OFFENDER RISK ASSESSMENT/RISK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

BY

ELANA SOKOLOV

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

© July, 2002

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
*****
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

OFFENDER RISK ASSESSMENT/RISK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

BY

ELANA SOKOLOV

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University

of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

of

Master of Arts

ELANA SOKOLOV © 2002

ABSTRACT

This inquiry examines the influence of gender and ethnicity on the validity of the Primary

Risk Assessment for both Adult and Young offenders in Manitoba. A sample of 1076

adult offenders and 595 young offenders are examined. Two data sets were obtained

from Manitoba Justice containing information about adult and youth probationers from

the years 1986-1992. Post probation reconviction rates were available for up to 4 years

following the completion of a probation term.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used to analyze the data.

The analysis for both data sets were essentially the same. Descriptive statistics such as

frequencies and cross tabulations were used to describe the population under study. The

items on the scale were correlated with one another to determine they were measuring the

same thing, in this case, recidivism. The total risk scores were correlated with outcome

variables to assess the strength of the relationship between total scores with recidivism.

Finally, the items which form the scale, were then correlated with the outcome variables

to examine the psychometric value of the scale.

This research concludes that gender and ethnicity do influence the validity of the Primary

Risk Assessment. While we found both the adult and young offender instrument was a

valid predictor of outcome on probation, the assessment had limited ability to reliably

predict recidivism in the post probation follow up period.

i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*"To laugh often and much; to win the respect
of intelligent people and the affection of children;
to earn the appreciation of honest critics
and endure the betrayal of false friends;
to appreciate the beauty, to find the best in others;
to leave the world a bit better,
whether by a healthy child, a garden patch
or a redeemed social condition;
to know even one life has breathed easier
because you have lived.
That is to have succeeded".*

-Ralph Waldo Emerson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM TO BE INVESTIGATED

This project addresses an important area of inquiry that has previously been ignored. Existing research in the area of offender risk/need has focussed almost exclusively on male offenders. With little, if any justification, the results of this research have consistently been extended to female offenders with no considerations of the differences between the groups. Differences between aboriginal and non-aboriginal female offenders have also been neglected. The leading research objective for the present study was to identify whether the Primary Risk Assessments used by the Department of Justice in Manitoba to assess offenders level of risk, were reliable and valid instruments for both male and female offenders. Furthermore, while previous research projects have examined the extent to which the Primary Risk Assessment used with adult offenders was useful for both aboriginal and non-aboriginal populations; no such examination has been performed for the young offender Risk Assessment. There has also been no attempt to examine how the synthesis of both gender and ethnicity influence the validity of the Primary Risk Assessments.

THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING RISK

Correctional services are responsible for the management of risk, the prevention of recidivism and the safe, economic and humane management of offenders. Correctional professionals are in a position to influence whether offenders receive a community or custodial based sentence. When the magnitude of this influence is acknowledged, one cannot deny the necessity to ensure that correctional professionals are making recommendations based on sound evidence that has been demonstrated to be closely associated with patterns of re-involvement. To accomplish this task, correctional officials require reliable and valid risk/need assessment tools to be used together with professional assessment interviews.

The research community by now has firmly established the notion that not all offenders present the same degree of risk to society. Specifically, a small proportion of offenders are responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime. The identification of which offenders are likely to go on to commit a disproportionately high number of crimes is imperative so that correctional services can focus most intensely on those most at risk of re-offending, while reserving less intrusive measures for those offenders who present a lower risk to society.

RISK BASED SOCIETY

Within the present economic climate government spending is increasingly being scrutinized and questioned. Fiscal pressures combine with a growing public concern regarding the degree of effectiveness with which the government generally, and the justice system specifically, is administered, has forced management to operate in a cost conscious manner. Over the last several years, there has been mounting public pressure directed at changing the manner in which services are delivered and the types of services that are available to assist offenders in the rehabilitation process. Society has become increasingly intolerant of violence and the concern for public safety is swelling. This climate has resulted in what some have characterized as the "increased commercialization of crime control in which cost-benefit analyses, market forces, privatization, economy, efficiency and effectiveness concerns have all impinged upon the management of criminal justice." (Kemshall and Pritchard, 1997) This approach to crime control and criminal justice management has been labelled the "new penology" by Feeley and Simon (1992).

The new penology demands that criminal justice agents become more accountable to the public, offenders themselves, and victims. The identification of risk, assisted by actuarial instruments, allow decision-makers to standardize their assessments and facilitates accountability of those making vital decisions. Risk/needs assessment instruments assist correctional officials in making recommendations for sentencing and in formulating intervention plans for offenders. By cataloguing an offender's individual risk and need factors, officials are able to quickly calculate a risk/needs score that is matched to a pre-

3

identified level of risk. This information can then be used to formulate appropriate sentencing recommendations to the court, as well as provide guidelines for intervention initiatives.

While risk can never be predicted with absolute certainty, there is a clear understanding that offenders who have scored high on a number of need components and have already accumulated a lengthy criminal record are at a greater risk for re-involvement. (Andrews, 1989) From an ethical point of contention, it should not be ignored that no prediction instrument today can establish conclusively which offenders will in fact become re-involved in further criminal activity and most instruments waver around a predictive validity of 30-40%, resulting in many false positives or false negatives. Put more simply, there are many dangerous offenders that may be assessed at low risk for re-involvement, and there are also offenders that may score high on a risk assessment instrument, however, will not inflict further harm on the community. It must be remembered that what is being assessed is future behaviour and many environmental contingents come into play in an offender's life that influence the direction of future behaviour. These factors cannot be easily assessed or measured through quantitative methods. The price of inaccurate assessments are high for both the individual offender (deprivation of freedom) and to society (economics of service delivery and harm to victims).

The results of risk assessments are increasingly being used to assist decision makers in deciding whether a custodial or community based disposition is most appropriate. Furthermore, the programming that is made available, whether in the community or within a custodial setting, are primarily predicated on the assumed areas of need. These programs have thus far been most appropriate for male offenders. Programming currently available has been developed from research on men's needs and are therefore male centred. As will be discussed further, there is sufficient research to suggest that these programs are not as appropriate for female offender populations.

