

Information Bulletin

OFFICE OF
CRIME STATISTICS
AND RESEARCH

No 34

February 2003

Extent of offending by persons on parole, home detention or bail.

Joy Wundersitz

Data extraction by Carol Castle

This briefing paper provides data on the number of adults who offended while on parole or on various types of home detention. In particular, it details levels of offending by persons on

- Bail – home detention (alternatively referred to as Intensive Bail Supervision)
- Home detention bond
- Post-prison home detention
- Parole
- Interstate parole and
- Licence.

Information was also sought on the level of offending while individuals were on court-ordered bail. However, the only category where this proved possible was that of bail – home detention.

Introduction

This briefing paper provides data on the number of adults who offended while on parole or on various types of home detention. In particular, it details levels of offending by persons on

- Bail – home detention (alternatively referred to as Intensive Bail Supervision)
- Home detention bond
- Post-prison home detention
- Parole
- Interstate parole and
- Licence.

Information was also sought on the level of offending while individuals were on court-ordered bail. However, the only category where this proved possible was that of bail – home detention.

Summary of Key Findings

The following results were obtained:

- Almost two thirds of persons placed on a home detention or parole order during 2000/01 did not offend while on these orders. Conversely, approximately one third did offend whilst on such orders.
- Overall, the level of offending whilst on an order was slightly higher for females than for males.
- The level of offending was also higher for Aboriginals than non-Aboriginals.
- The level of offending varied depending on the type of order involved. Offending was more likely to occur when an individual was on parole/interstate parole/licence and least likely to offend whilst on post-prison home detention or home detention bond.
- Females were more likely than males to offend while on parole but were slightly less likely to offend whilst on home detention bail or post prison home detention.
- For both Aboriginals and non-Aboriginals, offending varied depending on the type of order involved. However, for each type of order, Aboriginals were more likely to offend than non-Aboriginals.

While the study has shown that offending was higher amongst individuals on parole, interstate parole or licence, further work is needed to determine the impact of the length of time served on each type of orders.

Methodology

Data obtained from the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) identified all orders within each category listed above which occurred between July 2000 and June 2001.

In total, during the financial year 2000/01, there were 2,483 orders of home detention (comprising bail, bond and post-prison) and parole (comprising parole, interstate parole and licence). These orders involved 2,126 discrete individuals, which means that some

individuals during the course of the year experienced more than one episode on parole or home detention.¹

DCS also provided a Personal Identification Number (PIN) for each order, which was then used by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research (OCSAR) to link individuals involved in these orders with court data to obtain details on whether or not they had offended during the relevant periods. Overall, of the 2,126 individuals in the DCS data, 2,052 were successfully linked with Courts Administration Authority (CAA) data. These 2,052 individuals accounted for 2,398 orders of home detention and parole.

For the 2,052 individuals who were successfully linked to court data, all of their court files from 1 July 2000 through to 31 March 2002 were examined, to identify whether they were before the court during this period for any offence committed while on a home detention or parole order.

In using court data to identify offending while on parole or home detention, two points should be noted;

- First, an individual may have been apprehended and charged by police, but these matters may have been subsequently been dropped or the charges may not yet have reached court. However, the latter seems unlikely, given that all court records up to March 2002 were scanned. This means for all individuals serving an order during the 2000/01 financial year, a minimum of nine months would have elapsed since their last order was commenced – sufficient time for any police charges to have reached court.
- Second, the outcomes of the court hearings were not examined, with the result that some offences allegedly committed while on home detention or parole may not subsequently have resulted in a finding or admission of guilt.

It should also be noted that no details were extracted on the actual *number* of offences committed, only whether a person had or had not offended during the relevant time period – ie a dichotomous Yes/No outcome.

Counting units

In extracting the data, three counting units were used.

1. ***Discrete individuals***; ie each individual who served at least one home detention or parole order during the financial year 2000/01 were counted once only, irrespective of how many orders they served. For example, if an individual was placed on home detention bail, and was later given home detention bond, he/she would be counted only once.
2. ***Individuals involved in each type of parole or home detention order***; ie each individual who, during 2000/01 served at least one home detention bail order was counted only once, irrespective of how many home detention bail orders they served. However, if the same person was also given parole, they would be counted separately within the parole category.
3. ***Discrete episodes***: ie each episode for each of the various types of parole or home detention orders was counted separately. Whether or not the same person was involved was irrelevant.

¹ This paper relates to re-offending for current offenders (on 30//6/2000) in addition to new orders commenced during 2000/01. As such the total number of offenders and orders may vary to those published by elsewhere by DCS.

Number of individuals compared with number of orders

As background information, Table 1 details the number of individuals and the number of discrete orders per order type. There are two points to note:

1. The number of orders served is very similar to the number of individuals who served at least one order within each order type. In the main, the overwhelming majority of individuals experienced only one episode per order type during the 2000/01 financial year. As a result, no analysis of individual orders is included in this briefing. All data presented relate to individuals.
2. Parole accounts for the majority of orders (63.4%), followed by home detention bail (19.8%), and post-prison home detention (13.4%).

