

PRESERVATION

JOINT COMMITTEE ON YOUNG  
OFFENDERS.

STUDY OF CRIME AMONGST MAORIS;  
INTERVIEW STUDY; PRELIMINARY  
REPORT OF RESULTS.

463  
DSW  
364  
.36  
JOI

11514



BRN 12898

PRESERVATION



JOINT COMMITTEE ON YOUNG OFFENDERS

STUDY OF CRIME AMONGST MAORIS

INTERVIEW STUDY

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF RESULTS

OCTOBER 1966.

404652.780

## CONTENTS

Page

### INTRODUCTION

1. Aim of the Research 1
2. Plan of the Research 1
3. Presentation of the Results 4

### RESULTS

4. Age 7
5. Offences 8
6. Marital Status 19
7. The Nature of the Home 19
8. Parents and Family Relationships 22
9. Education 26
10. Employment 29
11. Financial Matters 33
12. Affiliation to Social and Religious Groups 34
13. Leisure Time Activities 35
14. Drinking 38
15. Sexual Behaviour 40
16. Accommodation 42
17. Migration 43
18. Maoritanga 44

### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

19. Age of the Samples 50
20. Circumstances Surrounding Arrest and Court Appearance 50
21. Upbringing 52
22. Family Health, Relationships and Discipline 54
23. Education 55

	Page
24. Employment	55
25. Handling of Money	56
26. Leisure	56
27. Drinking	56
28. Sexual Behaviour	57
29. Accommodation	57
30. Migration	57
31. Maoriness and Maoritanga	58

CONCLUSIONS

32. Overall Conclusions	59
-------------------------	----

# STUDY OF CRIME AMONGST MAORIS

## INTERVIEW STUDY

### PRELIMINARY REPORT OF RESULTS - OCTOBER 1966

#### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. AIM OF THE RESEARCH

The aim is to compare delinquent and non-delinquent Maori youths in the following areas: upbringing and family; education; employment; living conditions and financial commitments; drinking habits and leisure time activities; moves about the country; and degree of identification with Maoritanga. The research is designed to give a general picture of Maori youths, and to show in which of the above-mentioned areas of interest delinquents significantly differ from non-delinquents. In this study, delinquent means convicted of an offence under a New Zealand Statute and released on Probation; non-delinquent means that neither Police Headquarters nor the Child Welfare Division had any record of a court appearance for an offence by the subject considered. In this report offender and non-offender and similar expressions are used synonymously to delinquent and non-delinquent, respectively.

#### 2. PLAN OF THE RESEARCH

##### 2.1 Study design

A sample of young Maori offenders and a sample of non-offenders were interviewed using a six part structured interview schedule.

##### 2.2 The offender sample

2.21 In the first instance the offender sample was specified as: all male Maoris, born after 30 April 1940, who were released on Probation (but not Parole) for the first time between 30 April 1965 and 30 April 1966 inclusive, for any offence whatsoever. In May 1966, when it became evident that this sample would be considerably smaller than had been estimated, the survey period was extended by six months, to end on 30 October 1966. The Probationers were interviewed by the Probation Officers to whom they reported in the ordinary course of their probation.

2.22 This report contains information on the 126 Probationers who had been interviewed by May 1966.

##### 2.3 The non-offender sample

2.31 The non-offender sample was made up of Maori National Servicemen drawn from the intakes of January 1965 and September 1965. The interviewing was done at Waiouru Military Camp by Army Education and Welfare Officers. Only 124 National Servicemen were interviewed. Ideally, a considerably greater number would have been preferred, but the Army Education and Welfare Service was in the end not prepared to interview more than this number, and would not permit the National Servicemen to be interviewed by interviewers who were not Army personnel.

2.32 National Servicemen were used because they are chosen randomly from the national population of 20 year old males by ballot. However, about 20% are rejected as a result of medical examinations, and those required to undergo training are not a true random sample. (It would have been preferable to have had the

interviews conducted in conjunction with the medical examinations which all potential trainees selected by the ballot are required to undergo, but it was not possible to arrange this.) The National Servicemen who were interviewed are likely, therefore, to have better health than a truly representative group of Maoris in the age-group, and can also be expected to differ from such a group on any factors associated with health. In addition, sampling of non-offenders was from a more restricted age group, and age is a badly biased variable in the study. For these reasons the non-offender sample is not a control group in a strict sense.

2.33 A check with Police and Child Welfare records showed that 35% of the National Servicemen interviewed had appeared in either the Children's Court or the Magistrate's Court. These were set aside, leaving a group of 81 non-offenders.

#### 2.4 Definition of a Maori

2.41 One of the reasons why crime amongst Maoris is singled out for special attention from New Zealand crime generally is that the crime rate for Maoris, as calculated from the figures compiled by the Government Statistician, is very much greater than the rate for non-Maoris. The definition of a Maori used by the Government Statistician is: any person with half or more 'Maori blood.' At first sight this would appear to be the obvious definition to use in a study of Maori crime: certainly any definition used must be capable of being related to this definition.

2.42 However, the racial classification of a person necessarily depends on his own statement of his estimate of the extent of his Maori ancestry, and there is doubt about the consistency achieved by this procedure. A person might give different estimates on different occasions - for example, when talking to a Police Officer, to a Probation Officer, to a Child Welfare Officer, or when filling out a Census return - and could thus appear as a Maori in a Department of Statistics publication and a non-Maori in the Department of Justice Statistics, or vice versa.

2.43 It was therefore decided to take a wider definition than "half or more Maori" and only later to examine the relationship between cases studied and cases recorded in the published statistics. The interview schedules were therefore designed to explore the "Maoriness" of the subjects in some detail, to allow a flexible approach to the problem at the stage of analysing the data.

2.44 Accordingly, for the purposes of the study a Maori was taken to be any descendant of a Maori: if a person "had some Maori blood", no matter how little, he was considered to be a Maori.

2.45 National Servicemen were identified as Maoris from an Army induction form (Form 866). This is a general information form containing questions on age, education, occupation, race, and so on; it is filled out by National Servicemen in a group under supervision of regular N.C.O's when trainees enter camp. The section on race requires Maoris to indicate their Maoriness by circling one of a set of alternatives which range from  $\frac{1}{4}$ -Maori to Full Maori. Thus if a Serviceman regarded himself as less than a quarter Maori, he would not in general be identified as a Maori.

2.46 The instructions to Probation Officers concerning the definition of a Maori stated: '... if a person's racial classification in the records contains the word "Maori", however qualified (by words like "a quarter", "an eighth" and so on), or if he is otherwise known to have some Maori blood (even though he may be classified as "European") he is a Maori for the purposes of the interviews.'

2.5 The Interview Schedules

- 2.51 The interviewers (Army Education and Welfare Officers for National Servicemen; Probation Officers for probationers) were supplied with copies of a six-part interview schedule which had been constructed by the Joint Committee Research Unit. Interviewers were instructed to put the questions verbatim from the schedules and record the answers in the appropriate places on the schedules. Most of the questions were pre-coded; that is, a numbered set of alternatives was given with the question. For example:

DID YOU EVER HAVE A FIGHT WHEN DRINKING?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DK
4. NA
5. Fails to respond.

The interviewer recorded the answer by placing a circle around the number of the alternative which applied. (DK stands for "don't know", and NA for "not applicable".)

Interviewers were allowed and advised to interpret a question by re-phrasing the question in a way likely to improve understanding of its essential import, if the subject seemed not to understand the first verbatim putting of the question.

- 2.52 The schedule for Probationers contained 155 separate questions which were divided into six separate interviews. This was for the convenience of Probation Officers, who often see a probationer for only a short time in an ordinary reporting session. Each of the sections was sufficiently short to be given in the course of a reporting session, so that Probation Officers were able to interview a Probationer in the course of six reporting sessions without having to make special arrangements for unusually long sessions. The schedule also contained a recording form which Probation Officers filled out from their records concerning the Probationers.
- 2.53 The schedule for National Servicemen contained 113 questions, which were the same questions as those in the schedule for Probationers, except for some omissions and some minor changes of wording made necessary because the National Servicemen were in Army Camp at the time they were interviewed. For example, the wording of the question:

WHAT IS YOUR BIGGEST SINGLE WEEKLY EXPENSE, APART FROM FOOD AND BOARD?

had to be changed to:

In civilian life WHAT IS YOUR BIGGEST SINGLE WEEKLY EXPENSE, ETC.

- 2.54 The interview information was augmented by information recorded on the Army form 866. The National Serviceman schedule contained 42 fewer questions than the Probationer schedule; the difference is accounted for as follows: the Probationer questions about "the incident or incidents which resulted in the current probation" (32 questions) were not applicable to National Servicemen, and did not appear in the National Serviceman schedule; three questions on sexual behaviour were omitted from the National Serviceman schedule at the request of the Army interviewers; and seven questions in the Probationer schedule concerning education and employment were deemed to be covered by information on the Army 866 form, and were therefore not included in the National Serviceman schedule.\* Except for these

\* It was necessary to shorten the original questionnaire.  
(Footnote cont'd on next page)

differences the two schedules were made up of identically worded questions.

### 3. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

#### 3.1 Selection of data

3.11 The results presented in this report are derived from only a selection of the interview questions. The questions included are those which the writers considered either to be most important, or, important or not, to reveal substantial differences between the offender and non-offender samples. The selection was made to avoid undue length in this interim report.

#### 3.2 Size of samples

3.21 The results reported on are based in the main on information about 126 probationers and 81 non-offenders. (There are a few places where tables are based on different total numbers of subjects; attention is drawn to these in the text of the results, when they arise.) Altogether 124 National Servicemen were interviewed, but a check with Police and Child Welfare records showed that 43 of these had appeared in court for offences. These offenders were excluded from the sample. Information on these National Servicemen is not used in this report, but it will be included in the complete report on the study, when the group will be treated as a second offender sample.

#### 3.3 Statistical treatment

3.31 The results have not been given an elaborate statistical treatment because this would have been a costly and time consuming task (involving the use of a computer) which would have to be completely duplicated when the complete results become available. For the most part the results have been presented simply in percentages, with simple chi-squared tests on the frequencies given where they are appropriate.

3.32 A variety of different tests of significance have been used to evaluate the status of differences found to exist between the samples. All these tests give rise to the same kind of statement about the results, expressed in standard symbols: this is a statement of statistical significance. A typical one might read thus: " $p < .05$ ; the result is significant at the 5% level". The meaning of such statements must be clear to the reader before the results as presented can be properly understood, and so an explanation (which glosses over some points but is sufficient for the purpose) follows:

3.33 Whenever a difference is found, the question arises whether it is characteristic of the samples only, or whether it may be presumed to reflect an enduring difference - one obtaining between the hypothetical "whole groups" (or populations) from which the samples were drawn. That is, the question is whether the difference reflects a population difference in addition to the known sample difference. In this study, the problem is to decide whether a difference between the Probation sample and the National Servicemen sample reflects a genuine difference between similar Probationers and National Servicemen in general, or is

---

at least in a token way, to retain the goodwill and cooperation of the Army authorities. The risk of destroying comparability on this set of seven items of information had therefore to be taken. In fact, information was indeed rendered non-comparable and, in some cases, where the 866 form was poorly filled out, lost entirely.



merely a coincidental feature of the two particular samples, lacking any wider implications.

- 3.34 Differences are evaluated by finding and stating their "level of significance" as a probability value - which is to say, as "odd-in-favour" for the proposition that the differences have arisen merely as a quirk or fluke of sampling. The smaller the odds, the less the likelihood that in paying attention to the difference, one is pondering about something trivial, inconsequential, and, indeed, meaningless.
- 3.35 In general, the size of the sample difference has a lot to do with the decision; if it is large, the odds are less that it would have arisen by a fluke. The absolute number in the sample also affects the issue. The statistical tests locate and state the odds exactly, so that one is left only with the decision "how small do the odds have to be before we pay attention to the difference found".
- 3.36 The answer to this last question is to some extent arbitrary and a matter of preference. It is conventional to take odds of 1 in 20 (expressible as a fraction in any of the various ways  $1/20$ , 0.05, or 5%) as the dividing line. If the odds (symbolised as  $p$ , for probability) are less than this value of 5%, or .05, the result is said to be significant at the 5% level of confidence, or, more shortly and directly to have "probability less than 0.05" - in symbols, " $p < .05$ ".
- 3.37 A guide to interpreting levels of significance is as follows:

<u>Level of Significance</u>	<u>Usual Interpretation</u>
$p$ greater than 0.05 (symbolised $p > .05$ )	The difference is not usually regarded as significant, but rather as possibly just a fluke
$p$ less than 0.05 (symbolised $p < .05$ i.e., significant at the 5% level	The difference is considered to be moderately significant; the odds are less than 1 in 20 that the result is just a fluke
$p < .01$ i.e., significant at the 1% level	The difference is considered quite highly significant; there is only 1 chance in 100 that the result is just a fluke, rather than reflecting some enduring population difference.
$p < .005$ i.e., significant at the 0.5% level	The difference is considered highly significant; there are 5 chances in 1000, or 1 in 200, of a fluke.
$p < .001$ i.e., significant at the 0.1% level	The difference is considered to be very highly significant: only 1 chance in 1000 of a fluke.

### 3.4 Acknowledgement of sources of information

- 3.41 With each result the source of the information is given in brackets. The following conventions are used:

A-866 indicates that the information was recorded on the Army 866 form.

