

REPORT

JULY - DECEMBER, 1979

This report arises from a grant awarded to Mr. K.A. Maine, Director, Department for Community Welfare, Perth, W.A. by the Criminology Research Council in August 1979 (vide C.R.C. Project 13/79)

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

RECIDIVISM MONITORING PROGRAMME

COMMITTEE

Chairman: Don Andrew - Superintendent, Riverbank

Members: Marian Binnie - Superintendent, Hillston
Paul Birchall - Research Psychologist
Des Semple - Assistant Director,
Institutions
Kim Stotter - Superintendent, Nyandi
Ken Williams - Chief of Institutional
Services

Data Analysis: Paul Birchall, in conjunction with
Penny Dufty of the Regional Computing
Centre, University of Western Australia

Report: Kim Stotter

PREFACE

This Supplementary Report assumes the reader has read the Report on Study Period I. As such Part I (Introduction) and Part II (Methodology) have not been repeated. Similarly many of the introductory comments in Part III (Results) have not been restated. This Report simply notes the trends which were indicated in Study Period I and comments on whether or not the results from Study Period II support these.

The Overview of Results again is an update of Study Period I and does not repeat the discussion of the study design in relation to the results.

Similarly to the first Study Period the Summary is a complete and self contained statement which can be read in isolation from the rest of the Report.

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
1. Results	1
2. Discussion	18
3. Summary	24

PART 1

RESULTS

There were a total of 168 cases included in this study which is 20 fewer than for Study Period I. The numbers at each Centre were:-

<u>CENTRE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SAMPLE</u>
Nyandi	21	13
Hillston	86	51
Riverbank	61	36

The composition of the sample is very similar to Study Period I with Hillston and Riverbank having a slightly greater proportion and Nyandi being slightly reduced.

Originally the sample consisted of 180 cases. However a total of 12 had to be excluded from the study as they did not complete their 180 post intervention community days within the prescribed time limit. This time limit was originally set down as two years after the commencement of the Study Period. However it was later extended to 27 months so that in Study Period I at least 90% of the cases at each Centre would be included. With Study Period II the time limit had to be extended again, this time to 30 months, in order that 90% of the cases from each Centre would be included. Comments on the research problems associated with imposing a time limit can be found in Part 2 and Part 4 of the Report on Study Period I.

Offence rates at each Centre for the pre intervention period were:-

Nyandi	-	7.1 offences per person
Hillston	-	9.3 offences per person
Riverbank	-	21.1 offences per person

These rates are similar but slightly higher than the first Study Period. Again Nyandi's rate would be slightly higher if two non-offending cases were excluded.

The levels of offence reduction for the three Centres were:-

Nyandi	-	38.7%
Hillston	-	26%
Riverbank	-	61.3%

These figures indicate that Riverbank has improved its rate over the first Study Period by 5.7% while Hillston's rate has deteriorated by 24.1% and Nyandi's by 20.0%.

The results obtained by Riverbank appear to be within the normal statistical range. Hillston's results however appear to be an extreme fluctuation which has been caused by an over representation of cases whose post offending figures were unusually high. Preliminary perusal of the data being collected for the third Study Period indicates that Hillston's rate will again be similar to Study Period I. Nyandi's sample consists of a much smaller number of cases than the other Centres and thus the rates obtained for each Study Period are likely to be more erratic.

1.2 Offence Patterns
Relevant Table: 1.1.2

If all offences for both pre and post are combined for the three Centres then it can be seen that property offences dominate the results making 81% of the total which is almost identical to the previous Study Period. The most prevalent property offence was again common stealing or theft followed by motor vehicle offences.

Offences against the person were identical in percentage to Study Period I consisting of only 2% of the total. Again assault dominated this category.

The remaining 17% of offences were against good order being exclusively related to misconduct. Out of the total of 3,148 offences there were none related to drugs.

As for Study Period I the greatest reduction was in property offences (50%) followed by good order (38%) and person offences (15%).

2. Recidivism in Relation to Personal Characteristics at Intervention

2.1 Age Relevant Table: 2.1.1

Most children in the study were again aged between 13 and 18, the only variation being at Hillston where 5 boys aged under 13 were admitted. None of the Centres admitted persons over 18.

In the first Study Period there was no clear indication that recidivism varied with age. However it was noted that better than average results were obtained with 17 year olds at all Centres. This study generally supported these conclusions in that a significant reduction in recidivism was achieved irrespective of age although again a better than average result was achieved by the 17 year olds.

