



Australian Government
Australian Institute of Criminology

The specific deterrent effect of custodial penalties on juvenile reoffending

Don Weatherburn
Sumitra Vignaendra
Andrew McGrath

AIC Reports
Technical and
Background Paper **33**

The specific deterrent effect of custodial penalties on juvenile reoffending

*Don Weatherburn
Sumitra Vignaendra
Andrew McGrath*

AIC Reports
Technical and
Background Paper

33



© Australian Institute of Criminology 2009

ISSN 1836-2052
ISBN 978 1 921532 40 5

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), no part of this publication may in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, microcopying, photocopying, recording or otherwise) be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted without prior written permission. Inquiries should be addressed to the publisher.

Project no. 02/04-05

Published by the Australian Institute of Criminology
GPO Box 2944
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: (02) 6260 9200
Fax: (02) 6260 9299
Email: front.desk@aic.gov.au
Website: <http://www.aic.gov.au>

Please note: minor revisions are occasionally made to publications after release. The online versions available on the AIC website will always include any revisions.

Disclaimer: This research report does not necessarily reflect the policy position of the Australian Government.

Edited and typeset by the Australian Institute of Criminology

A full list of publications in the AIC Reports series can be found on the Australian Institute of Criminology website at <http://www.aic.gov.au>

Contents

v	Executive summary
1	Introduction
2	Deterrence theory
2	The evidence on specific deterrence
4	The present study
4	Survey procedure
5	Response rate and subject attrition
5	Variables
5	Analysis
6	Results
10	Conclusion
11	Appendix
14	References

Figures

9	Figure 1: Proportion not reconvicted by free time since index court appearance (Model A)
9	Figure 2: Proportion not reconvicted by free time since index court appearance (Model B)

Tables

5	Table 1: Factors examined for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis
6	Table 2: Descriptive statistics for bivariate predictors of time to reconviction
6	Table 3: Descriptive statistics for bivariate predictors of time to reconviction
8	Table 4: Effect of custody on time to reconviction (unadjusted and adjusted estimates)

Executive summary

Only 10.3 percent of the 6,488 juveniles who appeared in the NSW Children's Court in 2007 were given a control order, yet 48 percent of the budget of the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice is spent keeping juvenile offenders in custody. To date, however, only two Australian studies have examined the effect of custodial sentences on juvenile reoffending.

Kraus (1974) matched each of 350 juveniles given a non-custodial sanction against a comparable offender given a custodial sanction. Juveniles were matched on year of birth, category of offence, age at time of first offence, number of previous (proven) offences, type of previous proven offence and number of previous custodial sanctions. He found lower rates of reoffending among vehicle thieves who received a custodial penalty, but higher rates of offending for those receiving custodial penalties in each other category of offence.

Cain (1996) examined reconviction rates among a sample of 52,935 juveniles convicted in the NSW Children's Court between 1986 and 1994. He found that juveniles given custodial sentences were more likely to reoffend than juveniles given non-custodial sentences, but the study included no controls for prior criminal record or Indigenous status.

The Kraus (1974) and Cain (1996) studies both have limitations. Kraus (1974) was not able to control for a wide range of other factors potentially relevant to penalty choice and risk of reoffending (eg school

performance, level of parental supervision, race, socioeconomic status). His methods of analysis were also relatively unsophisticated by modern standards. Cain (1996) used more sophisticated analytical methods and a much larger sample than Kraus (1974) but was similarly restricted in the range of controls he was able to use.

This study seeks to build on the work carried out by Kraus (1974) and Cain (1996) by using more sophisticated methods of analysis than Kraus (1974) and a much wider range of controls than Cain (1996). The question addressed in the study is whether, other things being equal, juveniles who receive a custodial penalty are less likely to reoffend than juveniles who receive a non-custodial custodial penalty.

The data for the current study were obtained from a longitudinal cohort study of juvenile offenders. Two groups of offenders (152 given a detention sentence, 243 given a non-custodial sentence) were interviewed at length about their family life, school performance, association with delinquent peers and substance abuse. They were then followed up to determine what proportion in each group was reconvicted of a further offence. Cox regression was used to model time to reconviction.

The study found no significant difference between juveniles given a custodial penalty and those given a non-custodial penalty in the likelihood of reconviction.