Given the implications of the risk/needs assessment, it would be assumed that strenuous efforts have taken place to ensure that they are valid for the populations to which they are routinely applied. Unfortunately this has not been the case with regard to young offenders or adult female offenders. As in past criminal justice practices, the needs of female offenders have been secondary to that of their male counterparts. Risk assessment instruments that have been developed for, and tested on, men are routinely applied to women, with the assumption that they will be equally valid for both groups. In this thesis we examine how the instruments used with adult and youth offenders perform for female offenders and for female aboriginal offenders.

This thesis is organized first to provide the reader a review of what is known about the treatment of women and girls under the criminal justice system. We further discuss the changes in legal definitions and practices that have taken place over the years and how they relate to the treatment of adult and young offenders. We discuss the current

overrepresentation of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system and some of the changes that have arisen in order to allow correctional services to become more culturally sensitive to this situation. We review the literature on risk assessments generally, and provide background information on research previously performed on the Manitoba Offender Risk Assessment/Risk Management System.

In analysing the data for this thesis, we closely followed the work of Bonta et al. (1994). After presenting information on the demographic characteristics of the population, we analysed both the total scores of the scales, and the individual items which form the scale, to assess the validity of the Primary Risk Assessment for both adult and young offenders. We present the results of the data separately for the adult and young offender instruments.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Female offenders today, as in the past, have received minimal attention from both research and government policy initiatives. Their small numbers have frequently been used as a justification for the lack of serious attention being directed toward assessing and meeting their unique needs. This neglect has been present throughout the history of correctional service delivery in spite of increases in the proportion of female offenders and the changes in the types of offences committed. It is only recently that serious attention has been focussed on the characteristics of women who come into conflict with the law, specifically asking who they are, what types of offences they commit and the types of criminal careers they establish. Given the infancy of this interest, there are still significant gaps in statistical data available at all stages of the criminal justice processing from arrest to incarceration. In the next section, we outline the historical treatment of female offenders and connect this to the present climate for adult female offenders. We then turn attention to the treatment of young offenders under the law.

WOMEN IN PRISON

The history of women's confinement has been described best as a "curious and contradictory mixture of neglect, outright barbarism, and well meaning paternalism" (Cooper, 1993 p. 33). To a large extent the same gender assumptions and class biases which directed the treatment of female offenders historically, continue to influence the treatment of female offenders today. Prisons and Penitentiary's were originally established as part of a humanitarian movement. Heavily influenced by the church and

the belief that criminals were misguided rather than bad, they were established as places

of solitude where offending individuals were thought to benefit from time to reflect on

their deeds and rehabilitate themselves. "In practice, physical deprivations, torture, and

brutality were pervasive features of prison life in the 19th Century Canadian

Penitentiaries." (Boritch, 1997, p. 172)

Women have historically been confined in isolated sections of male institutions. Because

of their small numbers in comparison to that of male inmates, it was considered

impractical and unnecessary to construct a separate facility in which to house them.

From the beginning, we find evidence that prison officials defined women as a nuisance

and as a distraction from their dominant concerns with the larger male offender

populations. (Boritch, 1997) As they were denied access to programming and recreation

in the institution, women spent most of their time mending prison clothing and bedding.

They were frequently moved from one section of the institution to another as space was

needed for male prisoners. While the small number of women accounted for part of the

explanation for their constant relocations, the attitudes of correctional staff and the

general public in the mid 19th century also had strong influences. The widespread

overwhelming belief of the time defined female offenders as far more corrupt than their

male counterparts and far less amenable to rehabilitation. (Boritch, 1997) Due to

prevailing attitudes about the nature of female offenders, women confined were subjected

to the worst possible treatment afforded. They were often housed in units infested with

insects and rodents, provided with inadequate nutrition, meaningless labour, harsh

punishments for prison infractions, and subjected to sexual abuses by male guards.

8

(Faith, 1993) In fact, the abuses at Kingston prison were of such magnitude that they attracted public indignation which resulted in the charges being laid against the Warden and the appointment of a Royal Commission (The Brown Commission) to investigate the treatment of women in prison. (Boritch, 1997)

The Brown Commission (1848) signalled the first of many criticisms into the manner in which women had been confined. The Brown commission revealed a host of inappropriate and barbaric treatment of girls as young as 12 years of age. There appeared to be a complete lack of accountability on the part of those charged with the power to maintain peace within the prison walls. The Brown Commission strongly urged that a separate facility to house female offenders be constructed immediately to allow for a humane housing arrangement. In 1913, 65 years after the initial recommendation to construct a separate unit to house women, a separate unit was finally constructed. While conditions of confinement improved dramatically, Kingston remained the sole federal facility to house female offenders and in 1914, the Royal Commission recommended that female offenders be transferred to Provincial institutions to facilitate greater contact with their home communities. Given that a separate unit had just been constructed, this recommendation and the recommendation of numerous inquires thereafter, was ignored. (Adelburg and Currie, 1987)

While the majority of literature published concerns the history of federally sentenced women in Canada, the literature available for Provincially sentenced women and girls implies that their conditions of confinement were superior to that of federally sentenced

9

women. Provincial reformatories were segregated based on gender and age. Youth were housed separate from adults as early as 1879. Gender stereotypes dictated the treatment and management of women/girls and the programming offered was directed toward re-socializing fallen women into their proper role of the good girl/woman/mother. (Boritch, 1997)

The first federal Prison for Women was constructed in 1934 in Kingston, Ontario. Although the Kingston Prison for Women, P4W, was designated for an exclusively female offender population, its structure, organization, and program delivery was a replication of that developed for male prisoners. Women were confined in cells without windows, were denied any type of recreational ground and access to any educational facilities. Investigations into the Kingston Prisons for Women resulted in recommendations for its closure. By 1981, the culmination of efforts on the part women's groups resulted in a formal complaint to the Human Rights Commission on behalf of all federally sentenced women. The Human Rights Commission found that female offenders were discriminated against on the basis of sex. They acknowledged that women were subjected to substandard treatment from the criminal justice system in all areas from access to programming to choices of serving their sentences closer to their home communities. In response, the Correctional Service of Canada did improve their vocational and educational programming, however, the programs continued to have a traditional stereotypical flavour to them and were less varied than those offered to male offenders. (Boritch, 1997)

