

# 7

# APPENDIX





## EXPLANATORY NOTES

### INTRODUCTION

This report provides a statistical overview of the number and type of offences recorded by police during the period 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006, together with details on the clearance status of those offences at the end of the year. The report also provides some details on those persons who reported that they were the victims of a personal offence. Finally, it outlines some of the characteristics of those individuals who, during the course of the year, were apprehended by police for alleged offending behaviour.

As indicated earlier, it is important to note that the data presented in this report (and in particular those statistics relating to offences recorded) do not provide an accurate measure of the prevalence or incidence of crime in the community. Before an offence is recorded on SAPOL's databases, a number of steps have to occur. For those crimes which are victim-based, the victim must firstly recognise that a crime has been committed and then actually report it to police. It has been shown through victimisation surveys that a proportion of crime is never reported, and that reporting rates vary greatly between different offences. Victimisation surveys are therefore an important reminder of the gap between recorded offences and the actual incidence of crime in the community.

In the case of victimless crimes (such as *disorderly behaviour* or *possess/use drugs*) the identification or detection of an offence rests almost predominantly with police. For example, a high proportion of *drink driving* offences are detected through breathalyser tests. This means that the number of such offences recorded by police in any given year will be heavily influenced by policing practices – in this case, by the number of breath tests conducted.

Similarly, the profiles of victims presented in this report, because they relate only to those who actually choose to contact police, may not be representative of all victims. The same applies to those persons apprehended by police as possible perpetrators of crime. Given that for some offence categories (such as *serious criminal trespass*) the number of offences cleared is comparatively low, persons apprehended for these offences may differ from those perpetrators who avoid detection.

It should also be stressed that to correctly interpret the statistics contained in Sections 2 to 6 of this report, it is important to understand the counting rules and definitions used in each section, and to recognise how these vary from one set of tables to another. For example, the counting rules used by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research in identifying the number of offences reported (Section 3) is different from that used when extracting data on offences for which a person was apprehended (Section 6).

The aim of this Appendix is to clarify and explain the counting rules and definitions used in the statistical tables. It is therefore of critical importance in enabling the reader to interpret and use the data appropriately.

### DEFINITION OF OFFENCE GROUPS

Most serious criminal offences in this State are defined in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*, the *Summary Offences Act* and the *Controlled Substances Act*. However, recorded crime and offender data in *Crime and Justice* reports are not confined to this legislation. Serious breaches of Commonwealth or State Acts (eg drink-driving contraventions of the *Road Traffic Act*) are also included. Readers requiring detailed information on specific Acts covered by this *Crime and Justice* report are advised to contact the Office of Crime Statistics and Research.

To simplify the presentation of data in the tables, offences have been grouped into eight major offence categories (see Table 3.1). These groups correspond to the JANCO classification system implemented on

the Justice Information System and administered by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research. JANCO is an adaptation of the Australian Bureau of Statistics' ANCO (Australian National Classification of Offences, 1985. Catalogue No. 1234.0) classification system. JANCO adheres to the most detailed level of ANCO and extends this to even more detailed levels to highlight items of interest obscured by the generality of ANCO. The JANCO system was first used in the 1992 issue of *Crime and Justice*. This became possible because of the adoption of this system throughout the Justice Information System and the Courts Administration Authority.

While the tables in all sections of this report adhere to JANCO, different sections show different levels of offence specificity according to factors such as the frequency or relative seriousness of the offence. The most detailed offence data are presented in Sections 3 and 4 (relating to offences recorded and clearance status). However, for Sections 5 and 6 (relating to victims and alleged perpetrators), more generalised offence groupings are used. Lower levels of JANCO are used to distinguish particular subgroups of offences or to provide information on the characteristics of the victim (ie age group, sex), type of premises victimised, etc.

Each JANCO classification level generally contains a number of offences of the same type that may be located in either State and/or Commonwealth legislation. For example, the JANCO offence category of *kidnapping* includes offences of that type under State legislation (*Kidnapping Act, Criminal Law Consolidation Act*), Commonwealth legislation (*Crimes (Internationally Protected Persons) Act*) and common law. Further information regarding the legislation contained in each JANCO category is available from the Office of Crime Statistics and Research on request.