Study Period I found that overall, the 14 year olds had the highest offence rate before intervention and thereafter the rates generally declined as age increased. This trend was particularly apparent at Hillston and Riverbank. Although the results of this Study Period tend to support this overall trend, it is not nearly so marked, with Riverbank being the only individual Centre to clearly support it. Thus the results of future Study Periods will need to be examined before any trends can be claimed in this area.

2.2 Ethnic Identity Relevant Tables: 2.2.1 5.1.1

As with Study Period I, Aborigines again accounted for about 40% of admissions to Hillston and 60% to Nyandi. Riverbank's Aboriginal admittances rose from 40% to 54%.

At Hillston the offence rate of Aboriginal children prior to intervention was slightly less than the "Other" children and they tended to do slightly better in the post intervention period.

The offence rate of Aboriginal children prior to intervention at Riverbank was the same as "Other" children. However they did not appear to respond as well to the programme, having a higher offence rate in the post intervention period.

At Nyandi the offence rate of Aboriginal children at intervention was significantly less than the "Other" children but their performance in the post intervention period was very poor when compared to a significant improvement for the "Others".

The broad conclusion drawn from the previous Study Period was that institutionally based programmes were achieving good levels of success with Aborigines. This conclusion continues to be supported by this Study Period where the overall figures for Aborigines indicate an offence reduction of 44%. The trends at individual Centres however are not as clear but may be established after the completion of further Study Periods.

2.3 Normal Place of Abode
Relevant Tables: 2.3.1
5.1.1

Similar to the first Study Period, just under one third of the admittances to each Centre were from the country (Hillston 30%, Riverbank 32%, Nyandi 28%). The overall numbers from each of the Country Divisions were:-

Kimberley	-	4
Pilbara	-	10
Murchison	-	10
Goldfields	-	6
Central	-	10
Southern	-	12

This distribution is very similar to the previous Study Period.

The offence rate, prior to intervention, for country children referred to Hillston and Riverbank was slightly lower than for metropolitan children, while at Nyandi it was significantly lower.

At Hillston the metropolitan and country children showed similar improvement in the post intervention period. At Riverbank the country children did significantly better than the metropolitan children although both groups showed a reduction in offences of more than 50%. At Nyandi the metropolitan children did better than the country children.

The conclusion drawn in the first Study Period was that good levels of success can be achieved by the placement of country children in metropolitan Centres. The overall result of this Study Period supported this conclusion. However, in making this claim the high degree of association between Aboriginal and country children has to be taken into account. A Chi square test performed on the combined data for all Centres contained in Table 5.1.1 showed a highly significant association (.001 level) between country abode and Aboriginality. The results obtained for Nyandi however were not significant. This is an identical situation to that of the first Study Period.

2.4 Lifestyle before Intervention Relevant Table: 2.4.1

Similar to the findings of the first Study Period the predominant lifestyle of nearly two thirds of the children was classified as "Home or Extended Family". As a result, the remaining groups are too small to give anything but erratic results with the possible exception of the "mixed" group. When this group is compared with the home and extended family group they do better at each Centre

In Study Period I it was noted when examining data relating to lifestyle after intervention, that increased stability seemed to be associated with offence reduction. In examining this Table it could be argued that the "mixed" group in the pre intervention period hence the greatest scope for improving their stability of lifestyle, which in turn is reflected in the offence rates. For further discussion on this area see Section 4.3.

The results obtained in the first Study Period were inconclusive. Although it is possible that trends may be starting to emerge in this Study Period, the results need to be treated with some caution as small numbers in most categories are presenting erratic figures. The structure of the category definitions also appear to be limiting the usefulness of this Table at present.

2.5 Personality Indication
Relevant Tables: 2.5.1
5.3.1

As we found in Study Period I, when the figures for all Centres are combined, by far the greater number of children were classified as A (80%). A further 16% were classified as E, with the balance of 7 cases (5 at Nyandi and 2 at Hillston) being classified at P. Because of the small numbers in the P and E categories at all Centres, some caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the results.

At Hillston the offending rate of the P and E categories has deteriorated while the A category has shown a significant improvement. This is a similar result to that obtained in the first Study Period, except for the P classification which could virtually be disregarded because it contained only 2 cases.

During the two Study Periods under consideration Riverbank has only had one case classified at P. As such any analysis would have to ignore this category at present. In examining

the other two categories the results are still not indicating any trends. In fact, in the first Study Period the cases categorized as E did significantly better than A, whereas in the second Study Period the situation was reversed.