While programs were being expanded in P4W, greater numbers of women were being transferred to provincial institution under the Exchange of Service Agreement. Federal long-term offenders serving their sentence in provincial institutions do not presently have access to the same range of programs as those available in federal institutions. For many women the decision to be closer to their families and home communities therefore meant they had to forgo programming vital for their rehabilitation. (Boritch, 1997)

After numerous Task Force reports recommending the closure of P4W, finally in 1990, the Solicitor General of Canada announced that P4W was to be closed and replaced by five new regional correctional facilities for women. (Shaw, 1992) The impetus for this announcement was the *Creating Choices Report* compiled by the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women. The establishment of The Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women placed Canada as a leader for incorporating a feminist perspective in addressing the concerns of Federally Sentenced Women, as well as recognizing the need to respond to the experiences of aboriginal women. Creating Choices set out 5 broad principles on which the new institutions for women were to be premised;

1) Empowerment
2) Meaningful Choices
3) Treating women with respect and dignity
4) The provision of a physically and emotionally supportive environment, and
5) The sharing of responsibility for women's welfare between institutional staff, community members, and the women themselves. (Kelly Hannah-Moffat and Margaret Shaw, 2000)

The Creating Choices Report advocated for not just the construction of new buildings but the incorporation of fundamentally new philosophies, focussed on healing, rather than

11

punishment. Specifically, the new facilities were to be located on several acres of land and to be structured as small cottages that housed 8 to 10 women. There was also to be provisions so that women could reside with their children, and specific areas designed for family visits. The programming in the facilities was to be holistic and were to be women centred. (Hannah-Moffat & Shaw, 2000)

The Aboriginal Healing Lodge was to be located in the prairies and staffed primarily by Aboriginal staff. The report further placed focus on the development of community based resources where women could continue programming begun in the facilities, and could offer continued support to women reintegrating back into the community. (Hannah-Moffat & Shaw, 2000)

While the Federal Government accepted some of the main philosophies of Creating Choices, several alterations were made. While the report clearly called for facilities that were non-fenced, and not focused on security, the facilities were constructed with fences. The government further did not make financial commitments to the community resources. The new facilities were built in Truro, Nova Scotia, Kitchener, Edmonton, Joliette, and Okimaw Ochi Healing Lodge at Maple Creek, Saskatchewan. (Hannah-Moffat & Shaw, 2000)

Female offenders currently comprise approximately 10% of the incarcerated population. In 1997, there were 357 federally incarcerated females, as compared to 14,091 federally incarcerated males. (Correctional Service of Canada, 1997) In 1997, 17.7% of all adults

charged with criminal code offences were female, which amounts to 68,038 adult women. Of these, 22% were charged with violent offences, and 49% with property related offences. (Statistics Canada, 1997) When looking at young offenders, female youth accounted for 22% of all youth charged with criminal code offences in 1997, which amounts to 25,203 girls. Twenty – two percent were charged with violent offences, while 53% were charged with property related offences. (Statistics Canada, 1997)

While there has been a statistical increase in the number of women charged and convicted over the years, there has not been a dramatic change in women's pattern of offending. Women are still generally convicted of petty non-violent crimes. Shaw's survey of federally sentenced women (1992) reported that women in prison are generally poor, under-educated and unskilled. They are usually addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. They have few social supports and many have a history of physical and/or sexual abuse. A disproportionate number of them are aboriginal. The majority of federally - sentenced women have been convicted on property - related offences. Those who are convicted of violent crimes are often those who have been convicted for murdering an assaultive partner. The majority of women are serving their first federal sentence, signifying that most women are not repeat offenders. (Shaw, 1992) In fact available data for both federal and provincial levels reflect that female offenders generally do not recidivate at very high levels. The rates of recidivism were higher for provincially sentenced women, whose crimes were of lower severity than the federally sentenced group. (Boritch, 1997)

13

Gavigan (1991) collecting data in 1985, found that 50% of the 8000 provincially sentenced women had at least one previous jail term. Comparatively only 23% of the federally sentenced women had a juvenile crime record. Between 1975 – 1984, 73% of federally sentenced women had no previous federal committals. (Boritch, 1991) A more recent study by Belcourt et al (1993) found that of the 968 federal females released between the years 1978-1988, only 22% were returned to a federal facility. Of those who were readmitted, 49.8% were admitted for technical violations of release conditions, and only 21% were convicted of a new offence. (Boritch, 1991) This study further highlighted some important demographic characteristics of those women who were recommitted. Forty – four percent of the women readmitted were aboriginal. Aboriginal women were also over-represented in the group that was readmitted more than once within the ten year study period. Age was the other important demographic distinguisher. Fifty- one percent of those readmitted were between the ages of 18-30. (Boritch, 1997) Despite popular misconception that female crime rates have increased dramatically, they have actually decreased over the recent years. (Dell, 1998)

Surveys of federally sentenced women consistently find a high prevalence of substance abuse among women. Additionally, 70 % of the women reported histories of physical and/or sexual abuse. The incidents of abuse are even greater among aboriginal women. (Boritch, 1997) Lowcks and Zomble (1994)) comparing a sample of male and female federal offenders found that a dramatically higher proportion of women suffered from depression (31% vs. 12%) as compared to male offenders. While women in the general population are more likely to be diagnosed with depression and medicated for this

14

condition, the over-medication of incarcerated women is a concern. Forty –eight percent of the women as compared to 13% of the men had previously attempted suicide. While female offenders generally do not pose a serious threat to public safety, they do pose a danger to themselves in the form of self-injurious behaviour. This has been documented within all custodial facilities for women and girls. (Boritch, 1997)

Adequate programming is seriously lacking in most provincial correctional institutions, where the majority of women are incarcerated for two years less a day. Programming for aboriginal women in conflict with the law is most needed. (Adelberg and Currie, 1987) Programs currently offered are those developed primarily for male offenders, with few, if any alterations, these programs are the same ones applied to women. Provincially sentenced women and girls are not routinely exposed to programming directly developed to address issues unique to women.