Introduction

On an average day in 2006–07, 941 young people were held in detention across Australia (AIHW 2008: 51). The costs associated with juvenile detention are very high. For example, although only 10.3 percent of the 6,488 juveniles who appeared in the NSW Children’s Court in 2007 were given a control order, 48 percent of the budget of the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice is spent keeping juvenile offenders in custody (NSW Department of Juvenile Justice, personal communication 2009).

Given the high cost of juvenile detention, one would expect to find a large body of Australian research examining its potential benefits. To date, however, little research has been conducted on the effect of custodial sentences on juvenile recidivism. It is known that more than two-thirds of the young people who receive a control order from the NSW Children’s Court are convicted of a further offence within two years of their custodial order. It is not known what their reconviction rate would have been had they not received a custodial penalty. This study addresses this issue.

Deterrence theory

Conventional economic theories of crime (eg Becker 1968) contend that offenders allocate their time to legitimate and illegitimate activities according to the expected returns (ie costs and benefits) from each. A number of sociologists, however, have argued that imprisonment actually increases the risk of reoffending. There are three main variants of this argument. The first contends that prison is criminogenic because it is an environment which reinforces deviant values and which is conducive to the acquisition of new criminal skills (Clemmer 1940; Sykes 1958). The second variant contends that prison is criminogenic because it stigmatises offenders (Becker 1963; Braithwaite 1988; Lemert 1951). The third contends that prison increases the risk of reoffending because it reduces the offender's capacity (on release) to obtain income by legitimate means (Fagan & Freeman 1999).

The evidence on specific deterrence

There have been four major reviews of the evidence on deterrence over the last 10 years (Doob & Webster 2003; Nagin, Cullen & Jonson forthcoming; Villettaz, Killias & Zoder 2006) but only the Villettaz, Killias and Zoder (2006) and Nagin, Cullen and Jonson (forthcoming) reviews focus on specific deterrence.

Nagin, Cullen and Jonson (forthcoming) observed that most studies on the specific deterrent effects of custodial sanctions find these sanctions have a criminogenic effect. Nonetheless, given the many shortcomings among studies they reviewed, they concluded that '[t]he jury is still out on...[custody's] effect on re-offending' (Nagin, Cullen & Jonson forthcoming: np). Villettaz, Killias and Zoder (2006) reviewed 27 studies published between 1961 and 2002 that on the Sherman et al (1997) scale would be considered to be very reliable (ie level 4 and above). Only two obtained evidence favourable to the specific deterrent effect of imprisonment. Ten of the remainder found no effect of imprisonment, four found mixed effects of imprisonment (some statistically non-significant, some favourable to the criminogenic hypothesis) and 11 found evidence uniformly supportive of the criminogenic effect of imprisonment. Five of the studies that found either no effect or a criminogenic effect were randomised controlled trials.

Only two Australian studies have looked at the specific deterrent effect of custodial penalties on juvenile reoffending. Kraus (1974) matched each of 350 juveniles given a non-custodial sanction against a comparable offender given a custodial sanction. Juveniles were matched on year of birth, category of offence, age at time of first offence, number of previous (proven) offences, type of previous proven

offence and number of previous custodial sanctions. He found lower rates of reoffending among vehicle thieves who received a custodial penalty but higher rates of offending for those receiving custodial penalties in each other category of offence. Cain (1996) examined reconviction rates among a sample

of 52,935 juveniles convicted in the NSW Children's Court between 1986 and 1994. He found that juveniles given custodial sentences were more likely to reoffend than juveniles given non-custodial sentences, but the study included no controls for prior criminal record or Indigenous status.



The present study

The Kraus (1974) and Cain (1996) studies both have limitations. Kraus (1974) made a commendable effort to match juveniles receiving custodial and non-custodial sanctions, but was not able to control for a wide range of other factors potentially relevant to penalty choice and risk of reoffending (eg school performance, level of parental supervision, race, socioeconomic status). His methods of analysis were also relatively unsophisticated by modern standards. Cain (1996) used more sophisticated analytical methods and a much larger sample than Kraus (1974) but was similarly restricted in the range of controls he was able to use.