Most attempted felonies are dealt with under Section 270A of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*. With some exceptions (notably the *sexual offence* categories contained in Tables 3.4 to 3.6 and 4.4 to 4.6) all tables combine attempts with the offence attempted (eg an *attempted armed robbery* is included with *armed robbery*). While it is acknowledged that an *attempted serious criminal trespass*, for example, may not be as traumatic for the victim as an actual break in, the decision to combine them is in line with national counting rules. Overall, however, it seems that attempts represent only a small proportion within each offence category.

Under the classification system in use prior to the 1992 report, inciting the commission of an offence (which is itself a common law offence) was included in the category of the offence incited, rather than being listed separately, as were accessories before or after the fact. Under the JANCO classification system, accessories, aiding and abetting, and inciting the commission of offences are all grouped together under level 5496, regardless of the type of substantive offence involved.

It should be noted that offences where the offence type is not specified with a JANCO code are excluded from this report.

Copies of the current version of JANCO and of the individual offences comprising each category and sub-category used in the tables are available from the Office of Crime Statistics and Research.

A more detailed explanation of the counting rules and definitions used in each section of this report is provided below. If further clarification is required, readers are again advised to contact the Office of Crime Statistics and Research.

## POLICE INCIDENT REPORTS

### Tables 2.1 to 2.3

#### Counting Rules

When an incident is reported or becomes known to police, a police incident report is generally filed. Tables 2.1 to 2.3 detail the number of such reports filed during the period, 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006. Normally, one incident report is filed per victim. Depending on the type of crime, 'victim' may mean an individual (as in the case of an *assault*) or a household (as in the case of a *serious criminal trespass dwelling*) or 'other' (such as a financial institution, retail store etc). In a high proportion of incidents, only one victim is involved and this generates one incident report. However, some events may involve more than one victim. One example is where a person steals from a supermarket, is chased by the security officer and then assaults that officer. This would generally result in two incident reports – one involving the offence of *larceny from a shop* (where the supermarket is the victim) and one for *assault* (where the security officer is the victim). Similarly, if an offender robs a bank, assaults a customer during that robbery, and then steals a vehicle to make his escape, this would generate three incident reports, one involving *robbery* (with the bank as victim), one involving *assault* (with the customer as the victim) and one involving *vehicle theft* (with the owner of that vehicle as the victim).

#### *Table 2.2                      Number of offences per incident report*

Each police incident report may contain more than one offence or more than one count of the same offence. For example, if a person reports that their dwelling has been broken into and they have been assaulted during the break in, this may be recorded on the one incident report as a *serious criminal trespass-dwelling* and an *assault*. Alternatively, if the victim indicates that during the course of the one incident, they were assaulted several times by the same perpetrator, this may be recorded as *assault* (x2) – ie two counts of assault. In Table 2.2, all offences are included as are all counts of the one offence.

#### *Table 2.3                      Major offence recorded per incident report*

While an incident report may contain multiple offences, this table counts each report once, according to the major or most serious offence contained in that report. The major offence alleged is determined by comparing the Maximum Statutory Penalty level of the JANCO code for each offence and selecting the highest of these.

## OFFENCES RECORDED BY POLICE

### Tables 3.1 to 3.22

#### Counting Rules

For the majority of tables in this Section, the counting unit used is all offences and offence counts recorded on each incident report filed by police in a specified twelve month period. Generally, in South Australia, one offence is recorded for each victim of a particular type of crime. Alternatively, where one person is repeatedly victimised by the same perpetrator over a relatively short time frame, this could be recorded as one offence, but with multiple counts. In a few offence categories, what would otherwise be classified as multiple counts of the same offence are listed as distinctly separate offences. An example of this is *welfare fraud* where it is common for the offence to occur a number of times with each false drawing of benefits. Instead of recording such instances as one offence with multiple counts, every instance of fraud is recorded separately.

In Tables 3.1 to 3.22, all offences and all counts of the same offence listed in the incident reports are counted.