Nyandi's performance is opposite to that of Hillston in both Study Periods where children classified as P or E have done significantly better than those classified as A.

Because of the small numbers involved in some of the categories, definite conclusions are hard to draw. However, it is possible that some trends are beginning to emerge in relation to individual Centres although several more Study Periods will need to be examined to confirm this.

In examining Personality Indication in relation to whether offences are committed in Company or Alone, there are still no significant trends emerging.

2.6 Admission at Intervention

Relevant Table: 2.6.1

Similar to the first Study Period, over half of Hillston's cases were first admittances whereas Nyandi's were again spread more evenly over all categories. Nyandi was also the only Centre to have cases in the 10 - 14 admissions group. The number of first admittances to Riverbank reduced from almost 75% in the first Study Period to just over 40% in this Study Period. This was brought about by the fact that the Centre was continually operating at full capacity during the second Study Period, with a number of boys usually being held at other Centres awaiting admission. This situation was created by three factors. Firstly there were a greater number of boys who were on long periods of remand which similarly prevented earlier discharge arrangements being made. Thirdly Riverbank itself decided to keep several boys for longer periods because of their particular circumstances.

Riverbank's first admittances again showed the greatest offence reduction while Hillston again achieved its best results with the 2 - 4 admissions group. The numbers in each category at Nyandi are still too small, producing what appears to be erratic results.

The conclusion drawn from Study Period I was that, overall, there was no consistent trend to indicate that the prospects of success are affected at all by the number of admissions at the time of intervention. While this conclusion is generally supported by this Study Period, there is possibly a trend emerging in that Hillston and Riverbank are tending to be more successful with their lower admission groups. Several more study periods will be required to confirm this emerging trend.

3. Offence Patterns Prior to Intervention

3.1 Offence Frequency

Relevant Tables: 3.1.1
3.1.2

As in the first Study Period, the majority of cases are spread across the 1 - 5 and 6 - 20 offence categories with the only marked deviation being Riverbank which had 40% of its cases in the more than 20 offence category.

During the first Study Period all Centres showed some improvement with the 1 - 5 offences group, with Riverbank achieving outstanding results. During the present Study Period this group performed very poorly. At each Centre this group deteriorated in that they committed significantly more offences in the post intervention period than in the pre intervention period. However good results were achieved at all Centres with the remaining groups. The conclusion of the first study thus continues to be supported, in that frequent offenders, who are commonly regarded as the least likely to respond, are able to make significant improvement.

In analysing Table 3.1.2 the cells running diagonally from the top left hand to the bottom right hand contain the number of cases which neither improved nor deteriorated in terms of the categories. Cases which improved appear below and to the left of this diagonal, while those which deteriorated are above and to the right.

In terms of the Recidivism Monitoring Programme a non offender is a child who has not offended in the 180 community days prior to intervention. It is possible for a non offender in this study to be legally an offender. There were 4 non offenders in the total of 168 cases - 1 at Hillston, 1 at Riverbank and 2 at Nyandi. The non offender at Riverbank was, on remand for a rape offence committed before the 180 community days pre intervention period. The case at Hillston, together with one of the cases at Nyandi, became offenders in the post intervention period. The Riverbank case together with the other Nyandi case remained non offenders.

If the 4 non offenders are excluded it can be seen from the Tables that of the remaining 164 cases, 46 did not offend at all in the post intervention period (28%). This is lower than the 41% obtained in the first Study Period but still considered to be a good result.

By combining all the offender cases for the 3 Centres it can be seen that 60% improved in that they moved into a lower frequency category, 27% remained the same and 13% deteriorated in that they moved into a higher frequency category. These results are not quite as good as the preceding Study Period but consistent with it and again support the generalized view that juvenile rehabilitation is working.

Rather than examining the movement between offence frequency categories, an alternative way of assessing success in this area is to simply count the number of offences committed by each child in the pre and post 180 day periods. By doing this the number of children who improved, remained the same,

or deteriorated, can be ascertained. Results obtained using this method indicated that 73% improved in that they committed less offences in the post period, 4% remained the same and 23% deteriorated in that they had an increased offence frequency in the post period.