This study seeks to build on the work carried out by Kraus (1974) and Cain (1996) by using more sophisticated methods of analysis than Kraus (1974) and a much wider range of controls than Cain (1996). The question we seek to address is whether, other things being equal, juveniles who receive a custodial penalty are less likely to reoffend than juveniles who receive a non-custodial custodial penalty. The data for the current study were obtained from a longitudinal cohort study of juvenile offenders. A sample of juvenile offenders who received custodial and non-custodial sanctions were surveyed and then followed up to determine whether, after controlling for other factors likely to influence recidivism, juvenile offenders who received

control (custody) orders reoffended more quickly than juvenile offenders who received non-custodial sentences.

Survey procedure

The survey took the form of an interview using a written questionnaire comprising 95 closed-ended questions. The questionnaire was designed largely to test certain theories about the relationship between recidivism and juvenile reactions to the court process (McGrath 2009). As such, many of the questions included in the questionnaire are not of interest here. Some of the questions included in the questionnaire, however, are of interest because of their potential relevance as controls. The variables used in the present study are discussed in more detail below.

The interviews took place between 1 December 2004 and 30 June 2007 at children's courts and juvenile justice centres in New South Wales. Most interviews took 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Very few interview participants declined to answer questions, despite being given the option to do so. The end of the follow-up period for the study was 1 January 2008; six months after the last study participant was interviewed.

Response rate and subject attrition

The names and dates of birth of study participants were matched with the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research reoffending database (ROD) to determine prior criminal history for each study participant and instances of post-index offence reoffending, if any. In ROD, prior criminal history in the form of prior children’s court sentences was obtained from the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice Children’s Court Information System until January 2006. For further information about ROD, see Hua and Fitzgerald (2006).

Two interviewers carried out the non-custodial interviews. The response rate for one interviewer was 71 percent. The response rate for the second interviewer was 70 percent. One interviewer carried out the custodial interviews. The response rate for the custodial group was 93 percent. Data attrition from various sources (eg duplicate interviews, record linkage problems) resulted in the exclusion of a number of cases. The final sample comprised 395 people—152 on custodial orders at the time of the interview and 243 people on non-custodial orders at the time of the interview.

Variables

The measure of reoffending used in the present study is *free time to reoffend*, defined as the time between the date of the index court appearance and the date of the next proven offence (ie the next offence proved at a court appearance after the index court appearance). The term ‘free’ is used in this context because in measuring the time to reconviction, any time spent in custody between the end of the index sentence and the first proven offence or end of the follow-up period has been subtracted. Information on the dependent variable was obtained from ROD.

In order to isolate the effect of penalty type on juvenile recidivism, factors associated with the choice of penalty that might also influence risk of reconviction need to be controlled for. There is, unfortunately, no consensus on what these factors are. The selection of controls in this study was

guided partly by the meta-analysis conducted by Cottle, Leigh and Heilbrun (2001) and partly by exploratory analysis of the dataset used in this study. The list of factors examined in this study for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis appears below in Table 1. The appendix shows each variable, along with the method of construction of each factor (where relevant) and the p-value from the bivariate log-rank tests conducted for time to reoffend.

Table 1 Factors examined for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis

Gender	Parental status (sole parent vs other)
Race	Parenting style
Socioeconomic status	Level of parental supervision
Age	Association with delinquent peers
Age first contact with the law	School attendance
Prior criminal record	Substance abuse
Number of prior commitments to custody	Geographic mobility
Principal offence	Perceived certainty of arrest
Number of concurrent offences	Perceived stigmatisation
Whether a victim of abuse	Whether received a custodial sentence

Analysis

The analysis proceeded in two stages. In the first stage, bivariate (log-rank) tests were conducted to see which of the variables listed in Table 1 had an association with time to reconviction at $p < 0.25$. The variables found to have a significant relationship with time to reconviction were then ranked in order of p-value from smallest to largest. In the second stage, a series of Cox regression models was constructed. In the first, time to reconviction was regressed against penalty type without controlling for any other factors (unadjusted relationship). In the second, control variables were added to the model one by one, commencing with the variable with the smallest p-value from stage one. The process continued until a control variable was reached that added nothing to the explanatory power of the model (ie its coefficient was not found to be statistically significant at $p < 0.05$). That variable was

then removed and the final model consisted of the custody variable and those variables found to make a significant independent contribution to time to reconviction.

