between Prison Environment and Self-Harm Urge by Resilience**

The test on the strength of mediation between Prison Environment and self-harm urge by resilience was significant (Z = -3.15, p < .01). This confirmed the observed findings from Baron and Kenny procedures, thus confirming the formulated hypothesis.

**Discussion**

The result of the study revealed some connection to previous studies, yet different results were equally established. The result of hypothesis one which state that, prison environments will significantly predict self-harm urge among inmates in South-West Nigeria was confirmed. One explanation for this may be due to the massive influx of inmates that begun in recent times as a result of delay occasioned by bureaucracy in judiciary process which has produced high rate of growth in the nation’s inmate’s population that scholars and legal commentators have repeatedly described and characterized as unprecedented (Awopetu, 2014). Reports emanating from Nigeria suggests that the environment of most prisons in Nigeria can best be described as deplorable, the capacity of Nigerian prisons has remained effectively the same for the past two decades notwithstanding the disturbing increase in prison population (Ayade, 2010). The conditions of these prisons are in an alarming state of despair with no sense of maintenance or renovation reflective of long neglect by the Nigeria government. In fact, most of the prisons constructed at this period are old, in bad shape and at the brinks of collapse. The present finding is in agreement with previous research, which reported that psychological well-being, in general, is lower among individuals incarcerated than among the general population (Fazel S., Ramesh T., Hawton K. (2017).

The result of hypothesis two which state that resilience will significantly mediate the relationships between prison environment and self-harm urge among prisoners was confirmed. Results from the Sobel analysis showed that resilience has a significant mediatory role between prison environment and self-harm Urge. This result was convergent with the report of Shuwei Hao, Wei Hong, Honghong Xu, Lili Zhou, Zhongyao Xe (2015) that reported that resilience played a partial mediating role between work stress and burnout, that is, work stress had both a direct and an indirect, via resilience, impact on burnout. Work stress played a partial mediating role between resilience and burnout, thus, resilience could

prevent the development of burnout by relieving work stress, in addition to directly relieving it. The result of the present study is also consistent with the findings of Murphy & Moriarty (2012), which asserted that resilient individual escapes psychological dysfunction in spite of being in difficult circumstances. While less resilient individuals get worn out and negatively impacted by stressors in life, those high on resilience display dynamic self-renewal when faced with similar stressors.

This mediation relationship shows that resilience mitigates the effects of the direct relationship. In other words, the fact of being resilient leads to inmates to have less self-harm urge. The results of the present study evidenced the important role of resilience.

**Conclusion**

These results show that prison environment and resilience have a significant effect on self-harm Urge among inmates. In trying to understand the plights of inmates with focus on the prison environment, it is important to be cognizant of the varying circumstances that exist within prisons environment. These circumstances characterized by prison environment dimensions (structure, privacy, support, activities, emotional support, freedom, social relations, and safety) such give rise to unpredictable environmental dimensions. Additionally, the function of the prison and its impact on both inmate and guard contributes greatly to problems associated with these dimensions. The difficulties encountered with inmate concerns is heightened by the demands of society which argues for the barest of housing conditions, little or no recreational activities, and for stiffer, longer sentences while asking that those who are released be rehabilitated in hopes of reducing recidivism.

To potentially better the prison ideal of rehabilitation and reduce inmate concerns, effort and resources should be tailored to individual inmates rather than the total inmate population. This can start when offenders enter the prison by using sensitive psychological battery testing to help in profiling inmates who require specialized needs and placing them into the needed programmes. These programs would contain the proper resources needed to specifically deal and address unique inmate problems. Inmates who receive specific treatment regimen may feel as if the criminal justice system views them as an individual rather than a number, and by so doing reducing self-harm tendencies.

## Recommendation

On the basis of the above, the following recommendations were made, government may need to take into consideration the significant roles of prison environment when designing programme toward promoting or providing a prison environment for psychologically well-adjusted prison inmate and reduce self-harm. The implication of this finding is such that, new correctional policies, better operational and security procedures, with the ultimate goal of advancing an environment that is better equipped to accommodate the varying behaviors inmates' exhibit as well as incorporating their life experiences to better fit the prison environment and by extension reducing self-harm tendency among prison inmates should be put in place. In addition to using the prison environment scale across countries, attention should be given to studying the effects of the prison environment on some crowd behaviors among inmates.