#### Changes in offence classifications over time

In Tables 3.1 to 3.20, longitudinal data on the number of offences per offence category are provided. While similar tables have been included in earlier *Crime and Justice* reports, in the first 'stand-alone' volume on police statistics for 1998, the Office of Crime Statistics and Research took the opportunity to report on more detailed offence types. The same level of detail is reproduced in this 2006 report. Because of this expansion, for the lower level JANCO categories now included in these tables, data prior to 1998 are not included. However, for the higher level offence groupings, continuous data across this twelve year period are still provided to enable the identification of longitudinal trends.

For these more generalised offence groupings, similar offence classifications generally apply throughout this period.

#### **Table 3.21a and b**      **Offences recorded per Local Government Area and Statistical Division**

In these tables, rates have been calculated using dwelling figures obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001 Census of Population and Housing while the population figures were obtained from "Regional Population Growth, Australia and New Zealand" (ABS Cat. 3218.0, July 2007).

It should be noted that these tables have been updated for the 2006 report to reflect changes to LGA boundaries in 1998. They are therefore not directly comparable with the tables published in reports prior to 2001. In addition, as a result of the changes to LGA boundaries, it is no longer possible to categorise LGAs as 'metro' or 'country'. Accordingly, Table 3.21b includes all LGAs. However, to provide some indication of regional differences, an additional table based on Statistical Divisions has been provided (refer Table 3.21a).

Incorporated areas are legally designated areas over which local governments have responsibility. Parts of South Australia that are not covered by incorporated bodies are referred to as 'Unincorporated' South Australia.

## CLEARANCE STATUS OF OFFENCES

### Tables 4.1 to 4.29

#### Counting rules

The counting unit used here is the same as that used in preparing Tables 3.1 to 3.22 relating to offences recorded by police. All offences and all counts of the same type of offence listed in police incident reports are included, with the one exception of *sexual offences* where only one offence per victim per incident report is included.

#### Clearance status: category definitions

The heading of 'cleared' includes the following categories:

- Apprehension/caution: a suspect has either been cautioned, arrested or summonsed for the offence.
- Application: police have submitted an application, generally for an order.
- Unfounded: after appropriate enquiries have been completed, police found no evidence that an offence had been committed.
- Victim requests NFA (no further action): the victim of the alleged offence has signed an official form affirming that he/she wishes no further action to be taken in relation to the alleged offence.
- Shop Theft Infringement Notice issued: Shop Theft Infringement Notices were introduced by the *Shop Theft (Alternative Enforcement) Act* 2000, which came into force on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2001. Under the legislation, a police officer may issue a Shop Theft Infringement Notice instead of charging an alleged offender with larceny in circumstances described in the legislation. The Act was introduced to provide for certain adult persons accused of minor shop theft to be subject to a non-criminal enforcement process with their consent, as an alternative to prosecution. The legislation applies only to adults and requires an admission of guilt in relation to the alleged offence and the issuance of an apology to the victim.
- Other: includes
  - Accused died;
  - Complainant died;
  - Diplomatic immunity, when the person accused of committing the offence exercises a legitimate claim of Diplomatic Immunity;
  - Lapsed - the charge has lapsed due to the limitation of time specified in relevant legislation; and
  - Other - when the clear up or actions which have taken place do not fall under the definition of other values specified above.

The heading of 'not cleared' includes:

- Filed after investigation: enquiries have been exhausted at that time.
- Destroyed not cleared: no information is available to enable further enquiries to be conducted at that time, although a computerised record is retained to reactivate enquiries at a later date.
- Filed – not cleared: a suspect has been flagged as 'wanted' but has not yet been apprehended.
- Not cleared: this is a default clear up category assigned to the PIR at the time of entry, when the file is still awaiting vetting and the assignment of a more appropriate status.

#### Tables 4.1 to 4.20

#### *Clearance status of offences 1 January – 31 December 2006*

Two sets of data are contained in each of these tables.