Blanchette (1997), in her study looking at the differences between incarcerated violent and non violent female offenders, found that women who were convicted of a violent crime (specifically ones that involved serious violence) scored far higher on the needs dimensions as measured by The Offender Intake Assessment used by the Correctional Service of Canada, than did women convicted on non - violent offences. (Blanchette, 1997) Aboriginal women were over-represented in the sample, accounting for 22% of the violent offenders sampled. Blanchette (1997) further found that serious substance abuse was an issue for 74% of the violent offender sample as compared to 46% of the non-violent offender group. Using the Case Needs Identification and Analysis

instrument, Blanchette (1997) further reported that the violent group scored higher on 5 of the 7 targets needs than the non-violent group. There were no significant differences found in the areas of criminal associates, and community functioning. The most critical difference between the two groups of women reported were previous employment histories, where 34% of the violent women had no employment history as compared to 11% of the non-violent group. Additionally, violent women had a far greater risk associated with suicide and self harming behaviour. Fifty three percent of the violent group as compared to the non-violent group had a previous suicide attempt, more than double that of the non-violent group. (Blanchette, 1997)

ABORIGINAL OFFENDERS

The over-representation of aboriginal people is an important issue in corrections today, and this is especially the case for aboriginal women. While both aboriginal men and women are over represented throughout the system from arrest to dissolution, the rate is greatest for aboriginal women. Additionally, aboriginal peoples are more likely than their non-aboriginal counterparts to receive a custodial sentence. The rate of incarceration for aboriginal women outweighs that for aboriginal men. While Aboriginal people comprise approximately 12% of Manitoba's general population, they make up 38% of the male offender population and 48.1 % of the female offender population. (1996 Census, Statistics Canada, & The Correctional Service of Canada 1997).

Over the last two decades there have been significant efforts directed at developing

programs and policies that are culturally appropriate and specific to the needs of

aboriginal offenders. In spite of these efforts, there has been little change. One of the

reasons for the over-representation of aboriginal people in the criminal justice system, are

the high recidivism rates among aboriginal peoples. A number of studies have

documented dramatically higher rates of re-involvement for aboriginal as compared to

non-aboriginal offenders. Hann and Harman (1993) using a Canadian sample, found

recidivism rates were 19% higher for aboriginal offenders as compared to that of the non

-aboriginal group. Comparing the recidivism rates of aboriginal and non-aboriginal first

time offenders in Western Australian prisons, Broadhurst et al, (1988) found that male

aboriginals recidivated at a rate of 80% as compared to 48% for non-aboriginal males.

When comparing the rates for aboriginal/non-aboriginal inmates the recidivism rates

were 75% and 29% respectively. The authors however caution that recidivism did

decrease generally as age increased and much of the aboriginal offender sample was

younger in age. (Broadhurst et al, 1988)

Federally sentenced Aboriginal women in Canada are more likely than non-aboriginal

women to have served a previous federal sentence and are twice as likely to be

incarcerated for a violent offence. (Holly Johnson, 1987) Another reason identified in a

number of public inquiries is the role played by racism, either overt or systemic. What

appears to be more obvious is that a series of historical and contemporary events have

resulted in the marginalization of aboriginal people and has contributed to a large

17

segment of the aboriginal population coming into conflict with the criminal justice system.

Examining the long standing effects of the social and economic breakdown of the aboriginal communities stemming largely from their experiences with residential schooling, we find that aboriginal peoples in Canada generally possess substantially lower levels of education when compared to non-natives, fewer marketable skills and higher levels of unemployment. Additionally, infant mortality rates are considerably higher and general life expectancy rates are lower by 10 years compared to non native groups. Studies have further documented that the risk of violent death and suicide is 3 times higher for aboriginal populations when compared to the national average. When the data is examined closely, the researchers find that the suicide rate for aboriginals aged 15-25 is six times the national average. (Correctional Law Review, 1988)

Research comparing aboriginal with non aboriginal offenders have documented that aboriginal offenders are more likely to have come from dysfunctional familial settings characterized by much instability and a great deal of contact with social service agencies. Aboriginal offenders are more likely to have come from single parent families, or a series of foster care homes. All these factors contribute to aboriginal offenders having loose connections to conventional society, carrying instead strong feelings of anger, grief, and indifference. (Correctional Law Review, 1988)

There have been those who argue that it is unreasonable to assume that one generic risk assessment tool can adequately measure the risk of all racial and ethnic groups in the offender population, and call for group specific tools. (Hann and Harman, 1993) Others, have insisted that the factors that are relevant to recidivism are similar for all offenders regardless of ethnic and cultural differences. Bonta et al, contend that race becomes important only as a responsivity principle and should only be addressed in reference to programming style. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

In recent years Aboriginal programming has received greater emphasis both within custody institutions and in the community. Programming around reintegrative shaming and holistic healing have dramatically changed the traditional approach to correctional service delivery. With initiatives such as community youth justice committees, Family Group Conferencing and Victim Offender Reconciliation Programs, aboriginal communities are fighting to take control of the problems that effect their communities. The benefits of these programs can be evaluated by assessing the satisfaction on the part of both victims and offenders. Within our traditional framework of justice the victim is often left marginal to the process and the offenders themselves often feel overwhelmed by a foreign system. Unfortunately, while restorative approaches to justice are more humane and make more sense from a personal / communal perspective, they are drastically under funded and forced to rely on volunteerism to survive.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Prior to confederation, the Canadian criminal law treated youth offenders in much the same way adult offenders were treated. Most offences were resolved within the local community involving the victim, offender, and often, religious mediators. When the criminal law was utilized, it was reserved for those offences where community intervention proved to be either ineffective or inappropriate. Children as young as 7 years of age were subject to the same punishments originally designed for adults. (Hogeveen, 2001) Griffith and Verdun-Jones (1994) do however contend that in special circumstances the crown was able to argue for leniency when there was evidence that the youth lacked criminal intent. (Griffith and Verdun-Jones, 1994)

Criminal courts in the first half of the 19th century took little interest in the environmental contingencies associated with an offender's criminal behaviour. All offenders charged with a specific offence were subject to similar types of punishments irrespective of circumstances associated with the crime. It was not until the mid 1850's that reformers began to concern themselves with the treatment of children under criminal law. Reformers began to question the legitimacy of placing first time young offenders together with long term adult offenders. Changing images of childhood further focussed a greater emphasis on the concept of reformation for the young offender, a concept foreign at this time for all other offenders. (Hogeveen, 2001)