Results

Fifty-two percent of the sample had a proven offence subsequent to their index sentence during the follow-up period. The mean time to reconviction (for those who were reconvicted) was 163 days (median=110 days), with a standard deviation of 178 days. Tables 2 and 3 contain descriptive

statistics for variables found to have a statistically significant relationship with time to reconviction at $p < 0.25$.

Table 4 shows the results of the Cox regression analysis. Two models are shown. Model A gives the unadjusted effect of penalty type on time to reconviction. Model B gives the adjusted effect of penalty type on time to reconviction, after controlling for number of prior court appearances. Surprisingly, this was the only factor among those listed in Table 1 that remained significant when included in the multivariate analysis with a variable measuring type of penalty imposed.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics for bivariate predictors of time to reconviction (continuous variables)

Variables	n	Mean	Standard deviation
Illicit drug use in the 12 months prior to the interview	393	8.5	5.3
How long (years) have you been in that situation (ie living with the same people respondent is living with now)?	214 ^a	16.3	1.8

a: This item is restricted to people who have no other address

Table 3 Descriptive statistics for bivariate predictors of time to reconviction (discrete variables)

Discrete variables	n	%
Whether on custodial or non-custodial order at time of interview		
Custodial	152	38.5
Non-custodial	243	61.5
Age at first conviction		
10–13 yrs	79	20.0
14–15 yrs	170	43.0
16 yrs and over	146	37.0
Age group (at index court appearance)		
13–16 yrs	209	51.9
17 yrs	117	29.6
18 + yrs	73	18.5
Number of prior court appearances		
0	126	31.9
1 or more	269	68.10
Number of prior proven offences		
0	164	41.5
1 or more	231	58.5
Number of prior supervised orders		
0	235	59.5
1 or more	160	40.5

Table 3 (continued)

Discrete variables	n	%
Number of prior custodial episodes		
0	335	84.8
1 or more	60	15.2
Number of concurrent offences		
1	138	35.0
2 or more	257	65.0
Offence type (using ASOC descriptions)		
Violent	171	43.3
Property	136	34.4
Other	88	22.3
Sex		
Female	69	17.5
Male	326	82.5
ATSI status		
ATSI	95	24.1
Non-ATSI	299	75.9
Missing value	1	–
Whether living with single parent		
Yes	164	59.2
No	113	40.8
Missing values	118	–
Do parents know where young person is when young person is away from home?		
Never	96	24.9
Sometimes/often/always	290	75.1
Missing values	9	–
What would parent do if caught young person taking cannabis?		
Nothing	88	22.7
Discuss/scold/punish	299	77.3
Missing values	8	–
Do parents chop and change the rules?		
Never	255	66.2
Sometimes/often/always	130	33.8
Missing values	10	–
Do parents know what the young person thinks and feels?		
Never	110	28.6
Sometimes/often/always	275	71.4
Missing values	10	–
How often does young person hang out with friends who have been in trouble with the police?		
Never	66	16.8
Sometimes/often/always	328	83.2
Missing values	1	–

Table 3 (continued)		
Discrete variables	n	%
How many of young person's friends have shoplifted or stolen?		
None	95	24.1
One or more	299	75.9
Missing	1	–
How many of young person's friends have used illegal drugs?		
None	103	26.2
One or more	290	73.8
Missing	2	–
How many of young person's friends have been in trouble with the police?		
None	31	7.9
One or more	363	92.1
Missing	1	–
How often have you been/were you suspended at school?		
Never	63	16.0
Sometimes/often/always	330	84.0
Missing values	2	–
How often have you wagged/did you wag at school?		
Never	87	22.1
Sometimes/often/always	306	77.9
Missing value	2	–
Alcohol consumption at last sitting		
2–5 drinks over the maximum standard recommended amount per day	108	45.8
6 or more drinks over the maximum standard recommended amount per day	128	54.2
Missing values	159	–
Frequency of alcohol consumption over the maximum standard amount per day in the 12 months prior to the interview		
At least 1 day/week	157	39.9
2–3 days/month or less	237	60.1
Missing values	1	–
Young person's perception of their likelihood of being caught by the police if they commit crime in the future		
Very unlikely/unlikely	165	41.8
Very likely/likely	230	58.2