RS indicates that the information was recorded on the yellow recording sheet in the Instruction Booklet.

of the Probationer Schedule. (The information on offences recorded here was checked against Child Welfare and Police records.)

- Qx.yz indicates that the information was recorded as the answer to interview question number x.yz in the interview schedule.

⊗ indicates that the offender and non-offender samples cannot be regarded as comparable with respect to the question, because of age differences between the samples (cf. Section 4).

Tables of results are presented under the headings "Probs." for Probationers, and "N.S.", for National Servicemen.

RESULTS4. AGE4.1 Year of birth (A-866 and RS)

<u>Year of birth</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %
1941	5.4	1.2
1942	4.1	4.9
1943	2.7	22.2
1944	5.4	49.4
1945	6.8	...
1946	17.6	...
1947	21.6	...
1948	25.7	...
1949	9.5	...
1950	1.4	...

There is an average difference of about two years.

4.2 When evaluating the results of some of the questions it is important to know the ages of the subjects at the time they were interviewed. (Questions about drinking habits and leisure activities are examples; behaviour in these areas can be expected to vary with age.) The differences in birth years are not a good measure of differences in age between the two samples because the subjects were not all interviewed at the same time. The National Servicemen sample is made up of two intakes, separated by about seven months, and the Probation sample was built up continuously over a period of a year. The age at interview can be determined exactly for the National Servicemen. Unfortunately, it is not known for many of the Probationers, because some Probation Officers omitted to record the date at which interviewing was begun on the schedules. However, the age at Court appearance is known, and this is a close approximation to the age at which the interviewing was begun, as in almost all cases interviewing began within a few weeks of the Probationer's Court appearance, and in some cases within a few days.

4.3 Age at interviewing (A-866 and RS)

Age of National Servicemen at interviewing compared with age of Probationers at the time of Court appearance)

<u>Age</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %
15 years	3.2	...
16 years	16.9	...
17 years	24.2	...
18 years	18.5	...
19 years	17.7	...
20 years	6.5	54.3
21 years	5.6	38.3
22 years	4.0	4.9
23 years	2.4	2.5
24 years	0.8	...
Mean age:	18.6 years	21.1 years
Standard deviation	1.96	0.67

chi-square=138.46,  
p<0.001

df=9

The difference in age between the two samples is highly significant.

- 4.4 It can be fairly safely assumed that the difference in mean age (which is 2.5 years) does not affect the comparability of the samples on questions dealing with childhood, occupation of parents and such like. Questions for which comparisons are most likely to be distorted by the age difference are marked with the symbol X.

## 5. OFFENCES

- 5.01 The information in this section relates only to probationers; there is no source of comparison.

- 5.02 Results 5.03 to 5.12 are based on a sample of 74 Probationers. The remainder of the results in this section are based on a sample of 126.

### 5.03 Break-down of offences

The following table gives a break-down by offence category of the current offence deemed most serious, the offence deemed second most serious, the offence deemed third most serious, and of all current offences. The break-down has been made according to the offence categories used by the Department of Statistics. The figures given are the percentage of offenders who committed an offence of the type specified by the category. The percentages given under the heading "All current offences" add to more than a hundred because some offenders committed more than one offence.

<u>Offences (RS)</u>	Current offence deemed most serious	Current offence deemed second most serious	Current offence deemed third most serious	All current offences
	%	%	%	%
Negligent driving causing death	1.4	...	...	1.4
Common assault	5.4	...	...	5.4
Unlawful sexual intercourse	5.4	1.4	...	6.9
Indecent assault	1.4	...	...	1.4
Indecent assault on a male	1.4	...	...	1.4
Burglary	25.7	...	...	25.7
Being in possession of housebreaking implements	1.4	...	...	1.4
Theft	10.8	12.2	2.7	25.7
Receiving	4.1	...	1.4	5.4
Fraud	8.1	...	...	8.1
Extortion	1.4	...	...	1.4
Conversion (motor-vehicle)	14.9	6.8	...	21.7
Conversion (bicycle)	1.4	...	1.4	2.7
Conversion (boat)	...	...	1.4	1.4
Conversion (other property)	1.4	...	...	1.4
Wilful damage, trespass	2.7	...	1.4	4.1
Indecent, riotous or offensive conduct (annoying people, etc.)	1.4	1.4	...	2.7
Liquor near dance hall	...	1.4	...	1.4
Assaulting, resisting or obstructing the Police	2.7	...	...	2.7
Other vagrancy (consorting with disreputable person; incorrigible rogue; etc.)	4.1	...	...	4.1
Negligent or dangerous driving	...	2.7	...	2.7
Breach of regulations for the lighting of bicycles	...	...	1.4	1.4
Offences relating to the registration of motor-vehicles	...	...	1.4	1.4
Offences relating to driver's licence	1.4	2.7	1.4	5.4
Other traffic offenses	...	1.4	...	1.4
Perjury	4.1	...	...	4.1
Assisting prisoner to escape	...	1.4	...	1.4
Hire purchase agreement breach	...	1.4	...	1.4

Property offences are the most prevalent. For the category "Current offence deemed most serious", 69.2% are property offences.

5.04 Number of charges of current offence deemed most serious (RS)

	%
1 charge	70.3
2 charges	17.6
3 charges	5.4
4 charges	4.1
5 charges	1.3

5.05 Numbers of separate offence categories for current offences (RS)

	%
One	67.6
Two	20.3
Three	8.1
Four	2.7
Five	1.4

5.06 Total numbers of charges for current offences (RS)

	%
One	55.4
Two	16.2
Three	8.1
Four	8.1
Five	2.7
Six	5.4
Seven	1.4

5.07 Numbers of Appearances in Children's Court for Misconduct and Offences (RS)

	%
Nil	56.7
One	22.0
Two	10.8
Three	5.4
Four	4.1

5.08 Numbers of Appearances in Children's Court on Complaints Not Implying Misconduct (RS)

	%
Nil	98.6
One	1.4

5.09 Numbers of Appearances in Magistrate's Court for Misconduct (RS)

	%
Nil - has appeared in Children's Court only	21.6
One	56.7
Two	13.5
Three	5.4
Four	1.4
Five	1.4
Six	1.4

5.10 Number of Charges in Magistrate's Court for Misconduct (RS)

	%
Nil - only Children's Court appearance	21.6
One	27.0
Two	17.6
Three	10.8
Four	8.1
Five	1.4
Six	9.5
Seven	1.4
Eight	...
Nine	...
Ten	1.4
Eleven	1.4
Twelve	...

5.11 Total Number of Charges for Misconduct (for both Children's Court and Magistrate's Court, including current appearance.) (RS)

	%
One	27.0
Two	23.0
Three	13.5
Four	5.4
Five	6.8
Six	9.5
Seven	5.4
Eight	1.4
Nine	1.4
Ten	2.7
Eleven	...
Twelve	1.4
Thirteen	1.4
Fourteen	...
Fifteen	...
Sixteen	...
Seventeen	...
Eighteen	1.4

5.12 Age at First Appearance in Court for Misconduct (RS)

	Number Probs	% Probs
Ten	...	...
Eleven	2	2.7
Twelve	2	2.7
Thirteen	7	9.5
Fourteen	7	9.5
Fifteen	8	10.8
Sixteen	4	5.4
Seventeen	13	17.6
Eighteen	8	10.8
Nineteen	12	16.2
Twenty	5	6.8
Twenty-one	1	1.4
Twenty-two	3	4.1
Twenty-three	2	2.7
	74	100

Mean: 17.3 years  
Standard deviation: 2.82

5.13	<u>Plea</u>		(Q4.5)
		%	
	Guilty	97.6	
	Not guilty	2.4	

5.14(1)	<u>Legal representation</u>		(Q4.6)
		%	
	Represented by lawyer	39.7	
	Not represented	60.3	

Of those that had a lawyer, 82% said that they thought it worthwhile to have had a lawyer, the rest (18%) thought that it was not. (Q4.7)

5.14(2) For those not legally represented:  
Reasons given for not having a Lawyer (Q4.8)

		%
	Had already confessed, signed statement, etc.	15.9
	Just didn't want to (for other reasons than the foregoing)	23.0
	Expense	6.3
	Had Maori Welfare Officer instead	0.8
	Doesn't know - didn't think of having a lawyer	7.9
	Didn't or wouldn't know how to go about getting a lawyer	2.4
	Other reasons	1.6
	No entry, question missed	2.4
	Not applicable, had a lawyer	39.7

5.15 Attitude to Lawyers:

For subjects not represented by counsel, their opinion on whether it would have been a good idea to have been represented: (Q4.9)

		%
	Thinks so strongly	1.6
	Inclined to think so	5.5
	No opinion	15.1
	Somewhat against it	34.9
	Strongly against it	3.2
	Not applicable - represented by a lawyer	39.7



5.16 Getting a Lawyer

If without a lawyer, whether subject would know how to get one if he wanted one: (Q4.10)

	%
Would have a fair idea	14.3
Would need help	46.0
Not applicable - had a lawyer	39.7

5.17 Legal Aid:

What subject knows about Free Legal Aid: (Q4.11)

	%
Never heard of it	86.5
Hazy about it	10.3
Knows about it	3.2

5.18 Persons (apart from counsel) who spoke to court on subject's behalf (according to his view of situation): (Q4.12)

	%
No one	65.1
Maori Welfare Officer	0.8
Maori Warden	0.8
'Parents(s)'	5.5
Probation Officer	19.8
Other people	8.0

6 (4.8%) subjects said that 2 people, and 1 subject said that 3, people spoke to the Court on their behalf.

5.19 People that subject knew who came to sit at the back of the court when his case was heard: (Q4.13)

	%
No one	24.6
Maori Welfare Officer	6.3
'Parent(s)'	39.7
Other relatives	21.5
Employer	3.2
Adult friend(s)	4.0
Girl friend	3.2
Same-age friends	3.2
Probation Officer	16.7
Other	2.4

56.4% subjects had one person there, 12.7% had two, 3.2% had 3 and 3.2% 4; as shown, only 24.6 had no one.

5.20 Opinion of Court's decision: (Q4.14)

	%
Too severe	4.8
Fair, reasonable, etc	79.4
Too light, was lucky etc	11.1
They made a mistake, was not guilty, etc	0.8
Doesn't know	4.0

5.21 Whether in employment at time of offence: (Q4.15)

	%
Yes	71.4
No	28.6

5.22	<u>How subject was (in his opinion) caught:</u>		(Q4.16)
		%	
	Found at scene of crime	17.5	
	Suspicious circumstances during or immediately following the crime	4.0	
	Fingerprints, other circumstantial evidence	4.0	
	Name given police by companion in offence	14.3	
	Attempting to dispose of stolen property leads to arrest	...	
	Non-involved associate of subject (e.g. father) reports to police (e.g., after finding stolen property at home)	4.0	
	Description of subject by witnesses	15.1	
	Other means of detection	16.7	
	Not known	24.6	
5.23	<u>Money:</u>		(Q.4.17)
	Money situation at time of offence (this will often be irrelevant - e.g., when offence was assault):		
		%	
	Short of money at time	31.0	
	Not short	63.5	
	Not known, etc.	5.6	
5.24	<u>Premeditation:</u>		(Q4.18)
	Offence a sudden decision	64.3	
	Offence not a sudden decision	24.6	
	Can't decide, etc	2.4	
	Not applicable (e.g. motor accident)	7.9	
5.25	<u>Day of the week on which offence took place:</u>		(Q5.20)
		%	
	Monday	7.9	
	Tuesday	7.9	
	Wednesday	9.5	
	Thursday	12.7	
	Friday	17.5	
	Saturday	25.4	
	Sunday	11.9	
	No information	7.1	

5.26	<u>Whether subject had been drinking (at all).</u>		(Q4.21)
		%	
	Had been drinking	39.7	
	Had not been drinking	59.5	
	Not stated	0.8	
5.27	<u>Subject's verbalisations in reply to: "Why did you do it?"</u>		(Q4.22)
		%	
	Can state no reason	38.1	
	Needed property taken, etc	19.0	
	"For kicks" and similar	4.8	
	"Led into it" etc	8.7	
	For sexual gratification, etc.	5.6	
	"Drinking"	4.0	
	Other	15.9	
	Objects to say	2.4	
	Claims innocence	1.6	
5.28	<u>Verbalisations in reply to: "Was it worth it?"</u>		(Q 4.23)
		%	
	Yes	6.3	
	No	90.5	
	No reply, etc	3.2	
5.29	<u>Verbalisations in reply to: "Would it have been worth it if you hadn't been caught?"</u>		(Q4.24)
		%	
	Would have been	31.7	
	Would not have been	46.8	
	Doesn't know	14.3	
	Not stated	6.9	
5.30	<u>Person offender says suffered from his offence (first person mentioned)</u>		(Q4.25)
		%	
	Offender himself	47.6	
	His "parents" etc. by upset	18.3	
	"Victim" of offence	14.3	
	Other	10.3	
	Doesn't know or not stated	9.6	