It was with the introduction of the Juvenile Delinquents Act (1908) that Canadian criminal courts began to process youth and adult offenders separately. With the introduction of the JDA (1908), children were no longer defined as criminal, but rather as misguided. The social environmental circumstances associated with their offending behaviour came to be mitigating factors in sentencing. Reformers at the time felt that through incarceration, correctional staff could re-socialize misguided youth, and allow for them to return to the general population as rehabilitated members. In order to facilitate this, the courts were accorded broad discretionary powers in sentencing youth and the category of "status" offences were created in order to allow the courts to punish behaviors of youth, that would not have been defined as criminal for adults. The *'parens patriae'* otherwise referred to as "the child saving movement" in practice created in many circumstances, young children being confined for longer periods of time for offences that would not be considered criminal for adults. Alongside with the emergence of the JDA, Canadian criminal justice control increased to involve probation. Now surveillance that was previously only possible through institutionalization of some form, was available in the community. Probation officers by communicating with other social welfare agencies were able to closely monitor wayward children in order to maintain their 'normalization' once released from custody or as an alternative to custody. (Smandych, 2000)

It is female offenders who were most effected by the courts' broad range of discretionary powers. Given that patriarchal attitudes of the time placed strict double standards of appropriate conduct separated by gender, young girls were incarcerated far more often

under what was known as "status" offences than their male counterparts. (Chesney-Lind, 1989)

Canada's youth justice system was dramatically reformed with the introduction of the Young Offenders Act in 1984. The Young Offenders Act replaced the Juvenile Delinquents Act, which had been in place since 1908. Sentences under the Young Offenders Act ranged from absolute discharge to a maximum of 3 years in custody. Youth aged 12-17 years of age fall under the jurisdiction of the act. (Kirvan, 1995)

The YOA was developed with the following principles in mind;

- First, the YOA acknowledged that young people are responsible for their actions and should be held accountable, however, not to the same degree as adult offenders,
- Society has a right to be protected from the criminal acts of young people,
- While being held accountable, young people require assistance and rehabilitation in order to meet their rehabilitative needs and the needs of the larger community,
- That where it is possible community alternatives should be utilized in resolving criminal conflicts, in order to maintain young people in the community,
- That young people have the same rights as adult offenders and should have full protection under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (DeKeseredy, 1999)

The changes that were introduced to the juvenile justice system with the YOA clearly focussed increasingly on a crime control agenda and the protection of society, regarding young offenders less as children in need of salvation, and more as legal subjects. The changes in YOA that removed the category of "status" crimes, for which many youth were incarcerated for, should have resulted in a decline in the young offender population, this however, has not been the case. Boritch (1997) believes that the reason Canada did not witness a dramatic decrease in the number of young people processed, was because

22

officials reclassified the category traditionally referred to as "status" offences under administrative offences available under the YOA, specifically breaches of probation and undertakings. Data presented by Reitsma – Street (1993) informs that in 1991 one in four charges laid against girls were classified under administrative offences. Additionally, one in five girls sentenced to open or secure custody in Canada were serving sentenced for violations of administrative laws. (DeKeseredy, 1999)

In response to a number of concerns regarding the growing problems of youth crime, along side with failures of YOA amendments previously made, the Federal government in 1998 announced a plan to amend the YOA with The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA). While the act is still being debated, we will discuss some the main changes that have been introduced to date.

The Youth Criminal Justice Act is being proposed as a replacement to the current Young Offenders Act. The main focus of the act is to diminish the use of incarceration for young offenders, and reserve its use for only the most serious of cases. Additionally, the new act allows for greater emphasis on community support and supervision. While politically being advertised as a tougher and smarter approach to youth justice, in reality it provides greater leniency for young offenders. Under the YOA when a young person is sentenced to a period of custody, they serve their entire sentence in custody. Changes under the YCJA would require that youth sentenced to a period of secure custody be released into the community upon completion of two-thirds of their sentence. Additionally, the YCJA emphasizes the need to improve crime prevention programming

and to increase community involvement in dealing with first time offenders. This change involves creating meaningful consequences for young people and intensifying rehabilitation programming provided within correctional institutions for violent and dangerous youth, as well as developing appropriate community responses for less dangerous offenders. (Hogeveen and Smandych, 2000)

For serious repeat young offenders the YCJA is designed to offer courts increased ability to impose adult sentences for youth as young as 14 years of age. While the changes proposed in the YCJA are regarded as an improvement over the present YOA, critics argue that the federal government has still failed to deal with young offenders under the age of twelve.

GIRL DELINQUENTS

As with adult female offenders, there currently exists little empirical evidence to guide our understanding of what factors are uniquely relevant to predicting the recidivism of young female offenders and even less for aboriginal female youth offenders (Bonta et al., 1994) Female youth crime has traditionally been viewed as rare and less serious than male youth crime. As a result early theories around female youth crime, much like theories of adult female offending, focused on familial, and /or personal dysfunction as the source. In contrast, early theories of male youth crime focused on external factors such as peer groups, and blocked opportunities to occupation and education. While female crime remains far lower than male youth crime the gap is shrinking. Our statistics

24

further alert us to the fact that female youth offenders are involved in a broad range of offences and are not limited to only minor infractions. (Simourd and Andrews, 1995)

Simourd et al. (1997) reporting on their study of factors correlated with youth crime, indicated that the most important risk factors for female youth offenders were; antisocial peer group, attitudes supportive of criminal activity, previous conduct problems, and poor parent-child relationships. Personality, social class, and family structure variables did not produce strong correlation. Similar results were identified for male delinquents. There were no dramatic differences in the degree to which these factors proved to be important for each gender group. (Simourd et al. 1997)

While there are obvious social and cultural differences that have been implicated in the etiology of youth crime, most theories fail to adequately account for why some males become delinquent and other do not and why homes where gender stereotypes are most explicit still produce delinquent females. While socialization practices make delinquency for boys more likely and more acceptable by allowing boys greater freedom of movement and encouraging greater use of aggression, they do not provide clarity as to why and under what circumstances girls become deviant. While there is a developing body of research that has made connections between girls victimization and later delinquency, these findings have not been incorporated into the larger criminal justice response or program developments.