3.2 Offender Types

Relevant Tables: 3.2.1
3.2.2
3.2.3
3.2.4

As was found in the first Study Period a clear majority of the cases were classified as property offenders (84%). Of these approximately 75% were common property offenders while about 25% were car thieves. Again, similar to the previous Study Period, the next largest group was property and person offenders. The majority of this group were "mixed offenders" with 12 assailants comprising the majority of the remaining cases. This differs to the first Study Period in which assailants comprised the majority of the group. As with the previous Study Period there was only one child who offended exclusively against the person.

The overall character of the populations at the 3 Centres in terms of offender types, tended to differ from the first Study Period, although the similarity between the Centres was far greater this time. Future studies may establish trends in this area.

The predominant groups in descending order of frequency at each Centre were:-

Hillston	-	Common Property offenders Car thieves Mixed offenders Assailants
Riverbank	-	Common Property offenders Car thieves Mixed offenders Assailants
Nyandi	-	Common Property offenders Car thieves Assailants Non offenders

At Riverbank and Hillston the order differs slightly from the first Study Period. However the numbers which caused these changes are only small. Apart from common property offenders, the order of the groups at Nyandi have little meaning because of the low numbers in each.

The trend noted in the last report, that male assailants at Riverbank and Hillston had relatively low offence rates while female assailants at Nyandi has relatively high rates, was supported by this study.

The report on the first Study Period noted that if Table 3.2.3 was examined closely, enemy type of offender for each Centre achieved reductions in the identified problem areas. This trend, while still apparent in this Study Period, did not appear with the same consistency with some offender type categories showing an increased offence rate. There is also still no clear evidence to suggest that certain types of offenders improve more than others.

As with the first Study Period there were again no drug offenders and only one disorderly conduct offender, this time at Riverbank (previously there were 5 at Nyandi).

Table 3.2.4 shows the extent to which individual cases moved into different offence categories in the post intervention period. As in the first Study Period, this Table was used to examine only those cases which offended in the pre and post intervention periods. That is, those offenders who continued to offend, whether or not they remained the same type of offender.

Forty six percent of the cases who continued to offend remained in the same category as compared to 41% for the first Study Period. Twenty seven percent moved into a more serious category (previously 35%) while 17% moved into a less serious category (previously 25%). That is, about half of the offenders who offend again in the post intervention period, remained true to type. The other half were divided

evenly between those who became a more serious type of offender and those who became a less serious type. This appears to basically support the conclusion of the previous report that it is not generally meaningful to think of offenders as being of one particular type, in the sense that something in their make-up will predispose them to certain offence patterns.

3.3 Offender Type (Company/Alone)
Relevant Tables: 3.3.1
3.3.2
5.3.2

In the first Study Period it was found that only 17% of the offenders committed offences both in company and alone during the pre intervention period. This percentage was almost doubled in the present Study Period to 32%. The greatest majority of offenders still offended in company although in this Study Period it was 61% compared to 75% in the first Study Period. The lone offenders remained a small group of 7% (previously 10%).

The generalized distribution outlined in the previous paragraph was not found consistently across the Centres as in the first Study Period. Nyandi had a greater percentage of lone offenders than the other two Centres. Hillston had a higher percentage of company offenders than the others while Riverbank had a higher percentage in the company and alone category.

As with the first Study Period no consistent trend emerged to differentiate the various groups in terms of offence rates for the pre intervention period. Nor does there appear to be much to separate the groups in terms of offence reduction figures.

In examining Table 3.3.2 in the first Study Period, a trend was noted in that about 40% of company offenders subsequently became non offenders, compared with 30% of company and lone offenders, and 20% of lone offenders. This trend could not

be substantiated in this Study Period, where about 27% of offenders from all categories became non offenders in the post intervention period.

It was noted in the report on the first Study Period that only six cases changed from lone to company or vice versa, suggesting that these were fairly durable characteristics. This trend was substantiated by this Study Period with only seven of these cases changing type.

4. Departmental Action after Intervention

4.1 Observed Legal Constraint Relevant Table: 4.1.1

The number of cases subject to constraints was slightly higher at all Centres for this Study Period than for the first Study Period. Hillston rose from 8% to 12%, Riverbank from 32% to 34% and Nyandi from 8% to 19%. During the first Study Period 67% of the constraints were observed to the 75% level or above, compared to this study in which 83% were observed.

There was a total of six cases where, according to the data, the constraint recommendation was not complied with to the 75% level - three at Hillston and three at Riverbank. Further examination of these cases however revealed that one case at Hillston and one at Riverbank had in fact observed the recommended constraint to the 75% level. Rounding off to the nearest month in accordance with the present definition used had led to an incorrect response from the computer. Another of the Hillston cases involved the constraint being observed at Hillston rather than at Longmore as recommended.