Table 1
Number of individuals by number of discrete orders per order type

Type of order	Number of individuals who served at least one order	Number of discrete orders	Number of orders per individual
Home detention bail	436	475	1.08
Home detention bond	6	6	1.00
Post prison home detention	319	322	1.01
Parole	1,537	1,521	1.04
Interstate parole		41	
Licence		33	
Total	2,052 *	2,398	1.17

*This figure is smaller than the sum of each order because one individual may have experienced more than one type of order during 2000/01

Results

1. Total individuals

- During the financial year, 2000/01, 2,052 discrete individuals served at least one order of
 - Bail – home detention (alternatively referred to as Intensive Bail Supervision)
 - Home detention bond
 - Post-prison home detention
 - Parole
 - Interstate parole and
 - Licence
- Of these 2,052 persons, almost two thirds (1,325 or 64.6%) did not offend while on any of these orders. Conversely, 727 (35.4%) were charged with at least one offence, which occurred while they were on a home detention or parole order.
- Of the 2,052 individuals, only 145 (7.1%) were female. However, the level of offending while on an order was slightly higher for females than males. Of the 145 females who

served at least one home detention or parole order during 2000/01, 57 (39.3%) re-offended while on these orders. Of the 1,907 males on an order during this period, 670 (35.1%) re-offended. For both sexes, however, the majority did not offend while on an order.

- Of the 2,038 individuals for whom information on racial identify was available, 277 (13.6%) were Aboriginal. Proportionately more Aboriginals offended while on a home detention or parole order than was the case for non-Aboriginals. More specifically, 123 (44.4%) of the 277 Aboriginals offended while on an order, compared with 34.2% of non-Aboriginals.

2. Individuals involved within each order type

In this section, the analysis focuses on each discrete type of order – namely, home detention bail, home detention bond, post prison home detention and parole– and assesses the level of offending of individuals within each of these categories. To explain, if an individual were placed on three home detention bail orders during the course of the financial year 2000/01, any offending by this individual while on any of these home detention bail orders would be counted once only. However, if the same individual were placed on home detention bail, and later on home detention bond, he/she would be counted separately within each category. So, if that person offended while on home detention bail, but did not offend while on home detention bond, they would be listed as “yes” in the former and “no” in the latter category.

The results are detailed in Table 2. As shown, the level of offending varied depending on the type of order involved, with offending more likely to occur when an individual was on parole or licence, and least likely to offend while on post-prison home detention or home detention bond.

More specifically, 41.1% of individuals who served at least one parole order² re-offended while on that type of order compared with 24.3% of those on home detention bail, 3.4% of those on post-prison home detention and none on home detention bond. (Note that numbers in this last category are extremely small). While differences in re-offending patterns are noted across the types of orders, further work is needed to determine the impact of the length of time served on each type of orders.

Table 2
Level of offending per individual per order type

Offended	Bail home detention		Home detention bond		Post-prison home detention		Parole/interstate parole/licence ³	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	330	75.7	6	*	308	96.6	905	58.9
Yes	106	24.3	0	*	11	3.4	632	41.1
Total	436	100.0	6	*	319	100.0	1,537	100.0

*Numbers too small to calculate %

² Parole includes parole, interstate parole and licence. These three have been combined because of the very small number of licences and interstate paroles. In 2000/01, there were only 41 interstate parole orders and 33 licences compared with 1,521 parole orders.

Male/Female variations

A comparison between male/female offending levels whilst on an order are detailed below. (Note that since none of the six individuals on home detention bond offended, further analysis is not required for this category).

For both males and females, offending varied depending on the type of order involved (with the lowest levels of offending for both groups occurring when the individual was on post-prison home detention and the highest occurring when they were on parole/licence).

Females were more likely than males to offend whilst on parole (47.5% compared with 40.7%) but were slightly less likely to offend whilst on home detention bail (21.4% compared with 24.6%) and post-prison home detention (0% compared with 3.8%).

More specifically:

- Of the 1,436 males who served at least one order involving parole/interstate parole/licence during 2000/01, 584 (40.7%) offended whilst on this type of order compared with 48 (47.5%) of the 101 females.
- Of the 394 males placed on at least on home detention bail order, 97 (24.6%) offended whilst on this type of order compared with 21.4% of the 42 females.
- Of the 293 males given post-prison home detention, only 11 (3.8%) offended during such episodes, compared with none of the 26 females.

Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal comparison

A comparison between male/female offending levels whilst on an order are detailed below. It should be stressed that the number of Aboriginals in each category are relatively low, and so some care should be taken when applying these results. Again, since none of the six individuals on home detention bond offended, further analysis is not required for this category.

For both non-Aboriginals and Aboriginals, offending varied depending on the type of order involved (with the lowest levels of offending for both groups occurring when the individual was on post-prison home detention and the highest occurring when they were on parole/interstate parole/licence).

Within each category however, Aboriginals were more likely than non-Aboriginals to offend whilst on the order.

More specifically:

- Of the 1,322 non-Aboriginals who experienced at least one episode of parole/interstate parole/licence during 2000/01, 525 (39.7%) offended whilst on such an order compared with 106 (51.1%) of the 206 Aboriginals.
- Of the 369 non-Aboriginals who served at least one period on home detention bail, 86 (23.3%) offended whilst on this type of order compared with 20 (29.9%) of the 67 Aboriginals.
- Of the 290 non-Aboriginals given at least one post-prison home detention, only 8 (2.8%) offended while on this type of order compared with 3 of the 24 non-Aboriginals.

Acknowledgements: Department of Correctional Services data required for this analysis was provided by Mr. Mike Reynolds, Strategic Services Division. Matching with and extraction of Courts Administration Authority data was done by Carol Castle, Database Manager, OCSAR.