THE MEDIA AND MORAL PANIC AROUND THE NEW YOUNG OFFENDER

Canada has one of the highest rates of youth incarceration. This trend is likely to continue to increase when we assess the impact of the media portrayal of violent youth. Public perception seems to suggest that young offenders today are becoming more violent and more dangerous than in the past. This perception is largely false and exaggerated. The media's preoccupation with gang related offences has convincingly left the perception that gang activity is on the rise and the public concludes that the majority of youth crime is a result of gang influence and therefore encompasses detailed planning and organization. The growing public fear of a new wave of youth crime has resulted in police increasing surveillance of gang activity and therefore increasing enforcement of the youth population generally and gang activity specifically.

Media reports suggest implicitly that all youth offenders are members of minority groups. Here in western Canada, this places primary focus on the Aboriginal population. The media rarely provide information surrounding the circumstances of the offence or the offender, leaving the general viewer with the impression that the offence was random and unprovoked. The clear message the consumer of this information receives is that crime is a problem that belongs to members of racial minority groups, who are living in poverty and families dependent upon the social service sector for survival and subsistence. Take the following exert as an example of the media contributions to this assumption;

26

"Welfare dependency has also contributed to youth crime and family breakdown. Former Alberta crown attorney Scott Newark, now head of the Ottawa-based Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, argues, "welfare is not a responsible way of dealing with young people who can just as easily work." It invites trouble by creating a "lifestyle that is fundamentally anti-social. Idleness is not good" Mr. Newark believes that if young males were forced to support themselves, most will find work and the time they have to contemplate criminal behavior will evaporate. Sociologist June O'Neil and Ann Hill of Baruch College of the City University of New York seem to have proven this empirically. In their study of inner-city poor, Professor O'Neill and Hill found that the higher the welfare payments, the greater the "negative effects on the behavior of young men by increasing the likelihood of fathering a child out of wedlock, criminal activity, and by reducing their attachment to the labor force." The duo ultimately concluded that "a 50 percent increase in the monthly dollar value of welfare benefits led to a 117 percent increase in the crime rate among young black men." (Alberta Report, 2 May 1994:39 as quoted in Schissel, 2001)

Clearly the above exert makes no acknowledgement of the socioeconomic forces that possibly and probably have an influence on the reason young people are not employed. The reality for many young people is that employment options are limited and the types of jobs available are often low salaried and undervalued types of occupations. Occupations that cannot provide a salary of subsistence fails to meet the needs of young people who, as the exert implied, sometimes have dependents to care for, much less maintain themselves. The presentation of empirical research in the exert imparts an overall legitimacy that the general consumer will simple not question.

Sinclair and Dell (1998) analyzing data obtained from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics reported an overall decrease in the number of youth charged by police and those processed through youth court from the years 1992-93 to 1996-97. While they did report a slight increase in violent crimes by youth, the greatest increases were in crime of robbery and non-sexual assaults as opposed to murder, manslaughter and sexual assault.

(Sinclair and Dell, 1998) When dividing the sample of young offenders into male/female groupings, the researchers found a slight overall increase in the rate of violent crimes committed by female youth from the years 1992-1997 (38 per 10,000-47 per 10,000). Both robbery and homicide offences showed a slight increase. (Boe and Dell 1998).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE OFFENDER POPULATIONS

Although many female offenders come from similar social and economic backgrounds to male offenders, they tend to have even fewer economic resources, few if any marketable skills, and are far more likely to be vested with child-care responsibilities. Additionally, female offenders are likely to have more health problems, and are more likely to have been repeat victims of physical and sexual abuse. Substance abuse and eating disorders are also prevalent among female offenders. Women in prison are more likely to suffer from psychological and emotional disorders such as; depression, anxiety, schizophrenia and Bi-polar disorder. (Shaw, 1991) For incarcerated women, slashing and other self-injurious behaviours are common, while they are virtually absent in male institutions. (Shaw, 1992) There has been some research findings that suggest that women with a history of suicide or self injurious types of behaviour are at a greater risk for violent recidivism as compared with the control group. This would suggest the possible inclusion of information regarding a history of self injury as standard intake assessment for risk prediction for female offenders. This may well prove to be a need factor only relevance to female offenders. Additionally, suggested was that full time child rearing should be considered as full time employment when scoring female offenders primarily responsible for child rearing.

28

Female offenders generally have less extensive criminal histories than males and are incarcerated for less serious crimes. Female offenders are also less likely to become re-involved than their male counterparts. Their reported recidivism rates have consistently been shown to be lower than male offender populations. This has led some researchers to question whether incarceration is an option that should be used for women at all, and more specifically, to question whether the great majority of women serving a custodial sentence are in fact a serious danger to society. (Shaw, 1991)

Lowcks and Zamble (1994) comparing federal samples of male and female offenders identified that a significantly larger proportion of women suffered from depression at moderate clinical levels as compared to their male counterparts (31% vs. 12%). Moreover, 48% of their female sample as compared to 13% of the male sample reported a history of suicide attempts. There is generally less overt violence in women's prisons, and there tends to be greater use of disciplinary procedures for minor infractions. Female offenders are more often managed with the over use of medication. (Hannah-Moffat & Shaw, 2000)

The feminist community has been divided on what is viewed as the best way to ensure the rights of female offenders are being respected. The "equality" approach works to advocate for legislative equality, claiming that in order to receive equal treatment under the law women must have the same rights and services available to them as their male counterparts. The alternative approach is the "difference" approach. This view argues that it is unreasonable to ignore differences between the male and female population and

while the services provided should be of equal quality to that of the larger male population, management, programming and treatment of women should be centred and developed around the needs of women and not a replication of that available with male offenders, in male institutions. (Chesney-Lind & Pollock, 1994) "By emphasizing parity and then using a male standard, women will always lose. Equality in sentencing has led to staggering increases of women in prison, equality in prison programming has led to more vocational programs, but it has also led to more security measures, more formalistic approaches to supervision, and arguably a more 'prisoners first, women second' approach to supervision." This approach clearly placed males as the yardstick to which women are measured against. (Pollock, 1998 p.42) "In order for women offenders to receive justice, it must be recognized that men and women inhibit different social realities and that women are not necessarily best served if they are treated in ways that assume their needs are identical to their male counterparts." (Chesney-Lind & Pollock, 1995, p.170)