- 5.31 Knowledge of Victim (Q4.26)
- Offender's knowledge (at time of offence) of "victim" of offence: %
- |   |      |
|---|------|
| Victim a complete stranger  | 33.2 |
| Victim a complete stranger, but present at the scene of the crime (e.g., victim of assault on taxi-rank)                | 9.5  |
| A person known to offender, but not an acquaintance (e.g., known as "local service station proprietor, known by sight") | 7.9  |
| An acquaintance   | 12.6 |
| Friend  | 8.7  |
| Relative  | 7.1  |
| Employer  | 2.4  |
| Other   | 1.6  |
| Not applicable, not stated, etc.  | 16.6 |
- 5.32 Attitude to victim (Q4.26)
- Offender regarded victim as: %
- |   |      |
|---|------|
| Impersonal institution or business - "they" etc | 26.9 |
| A person or persons                             | 61.6 |
| Undecided, not stated, etc.                     | 11.5 |
- 5.33 When victim a person or persons, offender thought of victim(s) as: (Q4.26)
- |   |      |
|---|------|
| An acquaintance (not necessarily friendly, but know at least to speak to)         | 27.7 |
| Not an acquaintance but someone he had seen "around and about" before the offence | 12.7 |
| A complete stranger   | 23.0 |
| Not applicable, not stated etc.   | 36.4 |
- 5.34 Whether offender believed victims to be Maoris or Non-Maoris (Q4.26)
- |  |      |
|--|------|
| Maori(s)                                     | 19.0 |
| Non-Maori(s)                                 | 26.1 |
| Possibly some Maori(s) and some Non-Maori(s) | 26.9 |
| Not sure, don't know, etc                    | 15.1 |
| No information                               | 11.1 |

(5.35)

5.35 Subject's reply to question on whether the "victim" lost much, or suffered much harm, as a result of the offence (Q4.27)

	%
Yes - victim suffered substantial loss or injury	16.7
No - not much property involved, or if assault, etc, was trivial in nature	35.6
No - victim(s) could afford it; or if sex offence, assault, etc, "was asking for it"	10.3
No - victim(s) <u>insured</u>	0.8
No - for other reasons	15.9
Doesn't know	11.1
Objects to say, won't answer, etc.	1.6
Not applicable	7.9

5.36 Companions in offence (not counting partner in any sex offence) (Q4.28)

	%
None	42.9
One	25.3
Two	15.9
Three	7.1
Four	3.2
Five to seven	2.4
Eight to ten	1.6
More than ten	1.6

Of those that did have one or more companions, about 1/5th had all Pakeha companions, and about 2/3rds had all Maori companions, leaving a little under 1/5th that had both Maori and Pakeha companions. (Q4.29)

5.37 Age of companions (Q4.30)

Whether any were much older than offender - say about 5 years older:	%
Were older	11.1
Were of about same age	46.1
Not applicable - no companions	42.9

5.38 Where offender became acquainted with his companions in the offence (Q4.31)

	%
Neighbourhood, etc	20.6
Pub	1.6
School friends	15.1
Other long-standing friends	4.0
Relatives	7.1
Work	7.9
Not applicable - no companions	42.9

5.39 Whether any of the companions had been in trouble with the law previously (Q4.32)

	%
Yes	27.7
No	22.1
Doesn't know	7.9
Not applicable - no companions	42.9

5.40 Whether parent(s) at some time with the law (not counting traffic offences) (Q4.33)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Yes	11.1	7.4
No	77.0	79.0
Doesn't know	10.3	8.6
Not stated	1.6	4.9

The differences are not significant

5.41 Whether brothers and/or sisters in trouble with the law at any time (not counting traffic offences) (Q4.34)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Yes	35.6	16.0
No	60.0	75.3
Doesn't know	3.2	3.7
Not applicable	0.8	3.7
Information not available	...	1.6

Chi-square = 8.5 df = 1  
0.001 < p < 0.005

The difference is significant.

5.42 Age when subject first became known to the police for an offence, by his account (Q4.35)

	%
Under 8 years	0.8
8-9 years	0.8
10-11 years	3.2
12-13 years	7.9
14-15 years	16.6
16-17 years	29.2
18-19 years	27.7
20-21 years	5.5
21-22 years	3.2
23 and above	1.6
Inf. not available	3.2

Mean age was 17 years, with standard deviation 2.8

5.43 Whether, he says, it was really his first offence (Q4.36)

	%
Yes	67.9
No	29.2
Not known	1.6

6. MARITAL STATUS 6.1 Marital status and number of children

(A-866 and RS)

	Probs. % of 74	N.S. % of 81
Single, no children	90.5	84.0
Single, with children	2.7	2.5
Married, no children	1.3	4.9
Married, one child	1.3	8.6
Married, two children	1.3	..
Married, three children	2.7	...

The differences are not significant

7. THE NATURE OF THE HOME7.01 Number of towns lived in until about 6 years old (Q1.2)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
One town or place	62.7	66.7
Two	28.6	23.5
Three	6.3	4.9
Four	1.6	1.2
Not known, etc	0.8	3.7
Mean	1.5	1.4
Variance	0.47	0.42

There is no significant difference here

7.02 People mainly responsible for care of child until about 6 years old (Q1.3)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Both parents together	74.6	70.4
Mother alone	5.6	11.1
Father alone	...	1.2
Grandparent(s)	11.9	4.9
Other relatives	3.2	3.7
Foster parents	0.8	1.2
Adoptive parents	4.0	7.4

There is no significant difference here. About three quarters of both samples appear to have been reared to age 6 mainly by both parents. Where there was separation, the most common reason stated was informal adoption by relatives (8% of all Probationers and 11% of all Servicemen). There is thus no support here for the idea frequently advanced that the practice of informal adoption contributes markedly to delinquency among Maoris.

7.03 Whether parents alive (at time of interview) (Q1.5)

	Probs. %	N S. %
Both alive	64.3	63.0
Mother dead, father alive	8.7	7.4
Father dead, mother alive	20.6	18.5
Both dead	4.0	4.9
Dcesn't know	2.4	6.2

There is no significant difference here. The high mortality amongst the parents of both sub-samples is noteworthy, however; this throws new light on the earlier finding in the "Limited Study Comparing Maoris and Non-Maoris appearing in the Children's Court in 1960", that about one in every four of the Maori boys had at least one parent dead. In that report it was supposed in absence of control information that this factor might be contributory to delinquency. This new information throws grave doubt on the idea.

7.04 Whether parents living together (where both parents still alive) (Q.1.6)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Parents, if alive, together	38.5	50.0
Parents, if alive, apart	61.4	50.0

This difference is not significant.

7.05 Numbers of siblings (including half- but not step-sibs) (Q1.7)

	Probs.	N.S.
Mean numbers	7.04	6.89

This difference is not significant

7.06 Number of different towns lived in (Q1.8)

	Probs.	N.S.
Mean number	4.0	3.7

The difference is not significant

7.07 Number of different families or households lived with (Q1.9)

	Probs.	N.S.
Mean number	2.9	2.9

7.08 "Real" home  
Nominates "real" home as being with: (Q1.10)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Both parents	62.7	66.7
Mother and step-father	5.6	7.4
Father and step-mother	...	1.2
Mother singly	7.1	9.9
Father singly	1.6	2.5
Grandparents	8.7	2.5
Other relatives	6.3	2.5
Adoptive parents (whether legally or informally adopted)	4.0	4.9
Other	4.0	2.4

There is no significant difference here, nor in the proportions who are living in this real home about the time of interview.



7.09 Questions about home and family

Provision had to be made, in the construction of the interview schedules, for the wide variety of early backgrounds which could be expected to be found. If an interviewee had been brought up from birth by his grandparents, for example, there would be more value in asking questions about his grandparent's household than there would in asking about his natural parent's household, even in cases where he had maintained some contact with them. Accordingly, the following conventions were adopted:

"Home" refers to the household which had the largest share, by time, in the interviewee's upbringing. (The quotation marks are used to emphasise that the word home is used in this specialised way, and does not necessarily refer to the household of the natural parents.) Similarly, "parents", "father", and "mother" refer to people in the "home". Thus if an interviewee had been brought up mainly by his grandparents, "home" would refer to the grandparent's household, "father" would refer to his grandfather, and "mother" to his grandmother.

7.10 Family or household that had most to do with upbringing  
(by time) i.e. "home"

(Q1.12)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Both parents	64.3	66.7
One parent, with or without step-parent, etc	12.7	14.8
Grandparents and other relatives	15.9	11.1
Other	7.2	7.4

Differences are not significant.

7.11 Being away from "home" for lengthy period before age 15

(Q1.13)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Has been away	28.6	24.7
Has not	57.9	59.3
Ambiguous answers, not known, etc.	13.5	16.0

The differences are not significant, nor are age differences at time of being away. Careful note was taken of experience of institutions (hospital, children's homes, health camp, etc.). Probationers were neither more nor less likely than Servicemen to have been in an institution of some kind. In both samples, about one in three (with a very slightly greater proportion of Probationers) had been in hospital at some time; this was the most common experience of any kind of institution.

8. PARENTS AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

8.01 There were no significant differences in the following:

Identity of breadwinner of family (i.e., mainly whether the breadwinner was "father" or "mother"); whether breadwinner had to live in one place while working in another; whether breadwinner did seasonal work incidence of illness amongst the "parents"; who was the 'boss' at "home" - "father" or "mother".

The data on illness of parents are shown more explicitly below:

8.02 <u>Whether "father" had had serious illness</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q2.5)
	%	%	
Yes	36.0	51.8	
No	51.2	38.3	
Not known, etc	12.8	9.9	

This is a difference in a direction opposite to that expected; it is not, however, significant.

8.03 <u>Whether "father" had had continuing possibly mild illness</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q2.6)
	%	%	
Yes	24.8	22.2	
No	60.8	67.9	
Not known, etc.	14.4	9.9	

8.04 <u>Whether "mother" had had serious illness</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q2.7)
	%	%	
Yes	28.0	24.7	
No	62.4	67.9	
Not known etc.	9.6	7.4	

8.05 <u>Whether "mother" had had continuing, possibly mild illness</u>	Probs.	N S.	(Q2.8)
	%	%	
Yes	21.6	21.0	
No	72.8	69.1	
Not known, etc	5.6	9.9	

None of these differences is significant.

8.06 Data bearing on family relationships:

When subjects were asked to say whether there was anyone they did not get on with at "home" replies showed no significant difference (82% of Probationers and 89% of Servicemen said that there was no one specially that they felt they did not get on with). But the following questions showed up some differences.

\* The results about the Probationers reported in this section relate to 125 Probationers.

8.07 Person subject said he got on best with

(Q2.11)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
No one specially	28.8	61.7
"Mother"	28.8	3.7
"Father"	12.0	16.0
Both "parents"	2.4	1.2
Brothers and sisters	20.8	13.6
All others, not known, etc.	7.2	3.7

chi-square = 31.8 df = 4  
P < 0.001

The differences are highly significant.

The Probationers appear to "play favourites" in their family affections to a greater extent than the Servicemen; the main difference is the greater likelihood of expressing most liking for the mother, or for brothers and sisters. The latter preference could be interpreted as showing greater likelihood of some strain in relations with "the parents".

8.08 Person subject said he found hardest to get on with

(Q2.12)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
No one specially	55.2	70.3
"Mother"	7.2	7.4
"Father"	17.6	2.5
Brothers and sisters	15.2	16.0
All others, doesn't know, etc	4.8	3.7

chi-square = 11.7 df = 4  
0.01 < p < 0.02

The differences are significant.

The Probationers tend more often to nominate some family member as "hardest to get on with", and more frequently nominate the "father". Some further questions yielded data consistent with the suggestion that relations with the "father" are a source of difficulty.

8.09 Verbalisation concerning perception of "father"

(Q2.15)

(What was your "father" like?)	Probs. %	N.S. %
Tough on boy	12.8	21.0
Average	44.0	33.3
Easy-going	32.0	32.1
Variable	5.6	3.7
Can't say, etc	5.6	9.8

The difference is not significant. (It would be difficult to know how to interpret the difference is in the direction of the non-offenders being more likely than the offenders to perceive the fathers as "tough"; other studies suggest that, if there is a difference, it is in the opposite direction.) Possibly the result is connected more with a certain defensiveness in replying to the question than to the actual relationship purportedly described.

8.10 At the point in the interview reached in the foregoing question, the interviewer was asked to have an informal discussion about the "father's" drinking habits, and then himself answer some questions about these habits based on the information so obtained. The answers supplied are now dealt with.

8.11 Did "father's" drinking impair relations with the boy?

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q2.16)
Yes	15.2	3.7	
No	73.2	72.8	
Unable to tell, etc	2.4	12.3	

chi-square = 5.66, df = 1  
0.01 < p < 0.02

The differences are significant.

8.12 Did "father" drink frequently?

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q2.16)
Yes	24.8	11.1	
No	62.4	70.3	
Unable to tell, etc.	8.0	11.1	

chi-square = 5.63, df = 1  
0.01 < p < 0.02

The differences are significant.

8.13 Did "father" drink heavily (when he drank)?

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q2.16)
Yes	24.8	21.0	
No	60.8	62.9	
Unable to tell, etc	10.4	11.1	

The differences are not significant.

8.14 There is some evidence here that drink is more of a problem amongst the families of the Probationers than those of the Servicemen. This was borne out in the comments requested in an open-ended question where significant differences were found implying that the "fathers" of the Probationers were less likely to be non-drinkers and more likely to be problem drinkers of one kind or another, than the "fathers" of the Servicemen. The question on drinking for which the largest difference was found was that about whether the "father's" drinking impaired his relationship with the subject; there was no significant difference for the questions about the heaviness of the "father's" drinking. It may be that drinking was not a basic cause of discord, but rather that, when there was already a generally poor relationship between "father" and son, overt signs of disharmony would emerge clearly when the father had been drinking. It is noteworthy that the "fathers" of 11% of the Servicemen drank frequently and 21% drank heavily but that drink impaired the relationship in only 3.7% of the cases. There were no specific questions on the "mother's" drinking and nothing significant emerged about it.