Table 4 Effect of custody on time to reconviction (unadjusted and adjusted estimates)							
Model	Variables	β	SE	p-value	HR	95% HR CI	
A (unadjusted)	Custody vs non-custody	0.55	0.15	<0.01	1.74	1.29	2.33
B (adjusted)	One or more prior court appearance vs none	0.61	0.16	<0.01	1.85	1.35	2.52
	Custody vs non-custody	0.29	0.16	0.08	1.33	0.97	1.84

Note: The column labeled β shows the regression coefficient associated with each variable in each model. The column labeled 'SE' shows the standard error associated with the regression coefficient. The column labeled 'p-value' shows the probability of obtaining the observed value of β by chance. p-values less than .05 indicate that the variable in question is exerting a significant effect on time to reoffend. The column labeled 'HR' shows the hazard ratio associated with the variable. A hazard ratio of more than one indicates that the variable in question increases the instantaneous risk of reoffending. A hazard ratio of less than one indicates that the variable in question reduces the instantaneous risk of reoffending. The final columns show the 95 percent confidence interval around the estimated hazard ratio.

The first point to note is that the hazard ratio associated with the custody variable in Model A is 1.74, which indicates that, prior to the introduction of controls, juvenile offenders given a custodial sentence are 74 percent *more likely* to be reconvicted at any given time than those who receive a non-custodial penalty. When prior criminal record is introduced into the model (see Model B), juveniles given a custodial sanction remain more likely to be reconvicted, but the hazard ratio associated with the custody variable falls from 1.74 to 1.33 and is no longer statistically significant.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate this effect. The X axis in each figure shows free time since the index court

appearance. The Y axis shows the proportion of offenders in each group who have not yet been reconvicted of a further offence. Figure 1 shows the unadjusted difference in time to reconviction between the custody and non-custody groups. Figure 2 shows the adjusted difference. It can be seen from Figure 1 that, prior to controlling for previous court appearances, the survival (non-reconviction) rate in the custodial group is substantially lower than the survival rate in the non-custodial group throughout the follow up period. The same pattern appears in Figure 2, but the differences between the groups are obviously much smaller.

Figure 1 Proportion not reconvicted by free time (days) since index court appearance (Model A)





Figure 2 Proportion not reconvicted by free time (days) since index court appearance (Model B)



Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that, other things being equal, juveniles given custodial orders are no less likely to reoffend than juveniles given non-custodial orders. These results are inconsistent with the two previous Australian studies on specific deterrence, both of which found evidence that juveniles given custodial penalties are more likely to be reconvicted. The difference in findings is probably due to the fact that the present study more effectively controlled for prior criminal record.

The finding that prison exerts no specific deterrent effect is consistent with overseas evidence on the specific deterrent effect of custodial penalties reviewed earlier in this article. It is important to consider, however, that the long-term effects of custodial penalties might be quite different to their short-term effects. Fagan and Freeman (1999), for example, using data from a national panel study of 5,332 randomly selected youths, found that incarceration produced a significant negative effect on future employment prospects, even after adjusting for the simultaneous effects of race, human capital and intelligence. There have been no studies on the effect of juvenile detention on juvenile employment prospects in Australia, but Hunter and Borland (1999) examined the effect of an arrest record on Indigenous employment prospects using data from the 1994 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Survey. Controlling for age, years completed at high school, post-school qualifications, whether the respondent had difficulty speaking

English, alcohol consumption and whether the respondent was a member of the 'stolen generation', they found that an arrest record reduced Indigenous employment for males and females by 18.3 and 13.1 percentage points, respectively (Hunter & Borland 1999). On this basis, Hunter and Borland (1999) estimated that differences in arrest rates for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians might explain about 15 percent of the difference in levels of employment between these two groups.

These adverse effects of imprisonment on employment outcomes and the absence of strong evidence that custodial penalties act as a specific deterrent for juvenile offending suggest that custodial penalties ought to be used very sparingly with juvenile offenders. Fortunately, a range of non-custodial programs now exist which, in the United States at least, have been shown to be very effective in reducing juvenile recidivism. In the United States, they have been found to be considerably less expensive than a custodial sentence (Aos, Miller & Drake 2006). Western Australia and New South Wales are currently trialing an intensive supervision program (ISP) known in the United States as multi-systemic therapy. The NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research is currently evaluating the ISP. It will be interesting to see whether it proves as effective here as it has been in the United States (MacKenzie 2002).