Developing from the equal but different approach, there is a drastic need for an expansion of programming that is women centred. Currently prisons in Canada, Europe and the United States offer basic medical, educational, vocational, and intervention type programming on an equal basis to both men and women. Specialized programming that focuses on the needs of female inmates and members of minority races are still severely limited. Programming that confronts issues of physical and sexual violence in the lives of girls and women, as well as programming around pregnancy and motherhood, educational and vocational programs are very limited. Adult institutions that offer parenting and pre-natal programming for women have found these programs to be

30

extremely popular and constantly full. Programming for survivors of sexual violence are still necessary. (Chesney-Lind & Pollock, 1995, p.170)

RISK/NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CLASSIFICATION

Risk/needs assessment and classification is a routine correctional practice that is used to assist judges in making decisions regarding whether an offender should receive a custodial or community - based sentence, and, if incarcerated, at what level of classification. This information is then further used to establish a case plan and set treatment goals. The assessment and classification of an offender begins at conviction and continues throughout an offender's period of supervision, whether this is within a custodial complex or in the community. Objective assessment instruments have the advantage of minimizing person bias, providing equitable treatment of offenders with similar offence patterns, and can provide direction for treatment and accommodation. Additionally, they increase corrections accountability to both the general public and offenders themselves by clearly indicating the criterion that is used to inform assessments. Finally, Risk Assessment instruments provide continuity of care, as the same instruments should be utilized within provincial boundaries.

Correctional officials have been working to predict offenders' risk for re-involvement since the very origins a correctional system. James Bonta (1994) has described the development of risk assessment tools within a generation analogy. First generation assessment practices involved a subjective assessment of an offender's risk. The factors involved in the decision were difficult to isolate or replicate. There were no concrete

guidelines directing professionals as to what information was most useful in predicting

risk for re-involvement. There was great variation in the assessment, and hence the

sentencing, of offenders with similar circumstances. In short, the assessment relied

exclusively on the correctional officer's personal evaluation of the offender. These

assessment practices were most commonly applied prior to the 1920. It is no longer

acceptable to formulate correctional plans based solely on personal, subjective

assessments. (Bonta, 1994)

Second generation assessment practices began with Burgess's classic study of over 3,000

parolees in 1928. Using a sample of parolees, Burgess isolated 21 factors that

distinguished between those parolees who were successful and those who became re-

involved. With second-generation assessment tools, we see the development of

empirically based risk assessment tools. Researchers began to systematically assess

factors that were related to re-involvement by isolating and cataloguing those factors and

creating a scoring system. These scales provided a substantial improvement from first

generation assessments as they were able to reliably predict which offenders posed the

greatest risk to society and which were lower risks for re-involvement. (Bonta, 1994)

While second generation risk scales presented a significant improvement over first

generation assessments by providing both direction to staff and accountability to the

public and offenders themselves, they provided little direction for treatment. The primary

reason for this was that they measured exclusively historical factors. They provided no

measure of dynamic factors that are amenable to change. (Bonta, 1994)

Beginning in the 1970's, research in the area of risk prediction expanded enormously. Third generation assessment tools differ from second generation by accounting for both risk and need factors. Risk factors are those variables in an offender's history that are static, unchangeable. Need factors are aspects of the offender's social and personal environment that are amenable to change and serve as appropriate targets for treatment if we wish to impact recidivism rates. By combining both risk and need factors, these assessment tools allow professionals to assess an offender at different points in his/her sentence therefore providing a ruler by which to measure reductions in risk. (Bonta, 1994)

There are only three assessment instruments in use today that have the combined ability to assess both an offender's risk and needs. These instruments are; The Wisconsin Classification System (Baird, Heinz and Bemus, 1979), The Community Risk-Needs Scale of the Correctional Service of Canada (Motiuk and Porporino, 1989), and the Level of Service Inventory - Revised (Andrews and Bonta, 1995) Third generation or present day assessments, acknowledge that offenders have many needs. Of these needs, some are criminogenic, that is related to their criminal behaviour, and others are non-criminogenic, or unrelated. Isolating and appropriately addressing criminogenic needs will lower an offender's risk for recidivism. (Andrews et al., 1990)

The majority of risk/needs classification instruments in use today have been developed and validated on a general probation/parole population. In practical terms, this amounts to comprising between 80-85% male offender populations. There are many problems

33

with making the blind assumption that the results of these validation tests are equally applicable to female offenders. The only instruments in use today that have been demonstrated to have predictive validity with a female probation population have been the Level of Service Inventory -Revised and the Case Management Strategies; both are used in Ontario. In Manitoba risk/needs classification system has never been evaluated on an exclusively female offender population.

OFFENDER REHABILIATION

The area of offender rehabilitation has received its fair share of skepticism from both the general public and from researchers. The 1970's particularly was a period when the "Nothing Works" philosophy was widely accepted. Given this, it was believed that instead of allocating scare resources to rehabilitate offenders, what was needed were stricter penalties for those who violated the law. There is now evidence that offender rehabilitation programs can in fact work to reduce recidivism, particularly those programs that are appropriately matched to the offender and use a cognitive-behavioral approach. Additionally, we now know that greater sanctions have either no influence on reducing recidivism or actually produce a negative effect by increasing the probability of re-involvement. (Andrews, 1994)

Andrews and Bonta (1994) identified five principles of effective offender treatment, these are: risk, need, responsivity, professional discretion, and program integrity. The **Risk** Principle rests on two presumptions, the first is that criminal behaviour can be predicted and second, that it is necessary to match the level of supervision to the designates level of

34

risk. In line with the second point, the most intensive services should be reserved for those offenders who are assessed to be of greatest risk for re-involvement. (Andrews and Bonta, 1994)