- For those offences and offence counts recorded by police in 2006, the tables detail the clearance status for each offence and each count at the end of the calendar year.
- For those offences recorded prior to 2006 but cleared by SAPOL during the 2006 calendar year, the tables detail the method of clearance. (It should be stressed that offences cleared in 2006 but reported in earlier years were not counted in Tables 3.1 to 3.22 described earlier.)
- Since 2001, Tables 4.1, 4.9, and 4.12 have included *Shop Theft Infringement Notices* as an additional method of clearance. As indicated under the Clearance Status category definitions, Shop Theft Infringement

Notices were introduced by the *Shop Theft (Alternative Enforcement) Act 2000*, which came into force on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2001. Under the legislation, a police officer may issue a Shop Theft Infringement Notice instead of charging an alleged offender with larceny in circumstances described in the legislation. The Act was introduced to provide for certain adult persons accused of minor shop theft to be subject to a non-curial enforcement process with their consent, as an alternative to prosecution. The legislation applies only to adults and requires an admission of guilt in relation to the alleged offence and the issue of an apology to the victim.

**Tables 4.21 to 4.29      Clearance status of offences 1 January 1994 – 31 December 2006**

These tables, included for the first time in the 1999 report, detail the number of offences cleared as at 31 December 2006, by the year in which the offence was originally recorded. For example, an offence reported to police in 1994 and cleared in 1996 would be counted in the 1994 column. The intention of these tables is to provide a more accurate picture of clear-up levels by allowing as much time as possible to elapse after the report date.

While they also provide some indication of changes in the level of clear up from one year to another, comparisons across years are not entirely accurate because of the varying times available for clearance. For example, given the cut off date of 31 December 2006, for an offence reported in 1994 police would have had at least twelve years to 'solve' the crime, thereby maximising the chances of a clear up. In contrast, for offences recorded in 2006, less than 12 months would be available for police to clear them. Comparing clear up levels in 1994 with those observed in 2006 must be done with caution.

Tables 4.21 and 4.25 include *Shop Theft Infringement Notice* as an additional method of clearance. As indicated in the previous section, Shop Theft Infringement Notices were introduced by the *Shop Theft (Alternative Enforcement) Act 2000*, which came into force on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2001. Under the legislation, a police officer may issue a Shop Theft Infringement Notice instead of charging an alleged offender with larceny in circumstances described in the legislation.

## VICTIMS OF OFFENCES RECORDED BY POLICE

### Tables 5.1 to 5.4

Tables in this section provide a break-down of the age and sex of individuals who during 2006, were the victims of a 'personal' crime recorded by police. The offence categories selected for inclusion include all *offences against the person*, all *sexual offences* and all *robbery and extortion* offences where the victim was recorded as an individual. Those *robbery and extortion* offences perpetrated against a corporation were excluded, as were all *drug* and *driving offences* because these do not generally involve an identifiable victim. *Offences against property* were also omitted because of potential biases arising from how the information is reported to police. In the case of a house break, for example, if the property is jointly owned by a husband and wife, then both are victims. However, police only record the details of one of these individuals – usually the one who actually reports the offence. If house breaks are usually reported by the male, then the data will show a potentially misleading preponderance of males as victims of this particular type of offence.

In previous years, these tables also included information on *larceny from the person* victimisations. However, with the proclamation of the Offences of Dishonesty legislation in July 2003, this offence category became subsumed within the general category of theft. It is therefore no longer possible to separately identify *larceny from the person* offences.

### Tables 5.1 to 5.3      *Age and sex of victims*

#### Counting rules

Tables 5.1 to 5.3 in Section 5 each contain several sets of figures, based on different counting rules.