The next questions concerned discipline and supervision.

8.15 How the subject was punished when he played up as a child at "home"  
(before age 10)

(Q2.17)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
With a stick, strap, etc.	32.0	64.2
Slapping, etc	20.0	11.1
Fist, etc	1.6	...
Other corporal	10.4	4.9
Growling, telling off, etc	31.2	11.1
Other	4.8	19.7

chi-square = 26.1, df = 5  
p < .001

The differences are highly significant.

The suggestion is that discipline amongst the Probationers was more informal and a matter of impulse than amongst the Servicemen; this interpretation is more plausible than one which attributes greater severity to the disciplinary practices of the Servicemen families, and it is certainly in the informal categories (slapping and growling) that the Probationers preponderate.

8.16 Reasons for frequent punishment

(Q2.19)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
General disobedience and ill-discipline	22.4	8.6
Other	77.6	91.4

chi-square = 6.6, df = 1  
0.01 < p < 0.02

The difference is significant.

8.17 The remaining questions on supervision and discipline yielded no significant differences save the last of them, which required the interviewer to rate the discipline of the subjects, so far as information permitted, on the "scale" devised by the Gluecks (1950).

8.18 Discipline rated as: (Q.2.20)

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(N.S. offenders)
Adequate - firm but kindly	49.6	69.1	(53.5)
Overstrict	1.6	8.6	(9.3)
Lax	20.0	9.9	(30.2)
Erratic	24.0	6.2	(4.7)
Cannot rate	4.8	6.2	(2.3)

chi-square = 10.1 df = 4  
0.01 < p < 0.05

The difference is significant.

8.19 This question gave a clear-cut result, but we should be cautious in attaching too much importance to it. The "measurement" made here is one of the most likely of all to be distorted by factors associated with the imperfect experimental design that we were forced to use. The rating is a highly subjective one and ill-defined, and there were uncontrolled differences in the situation in which it had to be made, between Probationers and Servicemen. Thus, Army Education and Welfare Officers made their ratings in an Army camp, with very little acquaintance with the subjects, no access to files about them, no knowledge about whether they were offenders or not, and so on. The Probation Officers made their ratings during a reporting session, fully aware that the subject had offended (so that if an individual Probation Officer had a theory which related discipline and the likelihood of becoming an offender, this would be very likely to colour his rating) probably after a full perusal of his file on several occasions, and so on. Against the pre-supposition that the rating is hopelessly biased for these reasons is the interesting evidence that results for the National Servicemen who were offenders differ from those who were non-offenders, the latter showing in the main, laxer discipline. This difference could not be explained by factors associated with place and type of interview. However, significant differences between the two main groups on this rating need be no surprise; the question whether these differences reflect objective differences in the variable rated, or only situational differences as outlined above, though a vital one, cannot be answered with any certainty. The most that can be said is that the results of the rating are consistent with the results of the other questions, and indeed provide rather a good summary of the trend discerned. It suggests that discipline of the young was a duty less conscientiously undertaken in the homes of the Probationers than in the homes of the Servicemen, and that what discipline there was was more spontaneous and informal and perhaps erratic for the former than for the latter. Without more evidence, or at least a more sophisticated (correlational) analysis it is not possible to say more at present; greater numbers in the sample of Probationers will also help interpretation.

## 9. EDUCATION

### 9.01 Number of primary schools attended (Q3.1)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
One school	35.0	35.8
Two schools	30.2	30.9
Three schools	12.7	16.0
Four schools	12.7	12.3
Five schools	5.6	2.5
Six schools	3.2	1.2
Seven schools	0.8	1.2
Not known	0.8	...
Mean number of schools	2.4	2.3

The differences are not significant.

9.02 Number of secondary schools attended (Q3.3)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
No secondary schools	11.9	9.9
One secondary school	73.8	70.3
Two schools	13.5	17.3
Three schools	0.8	2.5
Mean number of schools	1.1	1.1

9.03 Age at which left school (A-866 and Q3.5)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
13 years	2.4	3.7
14 years	7.9	3.7
15 years	51.6	37.0
16 years	26.9	29.6
17 years	8.7	16.0
18 years	0.8	12.3
19 years	...	1.2
Still at school	1.6	...
Mean age at which left school:	15.4 years	16.0 years

$$z=4.78, \quad p < 0.001$$

The difference is highly significant.

9.04 Highest class reached at school before leaving (A-866 and Q3.6)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Standard 4 or lower	1.6	...
Form I	0.8	1.2
Form II	8.7	7.4
Form III	20.6	16.0
Form IV	42.9	30.9
Form V	23.8	38.3
Form VI B (Lower VI)	...	6.2
Still at school	1.6	...
Mean form reached:	3.8	4.2

$$z=2.60, \quad p < 0.01$$

$$\text{chi-square} = 15.11, \quad \text{df}=6,$$

$$0.01 < p < 0.02$$

The difference is significant.

9.05 Educational qualifications (A-866 and Q3.8)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
No qualifications	100	90.1
School certificate	...	4.9
University entrance	...	1.2
University degree or part degree	...	2.5
Other	...	1.2

$$\text{chi-square} = 8.78, \quad \text{df}=1 \quad (\text{using the dichotomy: "no qualifications" vs. "some qualifications"})$$

$$0.001 < p < 0.005$$

The difference is significant.

9.06 Probationers and National Servicemen do not differ on the average number of primary or secondary schools attended. However, Probationers tended to leave school at a lower age, and to be in a lower class when they left. None of the Probationers acquired any educational qualification, while 10% of the National Servicemen acquired School Certificate or some higher qualification.

9.07 Whether parents objected if the subject stayed home from school when not sick (Q3.11)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Parents would mind	61.9	88.9
Parents would not mind	33.4	11.1
Not known, etc.	4.8	...

For dichotomy: "would mind" vs. "would not mind"  
 chi-square = 13.12, df=1  
 $p < 0.001$

The difference is highly significant.

9.08 Truanting (Q3.13)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Often truanted	15.9	14.8
Sometimes truanted	38.8	34.6
Never truanted	42.9	50.6
Not known	2.4	...

The difference is not significant.

9.09 Whether liked school (Q3.15)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Hated school	7.9	3.7
Disliked it	12.7	21.0
"It was OK"	41.3	30.9
Quite liked school	14.3	24.7
Liked school	23.0	19.8
Not known	0.8	...

Omitting the "not known" category,  
 chi-square = 8.32, df=5  
 $0.05 < p < 0.1$

The difference is not significant.

9.10 A higher proportion of the Probationers truanted than the National Servicemen, but the difference is not statistically significant. A smaller proportion of the Probationer's parents were concerned about the child staying home from school when not sick; this difference is highly significant.



10. EMPLOYMENT10.01 Length of time between leaving school and starting work (Q3.16)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Less than 1 week	20.6	37.0
1 week	21.4	14.8
2 weeks	11.9	13.6
3 weeks	10.3	2.5
4 weeks	12.7	13.6
5 weeks	0.8	...
6 weeks	2.4	3.7
7 weeks	0.8	...
8 weeks	6.3	3.7
9 or more weeks	7.9	7.4
Not known, not applicable, etc.	4.8	3.7
Median length of time	2.0 weeks	1.3 weeks

Omitting the "not known" category

chi-square = 9.02, df=9

$0.3 < p < 0.5$

The difference is not significant.

10.02 From whom help in finding first job was received (Q3.17)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
"Parents"	29.4	25.9
Other relatives	27.8	21.0
Friends	6.3	2.5
Vocational Guidance Officer	3.2	11.1
Teacher	...	2.5
Child Welfare Officer	3.2	2.5
Others	6.3	4.9
No help received	27.0	30.9
Not applicable, not known, etc.	2.4	1.2

The differences are slight, and are not significant.

10.03 Trade apprenticeship (A-866 and Q3.19)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Apprenticeship completed	0.8	3.7
Apprenticeship current	7.1	7.4
Apprenticeship terminated	4.8	3.7
Status of apprenticeship not known	...	1.2
Never taken an apprenticeship	87.3	83.9

There is no significant difference.

10.04 Take-home pay for first job after leaving school (Q3.21)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
£0 to £3.19.6	5.6	6.2
£4 to £5.19.6	22.2	18.5
£6 to £7.19.6	15.9	9.9
£8 to £9.19.6	15.9	12.3
£10 to £15	25.4	30.3
£16 to £20	10.3	11.3
£21 to £25	...	2.5
Not known, not applicable	4.8	1.2
Mean pay (to nearest shilling)	£9.4.0	£10.6.0

Omitting the "not known" category

chi-square = 7.79, df=6

0.2 < p < 0.3 (not significant)

10.05 Whether still in first job (Q3.23)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Still in first job	11.9	17.2
No longer in first job	85.7	82.8
Not known, not applicable, etc.	2.4	...

Omitting "not known" category

chi-square = 1.04, df=1

0.3 < p < 0.5 (not significant)

10.06 Length of time in first job (Q3.22)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Less than 1 week	...	...
1 week and less than 2 weeks	0.8	4.9
2 weeks and less than 3 "	1.6	1.2
1 month and less than 3 months	11.9	11.1
3 months and less than 6 months	22.2	3.7
6 months and less than 1 year	26.2	14.8
1 year and less than 2 years	15.9	24.7
2 years or more	14.3	35.8
Not known, not applicable, etc.	7.1	3.7
Mean length of time	11.9 months	18.3 months

Omitting "not known" category

chi-square = 29.55, df=6

p < 0.001

The difference is highly significant.

10.07 Take-home pay for present job (in the case of National Servicemen, take home pay for job held immediately prior to entering camp) (A-866 and Q3.24)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
£4 to £5.19.6	4.0	2.5
£6 to £7.19.6	5.6	2.5
£8 to £9.19.6	8.7	6.2
£10 to £15	37.3	27.2
£16 to £20	28.6	40.8
£21 to £25	10.3	13.6
More than £25	0.8	3.7
Not known, not applicable, etc.	4.8	3.7
Mean pay (to nearest shilling)	£14.7.0	£16.5.0

$z=2.59, p < 0.01$

The difference in mean pay is significant.

10.08 Total number of jobs held (A-866 and Q3.25)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
1 to 3 jobs	47.6	60.5
4 to 6 jobs	31.8	27.2
7 to 9 jobs	10.3	8.6
10 to 12 jobs	3.2	1.2
13 to 15 jobs	2.4	...
16 to 18 jobs	0.8	...
19 to 21 jobs	...	...
22 or more	1.6	...
Not known, not applicable, etc.	2.4	2.5
Mean number of jobs	4.7 jobs	3.5 jobs

Omitting "not known" category

chi-square = 6.67. df=6,

$0.3 < p < 0.5$

The difference is not significant.

10.09 Length of time in best-liked job (Q3.27)

	Probs.	N.S.
Mean length of time	10.6 months	25.6 months
chi-square = 34.15, df=8		

$p < 0.001$

The difference is highly significant.

10.10 Longest time in any one job (Q3.29)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
3 to 6 weeks	0.8	...
2 to 3 months	4.0	1.2
4 to 5 months	5.6	...
6 to 7 months	9.5	2.5
8 to 9 months	6.3	2.5
10 to 11 months	6.3	1.2
1 to 2 years	44.4	49.4
3 to 4 years	11.1	33.4
More than 4 years	3.2	9.9
Not known, not applicable, etc	8.7	...
Mean time	17.8 months	22.7 months

Omitting the "not known" category  
chi-square = 29.98, df=8  
p < 0.001

The difference is highly significant.

10.11 Longest time without a job (Q3.30)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Less than 1 week	11.9	39.6
1 to 2 weeks	23.8	25.9
3 to 6 weeks	32.6	19.8
2 to 3 months	15.9	9.9
4 to 5 months	1.6	...
6 to 7 months	1.6	...
8 to 9 months	1.6	...
10 to 12 months	...	...
Longer than 1 year	0.8	...
Not known or not applicable, etc.	10.3	3.7
Mean time	5.9 weeks	2.6 weeks

Omitting the "not known" category  
chi-square = 24.24, df=7  
0.001 < p < 0.005

The difference is significant.

10.12 In the area of employment history the Probationers differed from the National Servicemen in the following ways: the length of time between leaving school and starting work was longer for Probationers; a slightly lower proportion of Probationers took up apprenticeships; Probationers received less pay in the first job after leaving school; Probationers had held more jobs. These differences were not statistically significant. The two groups were substantially the same in the matter of who aided them in finding the first job. Probationers remained in the first job for a shorter time, received less pay in the most recent job, and spent less time in the best-liked job. The longest time in any one job was greater for National Servicemen, and the longest time without a job was greater for Probationers. These differences were significant.

- 10.13 The results have not been standardised according to the age of the subjects. The mean age of the Probationers at the time of interview was 2.5 years less than the mean age of the National Servicemen, and this difference might in part account for some of the differences between the two groups. (Cf. Section 4.) However, a smaller proportion of Probationers were still in the first job, Probationers had held more jobs, and the mean of the longest time without a job was greater for Probationers. These differences (although not significant) are in the opposite direction from that which would be expected from purely the age difference, and add weight to the interpretation of the results that Probationers had a more unstable and unsatisfactory employment history, on the average, than did National Servicemen.