Appendix

Factors examined for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis and their relationship with time to reconviction

Variable/factor	Measure	Relationship with time to reconviction (dependent variable) p-value
Gender	Sex—Q36 of questionnaire	0.0763
Race	ATSI status Q37 of questionnaire	0.0002
Socioeconomic status	SEIFA Australian decile ranking	0.7577
	Household crowding—compute Q66 and Q67 of questionnaire	0.8639
Age	Interview date minus DOB and regrouped into three groups: 10–15 yrs; 16–17 yrs; 18 yrs and over	0.2421
Age at first contact with the law	The age at time of first proven offence (either a prior offence or a reference offence)—from ROD regrouped into three groups: 10–13 yrs; 14–15 yrs; 16 yrs and over	0.0043
Prior criminal record	Number prior court appearances—grouped into 'none' and 'one or more'—from ROD	<0.0001
	Number prior proven offences—grouped into 'none' and 'one or more'—from ROD	<0.0001
	Number prior supervision orders—grouped into 'none' and 'one or more'—from ROD	<0.0001
Number of prior commitments	Number prior custodial episodes—grouped into 'none' and 'one or more'—from ROD	0.0010
Number of concurrent offences	Number concurrent offences (including principal offence)—grouped into 'one' and 'two or more'—from ROD	0.0208
Type of crime at index court appearance	Offence type, created from four digit Australian Standard Offence Classification (ASOC) descriptions of offences in ROD and grouped into three groups: violence; property and other	0.0644

Factors examined for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis and their relationship with time to reconviction (continued)

Variable/factor	Measure	Relationship with time to reconviction (dependent variable) p-value
Victim of abuse	Q57 from questionnaire—Do your parents punish you by slapping or hitting you?—grouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.6460
Single parent	Compare options 1 (both parents) with options 2 and 3 (one parent) from Q43 of questionnaire—Who are you currently living with?	0.0903
Parenting	Do parents congratulate and encourage? (Q58)—grouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.2601
	Are parent(s) aware of what their child thinks and feels? (Q61)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.1538
	How close does young person feel to parents? (Q63)—regrouped into 'not close at all' and 'quite close/close/very close'	0.7784
	When parents make up rules do they explain them to young person? (Q52)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.7083
	Does young person think that the rules that their parents make up are fair? (Q56)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.5146
	Does young person think that their parents chop and change the rules? (Q59)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.1423
	Do parents follow through on their rules? (Q60)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.3275
	Do parents nag young person about little things? (Q62)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.3306
	How well does young person get on with their mother? (Q46)—regrouped into 'badly' and 'okay/well/very well'	0.6740
	How well does young person get on with their father? (Q47)—regrouped into 'badly' and 'okay/well/very well'	0.4438
	Does young person feel rejected by parents? (Q51)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.6523
	What would parents do if they found out young person had destroyed or damaged property on purpose? (Q53)—regrouped into 'nothing' and 'discuss seriously/scold not punish/punish'	0.6140
	What would parents do if they found out young person was using cannabis? (Q54)—regrouped into 'nothing' and 'discuss seriously/scold not punish/punish'	<0.0001
	What would parents do if they found out young person had taken something from a store? (Q55)—regrouped into 'nothing' and 'discuss seriously/scold not punish/punish'	0.8782
	How well do parents get along? (Q45)—regrouped into 'badly' and 'okay/well/very well'	0.9970
Do parents argue or fight in front of young person? (Q48)—regrouped into 'not at all' and 'a bit/quite a bit/a lot'	0.9846	
Supervision	Do parents know where young person is when young person is out of house? (Q49)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	<0.0001

Factors examined for potential inclusion in the multivariate analysis and their relationship with time to reconviction (continued)