## Reference

1. Africa Centre for the Prevention of Crime (2010). Challenges for the good governance of security in the Africa context, in International Report on Crime Prevention and Community Safety: Trends and Perspectives. Montreal, *International Centre for the Prevention of Crime*.
2. Ashkar, P., & Kenny, D. (2008). Views from the inside: young offenders' subjective experiences of incarceration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 52(5), 584-597.
3. Awopetu, R. G. (2014). An assessment of prison overcrowding in Nigeria: Implications for rehabilitation, reformation and reintegration of Inmates. *IOSR Journal of Humanities & Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19, (3), 21-26.
4. Ayade, E. A. (2010). Problems of prisons overcrowding in Nigeria: Some lessons from South Africa and America. LL.M, Human rights, Unpublished Thesis, Central European University, Legal Studies Department, Budapest, Hungary.
5. Beasley, S (2000). Deliberate self-harm in medium security. *Nursing Management*. 6, 8, 29-33.
6. Cerutti, R., Manca, M., Presaghi, F., and Gratz, K. L. (2016). Prevalence and clinical correlates of deliberate self-harm among a community sample of Italian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence* 34, 337-347.
7. De Looft J., Van de Haar M., Van Gemmert N., Bruggeman M. (2018). DJI in getal 2013-2017. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen.
8. Dhami, M. K., Ayton, P., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). Adaptation to imprisonment: Indigenous or imported? *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 34 (8), 1085-1100.
9. Fazel, S., Cartwright, J., Norman-Nott, A., & Hawton, K. (2008). Suicide in prisoners: A systematic review of risk factors. *Journal Clinical Psychiatry*; 69, 1721-1731.
10. Fazel S., Ramesh T., Hawton K. (2017). Suicide in prisons: An international study of prevalence and contributory factors. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 4, 946-952.
11. Finn, P. (2000). Addressing correctional officer stress: Programmes and strategies. Washington, DC: National institute of justice.
12. Gray, S. G., McGleish, A., MacCulloch, M. J., Hill, C., Timmons, D., et al. (2003). Prediction of violence and self-harm in mentally disordered offenders: A prospective study of the efficacy of HCR-20, PCL-R, and psychiatric symptomatology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 182, 443-451.
13. Haney, C. (2001). The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment. *British Journal of Psychological Sciences*, 1, 3, 394-397.
14. Hawton, K., Bergen, H., Casey, D., Simkin, S., Palmer, B., et al. (2007). Self-harm in England: A tale of three cities. Multi-centre study of self-harm. *Journal of Social Psychiatry & Epidemiology*; 42(7), 513-521.
15. Hinz A, Klein AM, Braehler E, Glaesmer H, Luck T, et al. (2017). Psychometric evaluation of the generalized anxiety disorder screener GAD-7, based on a large German general population sample. *J Affect Disorder* 210, 338-344.
16. Humber, N., Webb, R., Piper, M., Appleby, L., & Shaw, J. (2013). A national case-control study of risk factors for suicide among prisoners in England and Wales. *Social Psychiatry Epidemiology*, 48, 1177-1785.
17. Ineme, E. E. & Osinowo, A. B. (2015). Development and validation of prison inmates self-harm urges scale (Is-Hus): A psychometric study. *Ife Psychologia*, 23(1), 17-31.
18. Jeff, W. E., Levin, K. L. & Amit, K. O. (2010). Determinants of life satisfaction among 8 immigrants from Western countries and from the FSU in Israel. *Social Indices & Resources*; 96, 515-534.
19. Jimoh, M. O. (2007). Spiritual intelligence, emotional intelligence and intelligent quotient as predictors of adjustment to teaching profession among the voluntary teaching corps scheme employees in Ogun State. M. Ed Dissertation, Unpublished. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
20. Kapur, N. (2005). Management of self-harm in adults: which way now? *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 187, 497 - 499.
21. Kenny, D. T., Lennings, C. J., & Munn, O. A. (2008). Risk factors for self-harm and suicide in incarcerated young offenders: Implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 8, 358-382.
22. Kirchner, T., Forns, M., & Mohino, S. (2008). Identifying the risk of deliberate self-harm among young prisoners by means of coping typologies. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, 38, 42-48. doi:10.1521/suli.2008.38.4.442
23. Lanza-Kaduce L, Parker KF, & Thomas CW (1999). A comparative recidivism analysis of releases from private and public prisons. *Crime and Delinquency* 45, 28-47.
24. Murray H. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford
25. Murphy, E., Cooper, J. & Kapur, N. (2012). Hospital care and repetition following self-harm: multicenter comparison of self-poisoning and self-injury', *British Medical Journal*, 192, 440-445
26. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, (2004). Guidance on cancer services: Improving outcomes in head and neck cancers: The manual.
27. Nigeria Prisons Statistics, (2016). Prison population by total detainees, prison capacity and number of un-sentenced detainees by state and year and prison inmate population by gender 2011-2016.

28. Shuwei Hao, Wei Hong, Honghong Xu, Lili Zhou, Zhongyao Xe (2015) Relationship between resilience, stress and burnout among civil servants in Beijing, China: Mediating and moderating effect analysis *Personality and Individual Differences* 83(10).
29. Skegg, K. (2005) Self-harm. *Lancet*, 28, 1471 -1483.
30. Smith, R. (1984). The state of the prisons. Deaths in prison. *British Medical Journal* (Clinical Research Edition). 288, (12), 208-212.
31. Soyinka, W. (1972). *The Man Died: Prison Notes*. London: Penguin Books.
32. Stark, K., Herrmann, U., Ehrhardt, S. & Bienzle, U. (2006). A syringe exchange programme in prison as prevention strategy against HIV infection and hepatitis B and C in Berlin, Germany", *Epidemiology & Infections*, 134 (4), 814-819.
33. Swann, R. & James, P. (1998). The effect of the prison environment upon inmate drug taking behavior, *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 252-265.
34. Tang J, Ma Y, Guo Y, Ahmed NI, Yu Y, & Wang J. (2013). Association of aggression and nonsuicidal self-injury: a school-based sample of adolescents. 11, 40-49.
35. United Nations Prison Statistics Bureau, (2016). Correctional populations in the United States in 2016. *Bulletin of the Bureau of Justice Statistics: Office of Justice Programmes*.
36. Webb, R., Carr, M., Green, J., Carolyn, A., Kapur, N., & Ashcroft, D. (2017). Incidence, clinical management and mortality risk following self-harm among children and adolescent: Cohort study in primary care. *British Medical Journal*, 359.
37. Weiten, W., Dunn, D. S., & Hammer, E. Y. (2011). *Psychology applied to modern life: Adjustment in the 21st Century*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
38. Wright, K. N. (1985). Developing the prison environment inventory. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 22, 257-277.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here:

**Submit Manuscript**

DOI: [10.31579/2637-8892/203](https://doi.org/10.31579/2637-8892/203)

#### Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://auctoresonline.org/journals/psychology-and-mental-health-care>