## 11. FINANCIAL MATTERS

### 11.1 Debts - to whom money is owed (Q5.21)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
To the Court (e.g. fines, costs, restitution, etc.)	11.1	1.2
To a commercial firm, shop, grocery (including hire purchase debts, but not debts for professional services.)	26.2	17.3
To a professional person - doctor, dentist, etc.	1.6	1.2
Friend or relative	4.8	9.0
Other	4.8	...
No debts	50.0	70.4
Not known	1.6	1.2

Omitting the category "to the Court"  
chi-square = 9.66, df=5  
 $0.01 < p < 0.05$

The differences are significant.

### 11.2 Debts - amount of money owed by those who have debts (Q5.21)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Less than £10	27.9	34.8
£10 to £19	18.0	8.7
£20 to £29	14.8	...
£30 to £39	11.5	...
£40 to £49	6.6	13.0
£50 to £99	9.8	13.0
£100 to 199	8.2	21.7
£200 or more	3.3	8.7
Mean (to nearest shilling)	£42.4.0	£72.13.0

chi-square = 11.85, df=7  
 $0.1 < p < 0.2$

On the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test  
the probability interval was  $0.05 < p < 0.1$

The difference is not significant.

11.3 Accounts with business firms (Q5.23)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Account with clothing store	24.6	24.7
Account with grocery store or dairy	13.5	9.9
Account with department store	1.6	3.7
Account with other type of firm	2.4	13.6
No accounts	50.3	59.2

The differences are not significant.

11.4 Biggest single weekly expense (Q5.25)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Motor vehicle	6.3	2.5
Clothes	12.7	27.2
Girl friend(s)	46.0	43.2
Liquor	3.2	1.2
Other	24.7	21.0
Not known	7.1	4.9

Omitting the "not known" category  
chi-square = 8.22, df=4  
0.05 < p < 0.1

The differences are not significant.

11.5 A smaller proportion of National Servicemen than of Probationers had debts, but of those National Servicemen who were in debt a larger proportion owed relatively large sums of money (more than £40). The differences on the questions dealing with financial matters were not significant.

12. AFFILIATION TO SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS GROUPS12.1 Club membership (Q5.1)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Belongs to no clubs	60.3	38.3
Rugby, Rugby League, soccer, cricket, or hockey club	24.6	42.0
Other sporting club	2.4	4.9
Other type of club	11.9	14.8
Not known	0.8	...

For categories; "does not belong to  
any club" vs. "other"

chi-square = 9.60, df=1  
0.001 < p < 0.005

The differences are significant.

12.2 Church attendance (Q5.2)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Once a month or more frequently	27.8	40.7
Less often than once a month, or never	72.2	59.3

chi-square = 3.76, df=1  
 $0.05 < p < 0.1$

The difference is not significant.

12.3 Religious affiliation, (Q5.3)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Anglican	15.9	29.6
Catholic	11.1	14.8
Ratana	8.7	9.9
Methodist	4.8	2.5
Ringatu	1.6	4.9
Presbyterian	4.8	4.9
Salvation Army	1.6	1.2
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints ("Mormon")	11.1	9.9
Baptist	0.8	1.2
Other religion	4.0	9.9
Atheist	0.8	...
Not sure, not known	34.9	11.1

chi-square = 22.09, df = 11  
 $0.02 < p < 0.05$

The differences are significant.

For the dichotomy "Anglican" vs. the remainder  
 chi-square = 5.57, df = 1  
 $0.01 < p < 0.02$

The difference is significant.

- 12.4 Significantly more of the National Servicemen belonged to clubs than did probationers. More of the National Servicemen claim to attend church at least once a month, but the difference was not quite large enough to be statistically significant. Rather a larger proportion of National Servicemen were affiliated to the Anglican church; apart from this there was little difference in religious affiliation.

13. LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES13.1 Usual activity straight after work on a week night (i.e. Monday to Friday) (Q5.4.i)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Goes straight home, washes up for evening meal, etc.	46.0	51.9
Goes to hotel for a drink	4.0	14.8
Watches television	11.9	3.7
Other	35.7	29.6
Not known	2.4	...

chi-square = 13.70, df = 4  
 $0.01 < p < 0.02$  The differences are significant.

13.2 Usual activity after evening meal on a week night (Q5.4,ii)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Watches television	50.0	42.0
Listens to radio, plays records	7.1	7.4
Goes straight to bed	4.0	7.4
Plays billiards, darts, or some such game	7.9	2.5
Goes to cinema	6.3	9.9
Other	23.9	30.9
Not known	0.8	...

chi-square = 6.68, df=6

$p > 0.3$

The differences are not significant.

13.3 Usual activity on Saturday morning (Q5.5)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Sleeps in late	26.2	14.8
Works overtime in employment	23.0	32.2
Chores around house	19.0	17.3
Other	30.2	35.7
Not known	1.6	...

chi-square = 6.32, df=4

$0.01 < p < 0.02$

The differences are significant.

13.4 Usual activity on Saturday afternoon (Q5.5)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Watches television	7.9	2.5
Works overtime in employment	8.7	4.9
Plays or practises some physical sport	15.1	44.5
Plays billiards, darts or some such game	10.3	3.7
Goes to cinema	7.9	1.2
Watches sport	8.7	3.7
Drinks in hotel	7.1	21.0
Other social activity, visiting, goes to milk-bar, etc.	6.3	...
Cannot specify - "kills time", "just mucks about", etc.	5.6	...
Other	22.2	18.5

chi-square = 45.73, df=9

$p < 0.001$

The differences are highly significant.



13.5 Usual activity on Saturday evening (Q5.5)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Watches television	20.6	12.5
Goes to cinema	23.0	21.0
Goes to a party	11.9	27.2
Goes to a dance	19.0	17.3
Other	24.7	22.2
Not known	0.8	...

chi-square = 9.30, df=5  
0.05 < p < 0.1

The differences are not significant.

13.6 Usual activity on Sunday afternoon (Q5.5)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Watches television	21.4	12.3
Stays at home and does nothing in particular - "Loafs around house" etc.	11.9	1.2
Sleeps	2.4	19.8
Goes to the beach, goes for a drive, etc.	11.9	8.6
Other	51.6	55.6
Not known	0.8	2.5

chi-square=28.06, df=5  
p < 0.001

The differences are highly significant.

13.7 The activities recorded on interview schedules were coded into over thirty categories. When the data was analysed it was found that many of the categories had very low frequencies. Only the most frequently occurring categories are given above; other categories have been amalgamated and given as "other". Although the frequencies of the categories making up "other" were low, the large number of such categories resulted in fairly high proportions of the samples falling into "other".

13.8 The Probationers differed significantly from the National Servicemen in four of the six sections dealing with common activities. The overall impression is that the National Servicemen were more active than the Probationers. The proportion of Probationers who watch television is higher than the proportion of National Servicemen in all sections which include the category "watches television". On the other hand, the proportion of National Servicemen who play sport on Saturday afternoon is almost three times the proportion of Probationers. An interesting result is that a higher proportion of National servicemen drink in a hotel after work on week days and on Saturday afternoons, and go to a party on Saturday evenings; this might, of course, be largely a result of the age difference between the samples. Drinking and party-going are activities which some people would tend to associate with delinquents or potential delinquents rather than with non-delinquents. These results are difficult to interpret in the absence of further information, but the following possible explanations are offered: it may be that this is another aspect of the suggested tendency of the National Servicemen to be more active than the offenders - looked at as a form of social behaviour, going to party is considerably more active than watching television. It may be that offenders are generally

less sociable than non-offenders, and have a more limited peer group circle in which they can enjoyably engage in social activity; or, as has been suggested already, the difference may be no more than a consequence of the age difference between the samples.

14. DRINKING14.1 Whether subject drinks <sup>ⓧ</sup> (Q5.11)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Drinks	75.4	79.0
Does not drink	24.6	21.0

The difference is slight, and is not significant.

14.2 The question on whether the subject drinks refers to the time at which the question was asked. Some of the subjects recorded as non-drinkers had been drinkers in the past, or had become drunk (for example) on rare occasions although they considered themselves as non-drinkers. For these subjects some of the questions on drinking habits are relevant, even though they are included in the category "does not drink" above. For this reason the proportions in the "not applicable" category for the questions below varies slightly from question to question.

14.3 Type of liquor usually drunk <sup>ⓧ</sup> (Q5.11)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Beer	68.3	70.4
Spirits	0.8	2.5
Both beer and spirits	4.0	3.7
Other	3.1	2.4
Not applicable	23.8	21.0

The differences are not significant.

14.4 Frequency of drinking <sup>ⓧ</sup> (Q5.12)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Every day	4.8	6.2
Two or three times a week	14.3	21.0
About once a week	31.7	38.3
Once a month	14.3	13.6
Less often	8.7	...
Not applicable or not known	25.4	21.0

chi-square = 9.45, df = 5

0.05 < p < 0.1

The differences are not significant.

14.5 Effects of liquor (Q5.13)

(The percentages relate to <sup>the</sup> proportion of subjects who stated that liquor had the effect; as liquor had more than one effect on many subjects, the percentages add to more than a hundred.)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Happy, high-spirited	37.3	44.5
Sleepy, drowsy	16.7	19.8
Relaxed, at ease	14.3	12.3
Depressed	0.8	3.7
Reckless, willing to take chances	7.9	12.3
More confident, less shy	17.5	6.2
Quarrelsome, touchy	6.3	...
Want to be up and doing something	5.6	...
Dizzy, nauseous	1.6	2.5
Nothing noticeable - drinks to be sociable	7.1	4.9
Nothing noticeable - reason for drinking not stated	7.9	1.2
Not applicable or not known	23.8	19.8

The differences are not significant

14.6 Number of times subject has been drunk (Q5.14)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Has never been drunk	35.7	25.9
Has been drunk 1 to 3 times	23.0	24.7
Has been drunk 4 to 6 times	7.9	3.7
Has been drunk 7 times or more	29.4	45.7
Not known	4.0	...

chi-square = 8.93, df=4  
 $0.01 < p < 0.05$

The National Servicemen say they have been drunk significantly more often than the Probationers.

14.7 Getting into fights when drinking (Q5.17)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Has got into fights	27.8	18.5
Has never got into a fight when drinking	50.8	63.0
Not applicable, not known	21.4	18.5

chi-square = 3.27, df=2  
 $0.1 < p < 0.2$

The differences are not significant.

- 14.8 Only one of the questions on drinking habits reveals a significant difference between Probationers and National Servicemen. The slight differences which are found may be a result of the age difference between the samples rather than any important differences between offenders and non-offenders in the pattern of drinking.

15 SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR

- 15.1 The Army interviewers were so reluctant to ask the questions about sexual behaviour, that the Research Unit had to agree to the omission of these questions. The questions were included, however, in the interviewing of a small sample of twenty-seven National Servicemen in September 1964, when a prototype of the current National Servicemen schedule was given a trial run. The information on sexual behaviour gained from the "trial run" has been used below because, although inadequate, it is all that is at present available. No other information from the "trial run" sample has been used in this report.

15.2 Pre-marital sexual intercourse<sup>Ⓜ</sup> (Q5.6 and Q5.7)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Had engaged in pre-marital sexual intercourse	61.1	92.6
Had not engaged in pre-marital sexual intercourse	34.9	7.4
Refused to reply	3.2	...
Question omitted	0.8	...

For the categories "has engaged in pre-marital intercourse" vs. "has not, or not known"

chi-square = 9.92 df=1  
0.001 < p < 0.005

The difference is highly significant.

15.3 Age at which engaged in pre-marital sexual intercourse<sup>Ⓜ</sup> (Q5.8)  
(for those who had engaged in intercourse)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
11 years or less	8.0	4.0
12 years	2.7	...
13 years	10.7	...
14 years	2.7	...
15 years	25.3	28.0
16 years	20.0	16.0
17 years	16.0	24.0
18 years	10.7	20.0
19 years	2.7	4.0
20 years or more	1.3	4.0

15.4

The differences between the Probationers and the Servicemen shown in the two tables above are difficult to interpret because of the difference in mean age of the two samples. Although a significantly higher proportion of Servicemen than of Probationers had engaged in pre-marital sexual intercourse, this is largely because the Servicemen were on the average older. The cumulative frequencies presented in the table below involve a standardisation which overcomes this source of distortion; this table should be regarded as the most meaningful statement of the results about sexual behaviour. It can be seen from this table that when account is taken of age at the time of interview the apparent differences between the samples almost vanish.

15.5

Cumulative relative frequencies

The table below gives the proportion of those aged (n-1) years and older who had had pre-marital sexual intercourse before the nth birthday with n ranging from 12 years to 21 years of age.

	Proportion who had had pre-marital sexual intercourse before the nth birthday	
	Probs. %	N.S. %
Before 12th birthday	3.8	3.7
Before 13th birthday	5.7	3.7
Before 14th birthday	13.4	3.7
Before 15th birthday	16.0	3.7
Before 16th birthday	31.8	29.6
Before 17th birthday	47.4	44.4
Before 18th birthday	60.0	66.7
Before 19th birthday	72.3	85.2
Before 20th birthday	83.0	88.9
Before 21st birthday	88.5	92.6

Mean age at which pre-marital sexual intercourse is first engaged in (of those who engage in pre-marital intercourse before the 21st birthday):

16.7 years 16.9 years

The difference in the means is small, and is not significant. The relative frequencies for the National Servicemen and the Probationers are quite similar as are the means. As the figures given for the Servicemen are based on only 27 cases, however, the comparison must be regarded with great caution.