- *Total victimisations.* In the body of each table, each victim is counted once for each different offence type listed on the incident report. To illustrate: if, in the one incident report filed by police, the victim claimed that they had been assaulted twice and stalked once, that victim would be counted once under assault and once under stalking. However, if the same victim reported an assault to police in January and another assault in April, and each incident resulted in the filing of separate incident reports, the victim would be counted twice because the assaults related to two quite separate incidents. The counting rules used here are different from those used in counting the number of offences recorded by police (Section 3) and the clear up status of offences (Section 4). In these two preceding sections, all offences and all counts are included. In this section, however, only one offence per offence type is counted, which is in line with national counting rules used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- *Discrete victims per offence group.* In the far right hand column of each table in Section 5, the victims are counted once per offence group, irrespective of how many incident reports were filed during the course of the year. For example, in Table 5.1a of Section 5, there were 13,860 victims of *other assault*. This means that during 2006, 13,860 individuals reported being the victims of at least one *other assault*. If, over the course of the year, the same individual was subject to multiple assaults on different occasions, they were still only counted once. However, if they were subject on the first occasion to an *assault* and on the second occasion to *stalking*, they would be counted under each of these offence types.
- *Discrete victims per age group.* The second to bottom row of each table details the total number of victims per age group. To illustrate, in Table 5.1a of Section 5, there were 263 victims aged 0 – 9 years who, during 2006, were subject to at least one *offence against the person*. If the victim experienced more than one such offence during the course of the year, but fell within the 0 – 9 year age bracket on each of those occasions, that person was still counted only once. But if, over the course of these incidents, the person moved into the next age grouping of 10 – 13 years, they would be counted in both the 0 – 9 and the 10 – 13 year age brackets.
- *Total victims.* Finally, in the bottom right hand corner of each table is a single figure which details the total number of discrete individuals who, during the course of the year, were victimised at least once. In Table 5.1a for example, there were 16,320 discrete individuals who, in 2006, experienced at least one *offence against the person*. This applied irrespective of how many different types of *against person* offences they experienced or whether their age changed from one incident to another.

## **Age**

The age of the victims listed in these tables is that given at the point of reporting the offence to police. In most instances, this would equate very closely with the victim's age at the time of the offence itself. However, this may not always be the case. Particularly in regard to *sexual offences*, analysis indicates that victims who experience abuse as a child may not report that incident until many years later. Thus, while their age at the time of the offence indicates an adult, the offence itself occurred when they were children.

## **Racial appearance**

While details on the racial appearance of alleged perpetrators are recorded by police, it is not recorded for victims. Hence, no information on the nature or extent of victimisation of Aboriginal persons could be presented in this report.

### ***Table 5.4***                      ***Number of incident reports per victim by sex***

This table details the number of separate incident reports involving the same victim which were filed by police over the course of the 2006 calendar year. This provides some indication of the level of re-victimisation.

## OFFENCES CLEARED BY WAY OF AN APPREHENSION

### Tables 6.1 to 6.41

Once police officers become aware of the identity of an alleged offender they may initiate proceedings either by effecting an arrest or by filing a report that may later result in a summons<sup>1</sup>. An arrest generally implies that a person is detained by a law enforcement officer and that he or she is taken to a police station. A summons involves the alleged offender being sent a legal document detailing the charges and requiring attendance at court at a specified time. In the case of juvenile offenders (ie persons aged 10 – 17 years at the time of the commission of the offence), a police officer may decide to administer a formal caution or refer the matter to either a family conference or the Youth Court. However, for all juveniles who receive a formal police caution or who are referred to either a family conference or the Youth Court, police must file an apprehension report and must either arrest or report the young person. Readers should, however, be aware that juveniles who receive an informal caution are not counted here, because such informal cautions do not result in the filing of an apprehension report.

#### Counting rules

In this section, three distinct counting units are used: namely, offences alleged, apprehension reports and alleged offenders. When police identify a person suspected of having committed an offence and they have sufficient information to proceed against that individual by way of an apprehension, an apprehension report is filed, detailing the offences alleged against the suspect. The same individual may be apprehended more than once during the year, and therefore be the subject of more than one apprehension report. Moreover, each apprehension report may contain more than one offence charge or multiple counts of the same offence. A detailed explanation of the specific counting rules used in each of the tables is outlined below.

#### *Tables 6.1 to 6.26      Age, sex and racial appearance of alleged offenders*

#### Counting rules

The primary counting unit used in constructing these tables is the offence charged. That is, for every charge listed on an apprehension report, the age, sex and racial appearance of the alleged offender is identified. It should be stressed, however, that, whereas the tables in Sections 3 and 4 of this report counted all offences as well as all counts of the same offence, here, multiple counts of the same offence charge have not been included. For example, if the apprehension report lists the charges as:

- *assault* (2 counts)
- *serious criminal trespass dwelling* and
- *illegal use of a motor vehicle*

in Tables 6.1 to 6.26 this would be counted as one *assault*, one *break and enter* and one *illegal use*. However, if the apprehension report listed the charges as:

- *assault*
- *assault*
- *serious criminal trespass dwelling* and
- *illegal use of a motor vehicle*

this would be counted as two *assaults*, one *serious criminal trespass dwelling* and one *illegal use*. This counting procedure is in line with that used by SAPOL and is based on the premise that multiple counts of the same offence generally relate to the one incident, whereas separate listings of the same offence type generally indicate separate incidents. To illustrate, if a suspect is charged with *assault* (2 counts), this indicates that the two assaults stemmed from the same incident report and therefore involved the same victim and the same event. However, if a suspect is charged with two separate *assaults*, this indicates two separate incidents and possibly two separate victims.

It should be stressed that the counting rules used here differ from those used in *Crime and Justice* reports prior to 1998. Previously, when detailing information on alleged offenders, the counting unit used was all offence charges as well as all counts for the same offence charge listed on the apprehension report. The fact that

---

<sup>1</sup>A third option - issuing an expiation notice - may be used for adults involved in some minor offences. Expiation notices are not counted in these tables.

multiple counts of the same charge were excluded in 1998 means that the data for 1998 and subsequent years are not comparable with those contained in earlier reports.

### **Alleged offenders**

The term 'alleged offender' describes a person apprehended by police. Not all of these people would subsequently be prosecuted or found guilty of an offence in court. It should also be noted that a person may be apprehended for an offence which was reported some years previously. For this reason, offences allegedly committed by apprehended persons do not necessarily correspond to those recorded by police in the same twelve month period.

### **Age**

In Tables 6.1 to 6.26 the age of the offender is at the time of apprehension rather than at the time of the offence. Where age was recorded as greater than 99 or less than 10, it was set to unknown. Where age was not recorded on the apprehension report or where, within the one year, the person's age varied by more than one year, the correct age was determined by extracting the date of birth of the individual as recorded on the background database held by OCSAR (which spans the period July 1991 to the present) and comparing it with the date on the apprehension report.

### **Racial appearance**

In Tables 6.14 to 6.26, the classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. If an individual was apprehended on more than one occasion during the year, and the racial appearance recorded by police for that individual varied from one apprehension report to another, the following procedure was used to allocate a consistent racial indicator. The racial appearance listed on each apprehension report lodged for that individual since July 1991 was extracted and the 'majority' opinion regarding that person's racial background was identified. This value was then assigned to all apprehension reports recorded for that person in 2006.

The same process was used where the racial appearance was missing from an apprehension report. If that same person had previous apprehension reports, the 'majority' opinion regarding racial appearance was ascertained from those earlier reports and assigned to the current report where the information was missing.

**Table 6.27** *Offences alleged, apprehension reports and alleged offenders*

### **Counting Rules**

As noted earlier, each suspect may be apprehended on more than one occasion during the course of the year, and each apprehension report may involve more than one charge. In this table, for each of the eight major offence groupings, the number of offences alleged by police in 2006 are listed, together with the total number of apprehension reports filed and the number of discrete individuals apprehended. These figures are then used to calculate averages: in particular, the average number of offences per apprehension report, the average number of apprehension reports per alleged offender and the average number of offences per alleged offender.

Offences are counted in the same way as in Tables 6.1 to 6.26 (see previous explanation). As was the case for Tables 6.1 to 6.26, the number of offences does not include multiple counts of the same offence.

Under the heading 'Apprehension report', each report is counted once only per offence category, even if it contains multiple offences of this type. For example, if the one apprehension report listed two assaults, one rape, and resist arrest, it would be listed once under the category of *offences against the person* (for the assault), once under *sexual offences* (for the rape) and once under *against good order* (for the resist arrest). However, in determining the total number of apprehension reports lodged in 2006 it would be counted only once. Hence the total number of apprehension reports is less than the sum of those reports listed within each broad offence category.

Under the heading “Alleged offenders”, individual suspects are counted only once per offence category regardless of the number of times that person was apprehended during the course of the year or the number of offences alleged against him/her. For example, an individual who was reported for *assault occasioning and kidnapping and abduction* during 2006 would only be recorded once under the category of *offences against the person*. An alleged offender reported for two *robbery* offences and two *sexual offences* would be recorded once under *robbery* and once under *sexual offences*.