It might be expected that offence rates in the pre intervention period for the "no constraint" group would be the lowest, followed by the "constraints observed up to 75%" with the highest rate. In the first Study Period both Hillston and

Nyandi followed this pattern but the trend at Riverbank was in the opposite direction. In the current Study Period Nyandi and Riverbank followed this pattern with Hillston showing the reverse trend, although the differences in the groups at Hillston were not particularly big. Small figures in some of the groups at all Centres are probably leading to erratic results and further Study Periods will be needed to see whether any trends emerge. The other factor which might mitigate against the expected trends is the seriousness of the offences. That is, the Courts often make recommendations because of the seriousness of a particular offence rather than the frequency of a number of lesser offences.

Reductions in the offending rate were achieved in all categories at all Centres. Hillston did best with the group where constraints were observed up to 75% level and worst with the "no constraint" group. Riverbank did best with the "no constraint" group and worst where they observed constraint to the 75% level and above. Nyandi has achieved similar results with all groups. It can be stated however, that where the Department has not observed a recommended constraint to the 75% level, the groups have done better than the groups where it has been observed, indicating that departures from recommendations have generally been appropriate. Again because of small numbers further Study Periods will be needed before definite statements can be made. However, as with the previous Study Period, the Department has demonstrated a substantial degree of compliance with Court recommendations.

4.2 Number and Length of Admissions Relevant Table: 4.2.1

Similar to the preceding Study Period there was a reasonable spread of cases across the various "time in the institution" categories. Nyandi was again perhaps the exception with 43% of its cases in the 0-45 day category with subsequent decreasing numbers of cases as the time in the Centre increased. In single admissions they only had 2 cases which stayed in the Centre more than 45 days. It is also interesting to note that Riverbank's greatest number of cases were in the 135+ day

category (36%). This probably a reflection of the restriction placed on them by Court recommendations.

As with the first Study Period it was difficult to discern any trend in the pre intervention offence rates. However, in most categories across the 3 Centres single admissions have a better offence reduction than multiple admissions. This however, is to be expected as a readmission usually results from reoffending.

The report on the first Study Period also suggested there may be a patchy trend of declining improvement as the length of stay increases. Again this was difficult to establish, although it may become clearer with future Study Periods. It does appear however, that the 135+ days group at each Centre has performed worse than the other groups. Even if trends do not emerge with the completion of future Study Periods, there is certainly no evidence to date in either of the completed Study Periods, to suggest that short stays are ineffective.

4.3 Lifestyle After Intervention

Relevant Tables: 4.3.1
4.3.2
5.2.1

The distribution of cases over the various categories at each Centre is remarkably similar to the first Study Period. This again poses problems in analysing the data, as the majority of cases at all Centres are in the "home or extended family" group, leaving a thin distribution on other categories. As such, results are again likely to be somewhat erratic and it is likely to be several more Study Periods before any trends can be confirmed.

The first Study Period found that because the "home and extended family" group were highly represented, their offence rates in the pre intervention period were similar to the average at all Centres. Offence reduction rates were also similar but at every Centre slightly above the average. In the present Study Period the offence rate prior to intervention was again similar to the average but slightly above with the exception of Nyandi.

As was found in the previous study the offence reduction for the A.W.O.L. group is again well above average. Open institutional care also continues to do well at Riverbank, although the previous general trend noted was not supported by Hillston in this Study Period.

In examining Table 4.3.2 in the first Study Period, a clear trend emerged at all Centres showing that as changes in lifestyle reduced the degree of offence reduction improved. This trend was again strongly supported by this Study Period with all Centres showing a distinct and progressive improvement in offence reduction in relation to the relative stability of the group.

As pointed out in the previous report this is simply a correlation from which cause and effect cannot be determined at present. However, it continues to be an area worthy of further examination as it is possible that efforts to increase lifestyle stability could result in an improvement in offence reduction.

Table 5.2.1 clearly demonstrates the stability of the "home or extended family" lifestyle as compared to the high rate of movement in the other groups. As suggested in the first report, there still appears to be a need to investigate the hypothesis that the stability of lifestyle may be more important than the specific nature of any particular lifestyle.