16. ACCOMMODATION

16.1	<u>Household lived with at time of leaving school</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.2)
	Biological parent(s)	69.1	77.8	
	Grandparent(s)	7.1	...	
	Other relatives	14.3	6.2	
	Other people	9.5	16.1	

chi-square 11.0 df=4  
0.02 < p < 0.05

The differences are significant.

16.2	<u>Is this household the "home"?</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.2)
	(i.e. same as "home" in earlier questions - household that had most share, by time, in subject's upbringing)			
	Yes	82.5	79.0	
	No	14.3	21.0	
	"Home" not defined	3.2	...	

The differences are not significant.

16.3	<u>Housing at the time of leaving school</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.3)
	Ordinary dwelling house	92.1	93.9	
	Other	7.9	6.2	

The differences are not significant.

16.4	<u>Number of rooms in the house</u>			(Q6.4)
------	-------------------------------------	--	--	--------

The mean number of rooms for Probationers was 5.13 (variance 2.10) and for the Servicemen 5.51 (variance 2.13); this difference is not significant.

16.5	<u>Number of persons living in the house</u>	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.5)
	One to three	4.8	14.8	
	Four to six	79.4	76.6	
	Seven to nine	15.9	8.6	

The differences are not significant.

16.6	<u>Ratio of number of persons to number of rooms</u>		
------	--	--	--

Mean for Probationers	1.55
Mean for servicemen	1.37

This difference is not significant.

16.7 Nature of present housing  
at time of interview for  
Probationers and immediately  
before entering Army camp for  
National Servicemen) (Q6.6)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Ordinary dwelling house	57.1	59.3
Part of dwelling house	3.2	11.1
"Flat"	5.5	4.9
Boarding-house etc	8.7	8.6
Private board	11.1	1.2
Tenement	0.8	12.3
Bach	7.9	...
Other	5.6	2.5

The differences are not significant.

17. MIGRATION

17.1 Age when moved to present location  
(For National Servicemen  
"present accommodation"  
means where living prior  
to coming into Army Camp) (Q6.11)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
10 or below	6.3	1.2
11 to 15 inclusive	14.3	6.2
16 to 18 inclusive	34.1	18.5
Upwards on 19	11.1	33.3
Not applicable - still in "old home town"	34.1	40.7

chi-square = 23.1      df=4  
p < 0.001

Significantly more of the National Servicemen are still living in their "old home town" and, where they have moved, have tended to do so when older than those probationers who move.

17.2 Reasons for the move from previous to present location (Q6.12)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Mainly occupational - to get work, etc	27.0	30.9
Family was moving	19.8	9.9
For a change, etc.	7.1	7.4
Other reasons	11.9	11.1
Not applicable - no such move	34.1	40.7

The probationers are somewhat more likely to have moved because the family moved, but the differences are not significant to the 5% level.

17.3 Where subject stayed the night of first arrival in present town Probs. N.S. (Q6.13)  
%

Moved with family; stayed in own family's newly purchased house, etc.	7.9	6.2
With relatives	28.6	24.7
Lodgings	6.3	9.9
Other	20.6	18.5
Not applicable	34.1	40.7
Doesn't remember	2.4	...

The differences are not significant.

17.4 People accompanying subject on move Probs. N.S. (Q6.14)  
%

Came alone	30.2	34.6
With family	24.6	16.1
With friends	11.1	8.6
Not applicable	34.1	40.7

The differences are not significant.

17.5 Whether he had a job to come to or planned to shop around Probs. N.S. (Q6.15)  
%

Had job	29.4	34.6
Had no job	21.4	16.1
Doesn't remember	...	8.6
Not applicable (hasn't moved in this way, or was too young to have job, etc)	49.2	40.7

The differences are not significant.

18. MAORITANGA

18.01 Official record of race

18.011 Probationers

Recorded by Probation Officers from Probation records:

% of 74 Probationers

Full Maori	38.1
Three-quarter Maori	17.2
Half Maori	28.3
One-quarter Maori	12.3
Maori - not otherwise specified	2.5
Not known	1.2



18.012 National Servicemen

This information derives from the answers put down by the Servicemen on their Army 866 form, as explained previously, in answer to a question consisting merely of a heading RACE and the categories  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ , Full Maori, provided to be circled. It cannot be compared in any way with the immediately foregoing data.

% of 81 N.S.

Full Maori	18.9
Three-quarter Maori	1.4
Half-Maori	16.2
One-quarter Maori	5.4
Less than one quarter (but some Maori)	2.7
Maori, not otherwise specified	55.4

18.013 If we take "Maori, not otherwise specified" as meaning "half or more Maori" and amalgamate all categories meaning "half or more Maori" we find that 86.1% of the Probationers and 91.9% of the Servicemen are described in these records as "half Maori or more". However, it is the opinion of the writers that these figures are meaningless and that to ascertain the Maoriness of both groups it is necessary to refer to the information on Maoriness which is reported in the tables which follow:

18.02 Self-identification as Maori or Non-Maori

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.16)
Regards self as being a Maori	95.2	95.0	
Doesn't regard self as being a Maori	4.0	3.7	
Doesn't know	0.8	1.2	

The difference is not significant.

18.03 Proportion of Maori ancestry

	Probs. %	N.S. %	(Q6.17)
Full Maori	42.9	37.1	
Between $\frac{3}{4}$ and Full	6.3	4.9	
$\frac{3}{4}$ -Maori	8.7	16.0	
Between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$	7.9	8.6	
$\frac{1}{2}$ -Maori	21.4	18.5	
Between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$	...	1.2	
$\frac{1}{4}$ -Maori	7.1	8.6	
Less than $\frac{1}{4}$	3.2	3.7	
Not a Maori at all	...	...	
Doesn't know	2.4	1.2	

chi-square = 3.53, df=5

$0.5 < p < 0.7$

The matching is close.

18.04

Speaking Maori

(Q6.18)

If with someone who spoke both Maori and Pakeha, slightly preferring Maori, whether subject would use Maori to talk to him:

	Probs. %	N.S. %
All the time	4.0	18.5
Mostly	11.1	6.2
For a lot of the time	4.8	7.4
Sometimes	36.5	29.6
Not at all	43.6	38.3

chi-square = 13.74, df=4  
0.005 < p < 0.01

The differences are significant.

18.05

The Servicemen more often claim some acquaintance with Maori than do the Probationers; this claim is the more likely to be reliable in that a far higher proportion of Servicemen than of Probationers were interviewed by a Maori who was a fluent Maori-speaker (by his account - the matter was not otherwise tested) thus it is a reasonable assumption that the Servicemen would on the whole be less likely rather than more likely to put up the bluff which for all they knew might be called, that they knew how to speak Maori when they did not. It could of course happen that the fact the interviewer was a Maori would stimulate the subjects to make greater claims to expertise than justified; this seems, intuitively, the less likely explanation of the difference.

18.06

Language used in speaking to parents

18.061

Language used (before subject old enough to go to school) to speak to "mother":

(Q6.19)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Maori used	13.5	24.7
Pakeha used	70.6	64.2
Both used	11.9	7.4
Mixture or 'patois'	4.0	...
Doesn't know etc	...	3.7

chi-square = 11.24, df=4  
.02 < p < .05

The differences are significant

18.062	Language used (before subject old enough to go to school) to speak to "father":	Prob.	N.S.	(Q6.20)
		%	%	
	Maori used	13.5	21.0	
	Pakeha used	72.2	57.9	
	Both used	11.1	3.7	
	Mixture or 'patois'	1.6	...	
	Doesn't know, etc	1.6	3.7	

chi-square = 10.48, df = 4

0.01 < p < 0.02

The differences are significant.

There is a significant tendency for the Servicemen more often than the Probationers to claim that Maori was the language used, as a pre-school child, to speak to the "parents".

18.07	<u>Knowledge of Canoe</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q6.21)
		%	%	
	Can state at least one Canoe to which affiliated	34.9	28.4	
	Cannot do so	65.0	71.6	

This result is anomalous. On most of the questions on Maoritanga the Servicemen show themselves to be more knowledgeable about Maori culture than the Probationers; thus for the above question the difference is in the opposite direction to the one which would have been expected. The difference is not significant, but the result is still rather puzzling.

18.08	<u>Knowledge of Tribe</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q6.22)
		%	%	
	Can state at least one name of tribe to which affiliated	52.3	74.1	
	Cannot do so	47.6	25.9	

chi-square = 8.9, df = 1  
0.001 < p < 0.005

Significantly more National Servicemen can give the name of their tribe (or a name purporting to be such) than Probationers.

18.09	<u>Knowledge of Extended Family</u>	Probs.	N.S.	(Q6.23)
		%	%	
	Can state a name purporting to be that of subject's <u>hapu</u>	15.1	12.3	
	Cannot do so	84.9	87.7	

The difference is not significant.

18.10 Name called by relatives (Q6.25)  
(first name or nickname)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Maori or apparently Maori names	19.8	34.6
Non-Maori name	80.1	53.0
Doesn't know or can't be decided whether Maori or Non-Maori name	...	2.5

chi-square = 4.9    df = 1  
0.02 < p < 0.05

The difference is significant.

18.11 Name called by close friends (Q6.26)  
(first name or nickname)

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Maori or apparently Maori name	8.7	17.3
Non-Maori name	91.2	81.5

chi-square = 2.64    df=1  
0.1 < p < 0.2

The difference is not significant.

18.12 Attendance at Maori gatherings (Q6.27)  
during previous year

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Median number attended	1.7	1.6
Mean number attended	1.9	1.9

There is near identity here.

18.13 Identification with a (Q6.28)  
particular marae

	Probs. %	N.S. %
Names a particular <u>marae</u> as 'his' <u>marae</u>	65.0	80.2
Does not name any in this way	35.0	19.8

chi-square = 4.9    df=1  
0.02 < p < 0.05

The difference is significant.

The National Servicemen are significantly more likely to nominate a particular marae when asked "What is your marae?"

18.14 Number of times (in lifetime)  
that subject has travelled  
to another marae

	Probs.	N.S.
Median number of times	1.3	2.1
Mean number of times	2.4	3.4

The difference is not significant, nor is the difference in the proportions of those who have never, as against those who say they have, sometimes travelled to another marae.

- 18.15 The two samples are very similar with respect to self-identification as a Maori or Non-Maori, and the proportion of Maori ancestry claimed. The Servicemen, however, appear to be more knowledgeable about Maoritanga, and to be more closely associated with Maori culture, than do the Probationers.

## SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

### 19. AGE OF THE SAMPLES

19.1 When the study was planned it was known that the modal age for the National Servicemen would be twenty years; it was expected that for the Probationers it would be about the same. As the table in Section 4.3 shows, the modal age for Probationers was 18 years. Furthermore, the age distributions of the offender and non-offender samples are quite different. The distribution for the offenders is unimodal, and approximately normal; for the non-offenders the distribution is that of a J-curve. The latter distribution takes this shape because the ballot for National Servicemen includes only those of twenty years of age. Some Servicemen have passed their twenty-first birthday by the time they enter camp, and others are able to arrange postponements, and enter camp with later intakes. Thus for a typical intake none of the Servicemen are aged less than twenty years; the largest age group is that of the twenty year olds; and there are successively smaller proportions of twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four year olds. The difference between the distributions of the offenders and non-offenders has the effect of producing an even greater difference between mean ages than there is between modal ages. The mean age of the Probationers was 18.6 years; the mean age of the National Servicemen was 21.1 years; the difference is 2.5 years. Another consequence of the distribution difference is that there is very little overlap between the samples, certainly far less than there would have been if both had been normally distributed. All the National Servicemen are twenty years or older, compared with only 19.3% of the Probationers.

19.2 Many of the questions in the Interview Schedules are concerned with childhood and early adolescence. For these questions the age difference affects the comparability of the samples only to the extent to which the cohort of Maoris born in 1943-1944 experienced a different pattern of early life from the cohort born two to three years later. The extent of these differences is not known, but it seems safe to assume that they are negligible. The samples are considered to be comparable with respect to such questions.

19.3 This is not the case, however, for questions dealing with the mode of life at the time of the interview, or with such matters as the number of jobs held. For such questions the samples cannot be validly compared in a direct way. With larger samples the standardisations which would in part overcome this problem could be applied. This has not been attempted for the present account because the number of cases on which age specific comparisons could be based is small; the number should be considerably larger when the full Probation sample has accumulated.

### 20. CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING ARREST AND COURT APPEARANCE

20.1 The detailed results presented in the tables are somewhat heterogeneous, and only those of greatest interest will be singled out for discussion. These seem to the writers to be as follows: the surprising proportion (17.5%) of offenders summonsed, and by their account, not arrested; the high proportion admitting the offence when first questioned; the extremely high proportion who say they made pleas of "guilty"; the proportion, perhaps higher than expected, of those who say they were represented by counsel; the quite high proportion saying they were unemployed at the time of offence; the proportion saying they had not

been drinking at all, prior to the offence; the proportion apparently quite unrepentant after the offence; and the greater salience of self-concern, as opposed to any voicing of concern for the "victim" (if any) of the offence.