Variable/factor	Measure	Relationship with time to reconviction (dependent variable) p-value
Supervision (continued)	Do parents know who young person is with when young person is out of house? (Q50)—regrouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.4740
Delinquent peers	How many of young person's friends had been in trouble with the police?—regrouped into 'one' and 'more than one'	0.0499
	How many of young person's friends had shoplifted or stolen?—regrouped into 'one' and 'more than one'	0.1228
	How many of young person's friends had vandalised?—regrouped into 'one' and 'more than one'	0.3331
	How many of young person's friends had drunk alcohol under age?—regrouped into 'one' and 'more than one'	0.9624
	How many of young person's friends had used illegal drugs?—regrouped into 'one' and 'more than one'	0.2197
	How often did young person hang out with friends who had been in trouble with the police?—'never' and 'sometimes/often/all the time'	0.0068
	Q72/78 of questionnaire—How often do/did you wag?—grouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.0161
School attendance	Q73/79 of questionnaire—How often have you been/were you suspended?—grouped into 'never' and 'sometimes/often/always'	0.2177
Substance abuse	Monthly cigarette consumption—Q89 of questionnaire	0.7188
	Yearly cigarette consumption—Q89 of questionnaire	0.2208
	Monthly illicit drug consumption—Q90, Q91, Q92, Q93 of questionnaire	0.2237
	Yearly illicit drug consumption—Q90, Q91, Q92, Q93 of questionnaire	0.0262
	Have you ever injected drugs?—Q94 of questionnaire	0.4604
	Alcohol consumption—Q85/87 of questionnaire—regrouped into 'every day' and 'less frequently than every day'	<0.0001
	Alcohol consumption frequency—Q86/88 of questionnaire—regrouped into 'at least one day/week' and '2–3 days/month or less'	<0.0001
Change of address	Q65 of questionnaire—How many times have you moved in your life?	0.7835
	Q44 of questionnaire—How long have you lived in that situation? (in days and excluding 'whole life')	0.7708
	Q44 of questionnaire—How long have you lived in that situation? ('whole life')	0.2363
Certainty of arrest	Q2 of questionnaire—If you commit a crime in the future, how likely is it that you will be caught by the police?	0.0037
Court stigmatisation	Sum of Q22, Q23, Q24 Q25, Q28 and Q29 of questionnaire	0.5130
Custodial sentence	Identified in advance of interviews during sentencing at court (yes/no)	0.0003

References

- Aos S, Miller M & Drake E 2006. *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute of Public Policy
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2008. *Juvenile justice in Australia 2006/7*. Canberra: AIHW
- Becker GS 1968. Crime and punishment: an economic approach. *Journal of political economy* 76: 169–217
- Becker HS 1963. *Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe
- Braithwaite J 1988. *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Cain M 1996. *Recidivism of juvenile offenders in New South Wales*. Sydney: NSW Department of Juvenile Justice
- Clemmer D 1940. *The prison community*. New York, NY: Christopher
- Cottle CC, Lee RJ & Heilbrun K 2001. The prediction of criminal recidivism in juveniles: a meta-analysis. *Criminal justice and behaviour* 28(3): 367–394
- Doob A & Webster C 2003. Sentence severity and crime: accepting the null hypothesis, in Tonry M (ed), *Crime and justice: an annual review of research: vol 30*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press
- Fagan J & Freeman RB 1999. Crime and work, in Tonry M (ed), *Crime and justice: a review of research: vol 25*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press: 225–290
- Hua J & Fitzgerald J 2006. Matching court records to measure re-offending. *Crime and justice bulletin* no. 95. Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research
- Hunter B & Borland J 1999. Does crime affect employment status? The case of Indigenous Australians. *Economica* 67(1): 123–144
- Kraus J 1974. A comparison of corrective effects of probation and detention on male juvenile offenders. *British journal of criminology* 49: 49–62
- Lemert EM 1951. *Social pathology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill
- MacKenzie DL 2002. Reducing the criminal activities of known offenders and delinquents, in Sherman LW et al (eds), *Evidence-based crime prevention*. London: Routledge: 330–404
- McGrath A 2009. Offenders' perceptions of the sentencing process: a study of deterrence and stigmatization in the New South Wales Local Court. *Australian and New Zealand journal of criminology* 42(1): 24–46
- Nagin D, Cullen F & Jonson C (forthcoming). Imprisonment and reoffending, in Tonry M (ed), *Crime and justice: an annual review of research: vol 38*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Sherman L et al 1997. *Preventing crime: what works, what doesn't, what's promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice
- Sykes G 1958. *Society of captives: a study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Villetaz P, Killias M & Zoder I 2006. *The effects of custodial vs non-custodial sentences on re-offending*. Report to the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group, Institute of Criminology and Criminal Law, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

AIC Reports
Technical and Background Paper 33

Australia's national research and
knowledge centre on crime and justice

www.aic.gov.au