In determining a total figure for the number of alleged offenders apprehended by police during 2006 each suspected offender is counted once only, irrespective of the number of times they were apprehended or the type of offences with which they were charged during the twelve month period. It should be noted that this figure does not equate to the sum of alleged offenders listed within each broad offence category, since the same individual may be included in more than one offence category.

### **Age**

The age of the offender is at the time of apprehension. The process previously described was used to determine the person’s age when this information was either missing from the apprehension report or, over the course of 2006, varied by more than one year. When age was recorded as greater than 99 and less than 10, it was set to unknown.

### **Racial appearance**

As in Tables 6.14 to 6.27, the classification of an alleged offender as ‘Aboriginal’ or ‘non-Aboriginal’ is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another for the same individual.

**Table 6.28** *Average number of apprehension reports and offences per alleged offender by sex and racial appearance 2000 - 2006*

In this table, the average number of apprehension reports per alleged offender and average number of offences per alleged offender are summarised for the years 2000 to 2006 by sex and racial appearance.

### **Racial appearance**

The classification of an alleged offender as ‘Aboriginal’ or ‘non-Aboriginal’ is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

**Tables 6.29 to 6.32** *Apprehension reports*

### **Counting rules**

In these tables, the counting unit is the apprehension report. As was the case for Tables 6.1 to 6.27, the number of offences listed in Tables 6.31 and 6.32 does not include multiple counts of the same offence.

### **Age**

The age of the offender is at the time of apprehension. The process previously described was used to determine the person’s age when this information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, over the course of 2006, varied by more than one year. When age was recorded as greater than 99 and less than 10, it was set to unknown.

### **Racial appearance**

As in Tables 6.14 to 6.27, the classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

### **Tables 6.33 to 6.34      *Individuals: sex, racial appearance by age of alleged offenders***

#### **Counting rules**

In these tables, the counting unit is the individual. If a person is apprehended on more than one occasion during the 12 month period, he/she is counted once only in these tables.

#### **Age**

The age of the offender is at the time of his/her first apprehension in 2006. The process previously described was used to determine the person's age when this information was either missing from the first apprehension report or, over the course of 2006, varied by more than one year. When age was recorded as greater than 99 and less than 10, it was set to unknown.

#### **Racial appearance**

As in Tables 6.14 to 6.27, the classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

### **Tables 6.35 to 6.38      *Individuals: number of apprehension reports per individual by sex, racial appearance, age***

#### **Counting rules**

In these tables, the counting unit is the individual. If a person is apprehended on more than one occasion during the 12 month period, he/she is counted once only in these tables. For each individual apprehended in 2006, the actual number of apprehension reports is detailed.

#### **Age**

The age of the offender is at the time of his or her first apprehension during 2006. The process previously described was used to determine the person's age when this information was either missing from the first apprehension report or, over the course of 2006, varied by more than one year. When age was recorded as greater than 99 and less than 10, it was set to unknown.

#### **Racial appearance**

The classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

**Table 6.39**      *Individuals: number of apprehension reports per individual, 1999 - 2006*

This table summarises the number of apprehension reports per individual for the years 1999 to 2006 by sex and racial appearance.

**Racial appearance**

The classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

**Tables 6.40 to 6.41**      *Individuals: number of apprehension reports per individual by number of offences per individual by sex, racial appearance.*

**Counting rules**

In these tables, the counting unit is the individual. If a person is apprehended on more than one occasion during the 12 month period, he/she is counted once only in these tables. For each individual apprehended in 2006, these tables detail the number of times that person was apprehended cross-tabulated with the number of offences for which that person was apprehended over the twelve months.

In determining the number of offences, multiple counts of the same offence were not included.

**Racial appearance**

The classification of an alleged offender as 'Aboriginal' or 'non-Aboriginal' is determined by police and records the opinion of the apprehending police officer as to the appearance of the apprehended person. The process previously described was used to determine racial appearance in those instances when the information was either missing from the apprehension report, or, during the course of 2006, varied from one report to another.