- 20.2 Most of the offenders (93% of those arrested) say that they went quietly and did not resist arrest. Although before the study began, several senior officers in the Probation Service said that it would undoubtedly be found that all the offender subjects without exception would have been arrested and not summonsed, no less a proportion than 17.5% fell in the summonsed category. Further data should be obtained on this question and the present finding further analysed in its light.

In the Hunn Report\* (p.34) the question was raised of the proportions of Maoris and non-Maoris who admit offences and plead guilty, and the possible effect of this on the relative crime rates of Maoris and non-Maoris. In absence of more exact data at the time of publication of the Hunn Report, a senior Probation Officer was asked to estimate the proportions of pleas of guilty. The estimates given were 80 - 85 per cent for Maoris and 60 per cent for Pakehas. We still have no more exact data for Pakehas, but can compare the figure for Maoris with our figure of 97.6%. It is much higher than the estimate, which makes it a matter of some urgency to try to obtain a comparable figure for Pakehas and then to attempt statistical analysis designed to answer the question "What maximum and minimum quantitative effect may this difference in readiness to plead guilty have upon the statistics of convictions, and so upon the differential of crime rates between Maoris and non-Maoris?" It would also be necessary to obtain data or make a variety of estimates about the proportions convicted of those who plead guilty and proportions convicted of those who plead not guilty for each racial group. The question of the effect on the crime rate discrepancy between Maoris and Non-Maoris of the probable greater readiness of Maoris to admit offences and to plead guilty is clearly an important one, and deserves looking into in detail.

- 20.3 A related issue is the frequency with which Maori offenders - compared with Pakeha offenders - avail themselves of the right to be represented by legal counsel. The Hunn Report offered an estimate of this frequency, too, and the estimate again fails to agree closely with the figure obtained by the study. The Hunn Report suggests that 80% of Maori offenders are not represented by counsel; the present study's figure was only 60%. This may reflect the success of counsel's plea in mitigation of penalty, leading to a disproportion of represented subjects in our probation sample. We have not figures for Pakehas to compare with the Hunn Report Pakeha estimate.

- 20.4 In summary, the low frequency of legal representation (about 40%), the high frequency of signed admissions of guilt (about 70%) and guilty pleas (over 90%), together with the other findings in the area of legal aid (only 8% of those non-represented thought they should have been, three quarters of those non-represented were judged likely to need some help before they could successfully go about getting a lawyer if they decided to try, nearly 90% of the total sample had never heard of "Free Legal Aid" ) support our preconceived notion of the typical Maori offender as unsophisticated and rather helpless when enmeshed in the toils of the law and the courts.

---

\*J.K.Hunn, Report on Department of Maori Affairs,  
R.E.Owen, Government Printer, Wellington, 1961.

20.5 Folksey theories of crime nearly always list "unemployment" and "drink" as factors associated with the precipitation of offending. "Drink" and "unemployment" may be causative on occasions (as when an unemployed person spends his last shilling on the liquor needed to give him the courage to steal what he needs to continue to live without working) and on occasions may be associated with crimes merely as symptoms of more general fecklessness; it is very difficult to put the pieces of the jigsaw together. So it is with our present findings - that 75% of the offenders say they were in employment at the time of offence, and 60% that they were entirely sober: something of the kind would be expected, but its meaning, if any, is not clear. The fact that most of the offenders were (they say) in employment and sober at the time of offence does suggest, however, that statements such as that attributed to Mr David Barrett\* (Honorary Maori Welfare Officer, Christchurch) that "drink played a part in the offences of 98% of ... Maoris" are likely to be exaggerated.

20.6 The remaining point to be dealt with in this discussion of the actual offence concerns the offender's attitude to what he had done. The measurement of attitudes is a very difficult, and (these days) technical, proceeding and it was most unlikely that the crude questions that could be included in our omnibus questionnaire would tell us very much. There are, however, two fairly suggestive results: first, when asked whether the offence was worthwhile, six per cent of the subjects said unconditionally that it was, and another thirty per cent said that it would have been if they had not been caught; second, when asked who suffered from the offence (by means of an 'open-ended' non-directive question) about half the subjects named themselves, and eighteen per cent nominated parents or relatives. Only fourteen per cent nominated the 'victim' of the offence. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the offenders tend to be somewhat unrepentant and self-centred and are often quite open about this. This is not surprising, nor should it surprise that the experience of appearing in Court and of Probation (still very limited at the time of interview) has probably done little to alter basic attitudes. The information in this section will be more interesting and interpretable when results of follow up become available; it may turn out that the avowedly unrepentant subjects are more likely than many of the others to offend again.

## 21. UPBRINGING

21.1 The most striking finding on upbringing is the almost total lack of any difference between offenders and non-offenders in early background. As expected, the information made clear that a stable upbringing in the supportive atmosphere of the original biological nuclear family, (regarded by those with Pakeha middle-class value-orientations as desirable, even necessary, for adequate socialisation of the children) has quite commonly not been the lot of the young offenders in the

---

\* Evening Post, 9 April 1963. In fairness to Mr Barrett, it must be added that he has said that the report completely distorted his remarks.



sample. What is surprising is that the homes, families, and early upbringing of the non-offenders seem to have been very much the same. In fact, there is usually a close match of proportions of offenders and non-offenders falling in the various categories defined by questions dealing with home and family.

- 21.2 An apparent exception to this should be noted: namely, the question asking what family or household the subjects lived with at the time of leaving school. National Servicemen tended more frequently to be living with either a biological parent (or parents) or with non-relatives; Probationers tended more often to be living with "other relatives" (not including biological parents). In interpreting this result it is necessary to take account of the proportions boarding away from home to attend school (for example, at boarding school) and this has not yet been done because with our incomplete sample the breakdown results in categories containing numbers of subjects too small for a proper statistical evaluation. The result as it stands is suggestive of a greater degree of separation from biological parents amongst Probationers during middle adolescence, but will require the fuller analysis that will soon be possible when the larger sample of Probationers has accumulated before any positive assertion can be made.
- 21.3 For the remainder of the upbringing questions, no difference was significant. The greatest difference found was on information about whether the biological parents, if living, are living together or apart, and this did not reach even the five per cent level of statistical significance. However, though it fails to differentiate offenders and non-offenders, the interest of the information is not restricted to the comparison. Consider the following summary of the more striking information (mainly gained in the first section of the Questionnaire).

21.4 Summary of information on family background:

Data for National Servicemen  
(not significantly different from  
data for Probationers)

Not mainly brought up until age 6 by both biological parents together:	30% of sample of 81
Not mainly brought up by both parents, 0-16 years:	33% " " " "
At least one parent dead at time of interview:	37% " " " "
Both parents alive and living together at time of interview:	33% " " " "
Average number of different households lived in:	3 (households)
Proportion who have lived away from "home" for a time described as "a lengthy period; say, a month or more" (where "home" is defined as the household that had the major share, by time, in the subject's upbringing):	25% of sample of 81
Average number of brothers and/or sisters of subjects:	7 (siblings)

- 21.5 It is apparent that a high proportion of cases depart from the Pakeha middle-class ideal of the close-knit nuclear family. For Pakehas, the figures would be taken as indicating a high incidence of family pathology, though in fact reliable similar information is lacking for Pakehas, and it is possible - but unlikely - that the general picture in Pakeha working class society might not be very different.
- 21.6 The general conclusion must be that there is no evidence here supporting the hypothesis that the expected high degree of disruption in family background, with departure from the family structure conventionally thought desirable for adequate socialisation of children in our society, is associated with increased delinquency proneness. In particular, the corollary of this hypothesis that a much higher incidence of informal adoption by relatives would be found amongst the offenders than amongst the non-offenders is contradicted.
22. FAMILY HEALTH, RELATIONSHIPS, AND DISCIPLINE
- 22.1 A number of questions mainly concerned with the health and employment of the breadwinner, and his or her consort, in the family which had most to do with the upbringing of the interviewee largely failed to discriminate offenders from non-offenders; closely matching proportions continued to be found. On one question concerning serious illnesses of the "father") the matching was not close, with the trend being towards less illness in the families of the offenders; however, this difference was not large enough to be significant.
- 22.2 Information obtained in this part of the study failed to bear out an hypothesis, derived from the general picture of the young New Zealand offender prepared by the Child Welfare Division in 1957 (see Report on the Department of Education (E1), 1957, pp.44), that indications of ill-health would be found to be more prevalent in the families of the offenders compared with non-offenders. The samples were similar not only with respect to parental health, but also with respect to the health of the subjects themselves. Nearly the same proportion of the non-offenders as of the offenders had been in hospital (36% vs 42%), and there were <sup>no</sup> significant differences between proportions admitted to hospital at various ages. Similarly, much the same proportion (around 10%) had been in health camp at some time.
- 22.3 Questions touching on family relationships, the drinking habits of the "father", and family discipline, yielded some significant differences. Probationers were more ready than offenders to nominate one member of the family as "the one they got on best with"; most often they nominated the "mother" and did so far more often than did the non-offenders. Similarly, Probationers were more ready to nominate someone in the family as "hardest to get on with", and, far more often than for the National Servicemen, this person was the "father". The suggestion is strong that somewhat more difficult relations were characteristic of the Probationers' families, and that the father, or man in loco parentis was most often the focus of these difficulties.
- 22.4 There were also indications that the "father" indulged in drink on more frequent occasions, and that his drinking was more likely to impair relations with the boy, in the Probationers' families. A question intended to throw some light on the heaviness of the "father's" drinking gave no significant difference.

- 22.5 Results of the questions on family discipline suggested that punishment was more a matter of impulse in the Probationers' families, that it was less effective in curbing general disobedience, less consistent, and generally less satisfactory. Good questions in the area of discipline were hard to devise, and additionally the results could in part reflect an artifact of the experimental design, but there is some evidence that this is not a complete explanation of the significant differences.

### 23. EDUCATION

- 23.1 The general expectation on the questions concerning education was that educational experiences of the Probationers would turn out to have been more disrupted, limited, and generally unsatisfactory than those of the National Servicemen.
- 23.2 The two groups did not differ on the average number of primary or secondary schools attended, but the Probationers tended to leave school at an earlier age, and from a lower class (both these results highly reliable). None of the Probationers acquired any educational qualification, while 10% of the National Servicemen obtained School Certificate or some higher qualification.
- 23.3 The Probationers more often admitted having truanted and liked school less, but the differences from the National Servicemen here were slight and not significant. A sizable proportion (33%) of the Probationers said that their "parents" would not mind if they stayed away from school even when not sick; the proportion of the National Servicemen (11%) saying the same was significantly smaller.
- 23.4 The general expectation about educational experience is thus borne out by these data.

### 24. EMPLOYMENT

- 24.1 An imprecisely formulated but commonsensical expectation concerning questions on employment was that the Probationers would turn out to be more unstable in employment; would be unemployed for longer periods; hold jobs for shorter periods; change jobs more frequently; more frequently undertake "dead-end" jobs; and so on. In the event, significant differences were found in line with this expectation. Thus Probationers remained in their first job (after leaving school) for a shorter time, on the average; were paid less in their most recent job; and spent less time in the job they said they liked best of those they had held. The longest time in any one job was greater for National Servicemen, and the longest time out of employment was greater for Probationers, on the average. In addition to these results, a number of others showed differences in the expected directions, (e.g., a slightly lower proportion of Probationers took up apprenticeships); these were not large enough differences to reach significance, however.
- 24.2 The results on employment are likely to be biased as a consequence of the age difference between the samples. Fortunately (for the purposes of interpretation) differences indicative of less stable employment histories on the part of Probationers emerge not only on questions for which one would expect such differences to be exaggerated by the age factor, but also on questions for which one might have expected the differences to be reduced, and perhaps even reversed in direction. For example, a smaller proportion of Probationers were still in their first job, and Probationers had had a greater number of jobs, even though the length of time since they had left school was, on the average, less than for National Servicemen.

- 24.3 The prognostication that the Probationers would turn out to have had, on the average, more unstable work histories is thus upheld.

25. HANDLING OF MONEY

- 25.1 The Probationers were more likely to have debts; this tendency is to be accounted for partly but not completely by the fact that they more often have court costs and fines to pay. The trend after allowing for fines, costs, etc, is not strong. Proportions of National Servicemen owing large, middling and small sums (the range being between £0 and about £200) were not significantly different from corresponding proportions of Probationers.

- 25.2 In summary, there is some rather weak evidence that proportionately more of the National Servicemen can manage their money without resort to borrowing, which is in accord with the usual stereotype of the more feckless delinquent.

26. LEISURE

- 26.1 Taking account only of such differences as are significant at the 5% level at least, it was found that the Probationers less frequently belong to clubs; less often work overtime on Saturday mornings; less often play or practise some physically demanding sport; more often play billiards; more often watch sport; and less often drink in hotels on Saturday afternoon.

- 26.2 When the general trend of both the significant and non-significant differences are considered together, the decided impression can be gained that differences between Probationers and National Servicemen in this area probably reflect a difference on a passivity-activity dimension. Probationers are less active, and report doing less of everything save for such passive pastimes as "mucking about" and "loafing around" and, of course playing billiards.

27. DRINKING

- 27.1 It is difficult to interpret the questions on drinking because the extent to which distortions have been introduced by the age difference between the samples is not known. Overall, the results for the samples were very similar. The National Servicemen had been drunk significantly more often than the Probationers, but none of the other questions yielded differences that were statistically significant at the 5% level. The age disparity may be obscuring differences here; but it is not possible to determine whether this is the case without further information.

27. SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR

- 28.1 When account is taken of the age differences between the offender and non-offender samples, differences of reported sexual behaviour between them become trivial. According to this information, about 90% of the young people have engaged in pre-marital sexual intercourse by the time they reach their majority.
- 28.2 This is about the incidence that the writers, from their acquaintance with the attitudes and behaviour of present day young working class men in New Zealand would have expected; if anything, it is slightly greater than the fairly liberal amount expected. The information is, so far as is known, the only available information on the topic obtained first-hand from young New Zealanders. This is perhaps its main importance, though the figures themselves may perhaps be a surprise to some, and useful because of this. Comparable data on Pakehas would be of equal interest; probably the results for working class Pakeha youths would not be greatly different, but how the figures would vary with social class is not known and cannot confidently be guessed. The desirability of further investigation of sexual behaviour and attitudes amongst New Zealand young people is reinforced by the suggestive nature of the meagre and rather crude data we have obtained in this study.

29. ACCOMMODATION

- 29.1 Of the questions dealing with accommodation the only ones which yielded significant differences were those on whom the subject was living with at the time he left school. These are discussed in Section 21.2.
- 29.2 The ratio of persons to rooms (for the house in which the subject lived at the time he left school) was slightly higher for Probationers than for Servicemen, but the difference was not significant. For the remaining questions on accommodation the matching between the samples was close. Socio-economic theories of the origins of crime would suggest that differences could be expected, and the absence of such differences is rather surprising. One explanation is that the measures used were not sufficiently sensitive. This point is worth looking into further, as most views of crime amongst Maoris (including those expressed in the Hunn Report\*) place considerable emphasis on poor housing and material conditions generally as being features of the background of offenders.

30. MIGRATION

- 30.1 Most questions in this area did not yield significant differences, but one very strongly significant difference was as follows: more National Servicemen were still living in the town regarded as their "old home town". Where subjects had moved from this town, National Servicemen tended to have done so at a later age than Probationers. 7% of National Servicemen but 21% of Probationers had moved before age 15 years, and 33% of the Servicemen but only 11% of Probationers had moved at an age upwards on 19 years.

---

\* J.K. Hunn, op, cit.

30.2 The suggestion is strong that the two groups differ with respect to their past history of migration, and some support is given by these data to the idea that cutting adrift during early or middle adolescence from earlier patterns of living may be associated with criminogenic factors. A fuller analysis of these data is called for in order to decide such questions as whether solitary or family migrations are characteristic of the offender groups, and whether the move is frequently made prior to leaving school, with the family, and so on.

31. MAORINESS AND MAORITANGA

31.1 There is near identity between the samples on the proportions of those who say they regard themselves as Maoris, and on the proportions of those claiming the various fractions of Maori ancestry, from Full Maori down to Non-Maori. This is a pleasing feature of the sampling, for it means that a variable which should be controlled is indeed controlled: because of this, the differences on questions about Maoritanga are rendered more interesting.

31.2 The differences are indeed interesting, being as follows:

The National Servicemen make more frequent claims to be able to speak Maori and more often say that Maori was the language used to talk to "parents" during pre-school years. They more often know the name of their tribe, and are more often called by a Maori name by close relatives (but are not more often called a Maori name by friends). They more often claim a sense of identification with a particular marae. Matters on which there were no significant differences were: knowledge of Cance; knowledge of extended family name (hapu); attendance at Maori gatherings; frequency with which subject has travelled to another marae than his own.

31.3 It is hard to escape the impression that while the two groups are Maori to the same extent by the formal indices of self-identification and fraction of Maori ancestry claimed, the National Servicemen are more closely bound up with Maori things and are culturally more "Maori" than the offenders. It will be interesting to see if this trend is present also when the offenders amongst the National Servicemen are compared with the non-offenders.

CONCLUSIONS32. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

- 32.01 Only a simple analysis of the data has been made for this interim report, and the information on which it is based derives from an incomplete sample of Probationers. More sophisticated and exhaustive analyses will be made for the main report of the study, and points of particular interest will be examined in more detail. Any conclusions made at present must be considered therefore as tentative, and might well undergo modification when data on the complete sample becomes available. The writers offer the following comments as their own impressions, rather than as firmly established conclusions.
- 32.02 It is sometimes held that juvenile crime is a consequence of chaotic and impoverished conditions experienced during the formative years of life. The break up of the nuclear family of the natural parents, unemployment, drunkenness and criminality on the part of parents or parent-figures, migration and poor housing are, it is often presumed, prominent features of the background of the delinquent. The Hunn Report\*, for example, while acknowledging that the causes of crime are not known with exactness, suggests it can reasonably be supposed that a list of the chief causative factors would include: "insecurity in modern urban life"; "overcrowding in poor tenements"; "living apart from home or parents".
- 32.03 The results of the present study serve to confirm, as has often been asserted, that Maori offenders come from backgrounds which, by Pakeha middle class standards, are highly disrupted and unstable. For about three quarters of the Probationers appearing in the study the home of the natural parents had been broken by death or separation, and their upbringing had been divided, on the average, amongst three distinct households. For about a third, not even the first six years of life had been spent with the natural parents. They came from large families (the average number of children is eight) and grew up in households which were overcrowded by conventional (Pakeha) standards. Inevitably, migration and breaks in the family, particularly in early life, are reflected in disruptions in education.
- 32.04 Thus far the picture is very much the one which would have been expected. It comes then as a major surprise to learn that in all of the above respects the non-offenders showed the same pattern, and that for the present samples these factors do not discriminate at all between the offenders and the non-offenders. In the past, findings about the background of offenders (in the absence of information about comparison groups of non-offenders) have been interpreted as indicating a close relationship between delinquency and family disruption simply because the signs of disruption emerged with such dramatic and disturbing clarity for the only subjects closely studied - the offenders. It is often tempting to assume that a control group providing comparative information is unnecessary: a representative sample from the general population could not possibly have backgrounds as bad! Our present information shows that such glib assumptions, however safe they may appear, can be completely unfounded, just as they would have been if made here.

---

\* J.K. Hunn, op. cit.: p.33

32.05 Where, then, do the major differences between the delinquents and non-delinquents lie? One area is in the relationships within the "home", irrespective of its constitution. Overall, the results suggest the critical factors were not objective matters such as the frequency and severity with which the subject was punished, the heaviness of the father's drinking, and such like, but the attitudes of his parents towards him, and his towards them. The offenders were more ready to nominate some member of the family that they "got on best with", and also to nominate a member they found it "hardest to get on with." Furthermore, they more often nominated the "mother" as the person with whom they had the best relationship, and the "father" as the person with whom they had the worst. The questions on "parents" drinking indicated no significant difference on heaviness of drinking, but there were indications that drinking had impaired the relationship with the "father" more often for the offenders than for the non-offenders. The results on family discipline suggest that in the offenders' family punishment was more likely to be a matter of impulse, was more erratic and less effective in curbing disobedience through the conditioning of conformity to consistent rules of behaviour.

32.06 It is suggested that the important factor here appears to be attitude, and the patterns of values, expectations and motivations built up through familial interaction, rather than the actual overt behaviour and circumstances (as recorded through the questions contained in the schedules, anyway) of the parents or of the child. An additional piece of evidence for this view can be noted. The questions on attitude to schools covered: whether the subject ever had to stay "home" when not sick, to look after brothers and sisters etc.; whether he truanted; whether he ever worked instead of going to school; whether he liked school; and so on. The only question in which the samples differed significantly was: "Would your "parents" mind if you just stayed at home sometimes, even though not sick?" The parents of offenders were less likely to object than were the parents of the non-offenders.

32.07 The view suggested above is not, of course, a new one, nor is it one which most people would find difficult to accept. What is surprising is that impairment of relationships between parents and children do not appear to be closely related to poor material conditions or to breaks in the family. Probably what most people have in mind when they cite the break up of the nuclear family, overcrowding, and so on, as probable causes of crime is that these factors are likely to have a damaging effect on the child's emotional development, and that they provide good indices of the probable extent of the damage. This presumed causal relationship does not, for the subjects of the present study, appear to hold. While the offenders show more signs of unsatisfactory family relationships than do the non-offenders, the degree of family disruption and instability for the two groups is the same. It is not known whether this would also be found for Pakehas. The writers are hesitant about hazarding a guess, but suggest that the more hierarchical, less "parent-centred" structure of the Maori nuclear family (whanau), the social support available from the extended family (hapu) and in general from the wider community - support often loosely summed up as stemming from the "highly communal nature of Maori life" - might have the effect of cushioning the impact of family disruptions. Thus, Maori young people would perhaps be rendered less susceptible to effects that would be damaging to their Pakeha counterparts in otherwise similar circumstances.



- 32.08 Marked differences between the samples were found in the areas of education and employment. The offenders left school at a lower age, and from lower class. None achieved any educational qualification, while ten per cent of the non-offenders obtained School Certificate or some higher qualification. Offenders showed a more unstable employment record. They remained in the first job after leaving school longer than did the non-offenders, remained for a shorter time in the job they liked best, and changed jobs more frequently. The common-sense hypotheses that offenders would be found to have a lower level of education achievement and more erratic and unsatisfactory work histories thus are upheld.
- 32.09 The preceding comments apply to what might be called developmental factors. It is often suggested that influences of a different type, which might be called situational factors, are also important determinants of crime. Drink, migration to the city, and becoming associated with bad companions are three which are often cited. These will therefore be briefly examined.
- 32.10 The results on drinking can not at present be authoritatively interpreted because of the difference in mean age between the samples. They yielded only one significant difference, namely that the non-offenders had been drunk, on the average, more often than had the offenders. This difference is in the opposite direction to that which would have been expected, and while no firm conclusion can be reached the results do not suggest that the offenders are more likely to be "boozers" than the non-offenders. Sixty per cent of the Probationers claimed they had not had anything to drink prior to the offence; very few gave drunkenness as the cause of the offence when asked "Why did you do it?" Again, the significance of these findings is not clear, but they suggest that some of the statements which have been made linking crime by young Maoris with drinking have been rather reckless exaggerations.
- 32.11 The evidence on migration suggests that this might be a criminogenic factor. A smaller proportion of offenders than of non-offenders were still living in the town they regarded as their "home town", and offenders tended to move from the "home town" at a younger age. This suggests a pattern of offenders being more likely to cut themselves adrift of home and community ties in middle adolescence, but examination of this hypothesis will have to wait on a fuller analysis of the data.
- 32.12 In the absence of any control information it is difficult to know how the data on companions in the offence should be interpreted. About forty per cent of the Probationers offended alone, and about eighty-five per cent had less than three companions. Only eleven per cent offended with a companion who was older by five years or more. The stereotype of the Maori as typically offending in a gang is thus not supported. This is consistent with the finding of an earlier Joint Committee study of Children's Court cases\*, where it was found that young Maori offenders were more likely to offend alone than Pakehas.
- 32.13 In their leisure time activities the offenders gave the impression of being more passive than the non-offenders in almost all respects. A smaller proportion belonged to clubs and at times when the non-offenders were likely to be practising sport, playing sport or working overtime, for example, the offenders were more likely to be playing billiards, watching sport, or "mucking about".

---

\* A Limited Study Comparing Maoris and Non-Maoris Appearing in the Children's Court in 1950. 17 June 1963.

activity-passivity dimension appears to extend to social activity. The non-offenders are more sociable even to the extent that they are more likely to be found in a hotel drinking on Saturday afternoon, although this last result may be an artifact of the age difference between the samples. The difference in social and recreational activeness is not reflected in the sexual behaviour of the subjects. When account was taken of age, the results for the two samples were very similar.

- 32.14 Finally, the offenders and non-offenders differed substantially in the degree of association with Maori culture. Although the two groups were almost identical in the proportions of Maori ancestry claimed, a higher proportion of the non-offenders claimed to be able to speak Maori, and the non-offenders had a wider knowledge of Maoritanga, and more frequently attended Maori gatherings and visited a marae other than their own. The impression gained is that the non-offenders were more deeply anchored in traditional Maori culture, and showed a greater degree of self-identification with it.
- 32.15 In summary, the picture which the results of the study suggest is as follows: the offender has not, in general, suffered greater disruption of his family life through deaths, changes of household, and so on, than the non-offender (although for both groups the degree of disruption is great), but is more likely that the interpersonal relationships between parents and child have been strained, and the parental discipline erratic and ineffectual. His progress at school is inferior to that of the non-offender, and he is less likely to achieve an educational qualification. He is more likely to leave his "home town", and when he does so it is likely to be at a younger age than the age at which non-offenders leave. He is likely to have had a less stable employment record. He appears to be somewhat more passive in his amusements and probably rather less sociable than the non-offender. The part which drinking and "bad companionship" play in his offending is not clear. The offender is likely than the non-offender to be poorly acquainted with Maori culture, and to have a lesser sense of identification with it.
- 32.16 It should be emphasised once again that these conclusions can at present be regarded as no more than tentative.

S. W. Slater  
(Research Officer)

J. Jensen  
(Assistant Research Officer)

Research Unit  
Joint Committee on Young Offenders

DEPT. OF SOCIAL  
WELFARE

~~4723~~

~~364-256~~

501

DEPT OF SOCIAL WELFARE  
LIBRARY, WELLINGTON, N.Z.