4.4 Institutional Responsibility

Relevant Tables: 4.4.1
4.4.2

Similar to the first Study Period, most of the country cases returned to the country after intervention, having little contact with the After-Care Service offered by the Centres, while most of the metropolitan cases remained in the metropolitan area under the supervision of After-Care Officers.

There was some indication in the first Study Period for children with higher pre intervention offence rates to move from country to the metropolitan area and vice versa. Again data from the present Study Period does not clarify this issue but there does not appear to be much evidence to support the claim at this stage.

The issues involved in interpreting these cases are somewhat complex and there are a number of intertwined factors which affect the results. For example, correlated with the After-Care Service is the metropolitan abode and European race, whereas field supervision is highly correlated with country abode and Aboriginality. In addition to this, where the cases are not totally metropolitan or country, there is no indication as to where the offences occurred. These factors, together with the small numbers in most categories make any interpretation of these results difficult at this stage.

PART 2

DISCUSSION

During the second Study Period, from 1 July to 31 December, 1979 a total of 180 cases were collected. From these 12 had to be excluded from the analysis because the individuals concerned were unable to complete the required post intervention community time. This left a sample of analysis of 168 cases.

The excluded cases continue to present a genuine research problem. They cannot be included in the sample as they have not completed the required 180 days community time. In fact, 3 of the cases did not complete any post community days. As was argued in the first Study Period Report, however, to exclude them is to exclude possibly some of the less responsive cases. Although this was apparant in the first Study Period, where their inclusion would have reduced the overall offence reduction figure from 54% to 43%, inclusion of the 12 cases in this Study Period would not have had nearly the same effect. That is, it would reduce the overall offence reduction figure by only 3% to 44%. This lesser effect may have to some extent resulted from the fact that the excluded cases in the second Study Period only accumulated an average of 77 community days each compared to 109 days average for those cases excluded from the first Study Period. In fact, the 12 cases excluded in this Study Period showed an offence reduction of 26% compared to an increase of 71% in the first Study Period.

There was some discussion in the Report on the first Study Period concerning the length of the 180 community days monitoring period. It was pointed out that to accumulate these 180 days up to 2 years was required and even then 10% of Riverbank cases had to be excluded because they had been unable to collect sufficient community days. With the second Study Period the collection time has had to be extended to 30 months in order to allow 90% of Riverbank's cases to be included.

The collection time may of course be extended ad infinitum until all participating cases have accumulated 180 days community time. The base line period it seems would also similarly have to be extended. However, there does come some point in time when a child's behaviour in the community cannot be said to be a reflection of the institutional programme. For example, if a youth under Riverbank's care is gaoled for 4 years can his behaviour on release be attributable to the time he last spent in Riverbank for some 4 plus years ago?

There is also the practical issue that it is essentially a monitoring programme and the collection period must be kept sufficiently short in order to produce information which is up to date and useful.

A similar issue which also brings into effect the above arguments is whether or not the 180 community days is a sufficiently long monitoring period. To extend this means in effect that the collection time would have to be extended. If the 180 days monitoring period was to be extended then so too would the baseline period. This is because offending patterns are not constant over the baseline period but vary with factors such as age. Thus it was hypothesised in the first report that an extension of the 180 community day period would not necessarily lead to an improvement or deterioration in the results obtained.

In order to test this hypothesis each Centre took the first Study Period and extended the pre and post community days to 360. This in effect produced a marked decline in the offence reduction rates at each Centre. Results obtained were as follows:-

	<u>180 days</u>	<u>360 days</u>
Nyandi	58.7%	46.9%
Hillston	50.1%	37.0%
Riverbank	55.6%	49.0%

The reason for these results were unclear but may be attributable to the increased influence of maturation factors in the post period. The committee resolved to conduct the exercise again for the 80a Study Period when sufficient time had elapsed to make this exercise possible.

It was noted in the first Study Period that some individuals in the sample had a disproportionately adverse effect on the overall offence reduction figures. It was suggested that a worthwhile future development would be to identify these as atypical cases and examine their effect on the results. As a result of this each Centre assembled data relating to all its cases in the first Study Period. This data was then graphed so that atypical cases could easily be identified. What was found was that there were 2 fairly distinct groups of atypical cases - 1 which had a markedly adverse effect on the results and 1 which had a markedly good effect on the results. These 2 groups tended to cancel each other out in terms of any unbalanced effect. It was felt that to separate out 1 group would be inappropriate and then it was decided not to proceed with this type of data analysis in future Study Periods. Rather it was resolved that more benefit would be gained by analysing more closely those children whose rate of offending deteriorates in the post intervention period in 2 or more consecutive periods. This data is now being collected on an ongoing basis and results will be discussed in the reports of future Study Periods.

As with the first Study Period, the sample size in this Study Period is quite adequate for the purpose of conducting the broader type of statistical analysis. However, in conducting some of the more detailed analysis, the small numbers in some categories again lead to inconclusive and what often appeared to be erratic results. Thus while some of the results obtained from individual Study Periods may be criticised because of the small number of cases on which the results are based, the design strength of the Recidivism Monitoring Programme is that the Study is in effect replicated every 6 months. Results or trends noted in 1 Study Period can

eventually be confirmed, or rejected by subsequent Study Periods. If needs be the raw data from the same categories in different Study Periods can also be collapsed together to increase the numbers in a particular category to enable a more valid analysis.

The sample for the second Study Period was similar in size to the first Study Period and the distribution of cases between Centres was also very similar. In general the second Study Period confirms the results obtained in the first.

It was concluded in the first Study Period that the safest interpretation of the overall data, taking into consideration factors such as the excluded cases and the adverse effect of a few atypical cases, would be to claim an offence reduction in the vicinity of 50%. The offence reduction achieved in this Study Period of 47% is thus similar.

Future Study Periods will be needed to confirm this result as a normal fluctuation from what will eventually "pan out" as the average. However a brief perusal of the results of data already collected for future Study Periods would indicate this to be the case.

Again the majority of cases in the second Study Period have come from Hillston and Riverbank with Nyandi contributing only 13% (21 cases) of the sample. This situation has been largely brought about by a practice at Nyandi to admit most of its new referrals direct to community-based facilities (hostels) rather than the maximum security unit. These hostels operate an intensive treatment programme and it is only when the girl consistently fails or seriously offends that she is admitted to the secure unit. This programme of course monitors only those girls who are admitted to Nyandi security.

It has already been noted that the analysis conducted on some of the more detailed Tables with small numbers in each category can produce inconclusive or erratic results.

This is particularly the case with Nyandi where even the total sample is of questionable size for the purpose of conducting an acceptable statistical analysis. Thus as future Study Periods are concluded there would appear to be a good case for Nyandi at least to collapse the raw data from a number of Study Periods together prior to the analysis being conducted.

The community in general regarded offences against the persons as the most serious category of offence, probably followed by offences against property and then good order. It is thus pleasing to note that offences against the person amount to only a very small number of the total offences committed in both pre and post periods (2%). However, in both Study Periods the least reduction has been achieved with person offences. While the differences in the rates of reduction for property, person and good order offences were not as great in the first Study Period as the marked differences obtained in the second Study Period future results will need to be watched. If in future a trend is established which indicates that offences against the person do not improve as much as other categories, then there may be future programme implications. This would be irrespective of whether the same or different individuals are committing the offences.

The age at which a person should cease to be dealt with under the Juvenile Justice System and come under the Adult Criminal Justice System has been a point of debate in Western Australia for some time. At present the age is 18 years and any mooted change is usually for a lowering of the age. Thus the performance of 17 year old age group in this programme has been looked on with special interest. In the first Study Period a better than average result was achieved with 17 year olds and this was again the case in this Study Period. Thus a group who were commonly thought to be suspect in relation to gaining any benefit from the institutional programmes to date have responded well.

Another commonly held and often debated opinion in Western Australia is that there is little value in admitting Aborigines to metropolitan based institutions. particularly if they are from the country areas. Similarly it is commonly held that there is little value in admitting children from the country to institutions in the metropolitan area. Consideration of both these factors is complicated by the fact that there is a high degree of correlation between the two of them. However, in looking at each group separately good levels of success have been achieved with both in the first and second Study Periods. Thus while this in itself does not justify these admissions, it does indicate that when such admissions take place, then something positive can be achieved.

Concern has recently been expressed in Western Australia about the practice of treating offenders and non offenders in the same institution. Although there are a number of complex issues involved one of the main concerns is the contaminating effect that offenders may have on non offenders.

The "non offender" at Riverbank during the second Study Period was admitted on a charge of Rape committed prior to the 180 day pre intervention period. However if data for the first 2 Study Periods is combined for Hillston and Nyandi then 3 of the 5 non offenders admitted to Hillston subsequently offended while 2 of the 10 at Nyandi offended. Some care needs to be taken in considering these results as already mentioned a non offender in terms of this study is not necessarily legally a non offender.

In general terms the results obtained in this Study Period are again very pleasing and continue to indicate that the institutional based treatment of juveniles in Western Australia is making a major contribution to their rehabilitation.

PART 3

SUMMARY

The Recidivism Monitoring Programme was implemented by the Department for Community Welfare in Western Australia as a standardized system of evaluating its major training Centres which deal with juvenile delinquents - Hillston, Riverbank and Nyandi. Whilst these Centres have various objectives with children, it was considered that offence reduction was clearly the most important goal and therefore the main criterion to be applied in evaluating effectiveness.

The Recidivism Monitoring Programme was introduced on the 1 January 1979. This is the second in what is proposed to be an ongoing series of reports based on 6 monthly "Study Periods". Each period corresponds with either the first or second half of a calendar year and it is during these periods that the cases for the study are collected. The cases comprise all those children admitted to the Centre for training purposes at some time during a particular Study Period, in this instance between July and December 1979.

The first admission by each child during a Study Period is when intervention is said to have occurred. Offence related data for each person is then collected for 180 days before and 180 days after Intervention and compared. In determining these 180 day periods only days when the individual is in the community and therefore has an opportunity to commit offences are counted.

The term "recidivism" is used comparatively in the programme in that an earlier rate of offending is compared with subsequent performance. In this sense it is a measure of improvement (or deterioration), improvement when there has been a reduction in the rate of offending.

Originally it was thought that two years would be sufficient time to collect the data. However, in the case of this Study Period 30 months were required for at least 90% of the cases at all Centres to complete their 180 post intervention days in the community. Cases which were unable to complete this requirement due to various factors such as gaol terms have been excluded from the data analysis.

Twelve cases were excluded from the second Study Period because they were unable to complete the post intervention period in the community. This left a sample of 168 cases. Similar to the preceding Study Period nearly all the children were aged between 13 and 18 with 87% being boys.

The overall results obtained by the 3 Centres was again very pleasing and consistent with the previous Study Period. Offences were reduced from 2236 in the pre intervention period to 1182 in the post intervention period, a reduction of 47%.

Offence patterns were almost identical to the first Study Period with 81% of the total of all offences in both pre and post intervention periods being property offences. Again offences against the person accounted for only 2% of the total. The remaining offences were against good order. Similar to the previous Study Period the greatest reduction was achieved in property offences, followed by good order and then person.

As with the first Study Period a significant reduction in recidivism was achieved irrespective of age although again better than average results were achieved with the oldest group, 17 year olds.

The institutionally based programmes again achieved a good level of success with Aboriginal children resulting in an offence reduction rate of 44% for this group. Similarly

they again achieved a good level of success with country children who accounted for just under one third of the admissions. It should be noted however, that there is a significant correlation between Aboriginal and country children and any discussion of the results needs to take this into account.

In general the findings of the first Study Period that overall there was no consistent trend to indicate that the prospects of success are affected by the number of previous admissions, was again supported by this Study Period.

If offence patterns prior to intervention are examined the conclusion of the first Study Period is supported in that frequent offenders who are commonly regarded as the least likely to respond are able to improve significantly. In examining individual cases it was found that 73% improved in that they committed less offences in the post intervention period, 4% remained the same and 23% deteriorated.

The report on the first Study Period noted that every type of offender for each Centre achieved reductions in the identified problem areas. For example assailants showed a reduction in person offences. This trend, while still apparent in this Study Period did not appear with the same consistency, with not all offender type categories showing a reduced offence rate. There is also still no clear evidence to suggest that certain types of offenders improve more than others.

The majority of offenders again offended in company. However, as with the first period there was no consistent trend to differentiate company and alone offenders in terms of offence reduction.

The distribution of cases over the various lifestyle after intervention categories was similar to the first Study Period. In the first Study Period a clear trend emerged

at all Centres showing that as changes in lifestyle reduced the degree of offence reduction improved. This trend was again strongly supported by this Study Period with all Centres showing a distinct and progressive improvement in offence reduction in relation to the relative stability of the group. While this is simply a correlation from which cause and effect cannot be determined it is possible that efforts to increase lifestyle stability could result in an improvement in offence reduction.

In conclusion this second Study Period generally supports the findings of the first in that most of the trends initially identified were supported. The data again quite clearly indicates that the Department's 3 main training Centres for juvenile delinquents are effective in reducing the crime among the populations for which they cater.