Andrews, et al, (1990) reviewing 154 treatments, found that providing intensive correctional services to all offenders did not produce desired effects for all. Specifically, they found that recidivism was either unaffected or actually increased for lower risk offenders, when they received intensive treatment. It is, therefore, both socially and fiscally desirable to match the level of treatment to an offender's assessed level of risk. (Andrews and Bonta 1994)

The **Need** Principle accepts that offenders have many needs, some are defined as criminogenic and others as non-criminogenic. Criminogenic needs are those related to an offender's criminal behaviour. Criminogenic needs are generally referred to as dynamic risk factors because they are amenable to change. If treatment interventions are successful in diminishing these needs, then there will be a corresponding decrease in recidivism. Some examples of important criminogenic needs include; pro-criminal attitudes, criminal associates, substance abuse, anti-social personality, poor problem-solving skills, and hostility/anger. These factors have consistently been found to be associated with recidivism for both youth and adult offenders. (Andrews and Bonta, 1994)

The **Responsivity** principle states that intervention can only be successful when matched to an offender's intellectual ability and individual learning style. Treatment programs that involve social learning and cognitive behavioural approaches have been found to demonstrate greater success than other approaches used. (Andrews and Bonta, 1994) Social Learning and Cognitive Behaviour treatment programs tend to offer structured treatments that focus on behavioural choices, and the modelling and reinforcement of pro-social behaviours. (Bonta, 1997)

Professional Discretion forms the fourth principle of effective offender classification and treatment. While assessment and classification instruments are designed to produce accurate prediction for the majority of offenders, there may always be an individual exception. Correctional officials working with individual offenders therefore need to have some professional discretion to override an assessment. (Andrews and Bonta, 1994) Professional expertise should in these cases be applied to the appropriate management of an individual offenders risk.

A fifth and final principle is **Program Integrity**. Program Integrity involves a structured delivery of the treatment program that adheres to all of the above principles, and is lead by enthusiastic and dedicated staff. (Andrews, 1994)

Andrews et al, (1990) found that when comparing programs on the basis of criminal sanctions (Probation vs. Prison), appropriate treatment (combining the principles of risk, needs, responsivity, professional discretion and program integrity) and inappropriate

treatments, that appropriate treatments were associated with a reduction in recidivism that averaged 50%, while criminal sanctions and inappropriate treatments demonstrated small increases in recidivism. (Andrews and Bonta, 1994)

All of the knowledge we have on effective offender rehabilitation rests first on the assumption that we can reliably classify any offender's risk. In addition to issues of accurate prediction, the introduction of risk assessments as an integral aspect of treatment planning and risk reduction requires some discussion. Historically, the principles of effective rehabilitation were not well understood and less researched. Within the current actuarial risk society orientation it has become a measure of effective supervision to manage and lower the risk any individual offender poses to society. In order to responsibly manage risk, the correctional officers involved with the offender both within the institution and in the community must be proactive in gathering collateral information from many sources outside the offender him/herself. The probation or correctional officer must further become involved in intervention as never before required. The officer must make regular appraisal of the offender's coping skills and strategies, be cued to environmental stressors that influence the offender, and act as both a supporter for pro social behavioural changes in the offender and an enforcer of court ordered conditions. As the number of serious violent offenders being monitored in the community increased together with accompanying case load increases, these duties become more difficult to accomplish.

RESEARCH ON RISK FACTORS

There has been much research conducted on factors associated with recidivism. The majority of such studies have been conducted using samples of recidivist and non-recidivists. The two groups are then compared to highlight factors that distinguish between the two groups. These factors are then tested on new samples to determine if they are associated with recidivism. Also common are studies that identify a cohort of children and follow them to see who of them go on to become habitual criminals. (Andrews, 1989)

Bonta and Wormith (1988) summarized the finding of several large-scale studies, found remarkable consistency in factors associated with youth crime. They summarized these findings as;

- Antisocial/delinquent associations,
- pro-criminal attitudes displayed as anti-social, presenting difficulty with authority, and having values and beliefs that support criminal activity,
- poor parental supervision,
- dysfunctional familial environment,
- economically depressed,
- early display of antisocial and deviant behaviour,
- poor school achievement,
- below average verbal intelligence,
- and being male.

The conclusion from these studies suggests that the prediction of criminal involvement can be substantially increased when a number of factors are together assessed. (Andrews, 1989) While some of the factors associated with re-involvement are static, it is those variables that are changeable that correctional staff, whether in prison or in the community, must focus on in order to reduce an offender's risk level, and work towards

assisting that offender in becoming a productive member of the community.

Additionally, studies comparing delinquent and non-delinquent groups of youth have found that delinquent youth come from low functioning families, often characterized by violence, substance abuse, emotional inconsistency and conditions of poverty. Often there are a number of family members also involved in criminal activity and young offenders are modelling behaviour they have observed in the home or by relatives. Delinquents generally are not high achievers in academic settings, many having developed a history of defiant behaviour in school. Young offenders demonstrate a history of problems in relationships with both teachers and peers. Juvenile delinquents spend less time at home and more time with peers. (Angenent and De Man, 1996)

Research data has established a pattern connecting criminal involvement with age. Criminal activity appears to peak at the 14-15 years of age and shows a slow, but steady decline thereafter. This pattern was found to be similar for males and females, however, females increased at a lower rate. Farrington et al (1982) when analyzing self reports of youth found the same pattern. (Emler and Reicher, 1995)

RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND FEMALE OFFENDERS

Studies that have sought to validate risk/needs assessment tools initially developed and validated on a predominantly, if not exclusively, male offender population, with female offenders, have met mixed results. While instruments such as The Level of Service Inventory – Revised and the Case Management Strategies, have been found to reliably

39

predict recidivism for both male and female offenders (and the Youth Level of Service Inventory has been demonstrated to be reliable for male and female young offenders), others such as the SIR scale used by the Correctional Service of Canada, have repeatedly failed to demonstrate predictive validity when tested on female offender populations. This should not be surprising given that the theoretical frameworks that guided the inclusion of various factors in the risk assessment instrument, were all theories of male offending.

The SIR scale was developed by Joan Nuffield, using a sample of male inmates released between 1970 – 1972. Since its initial validation, the scale has been successfully re-validated a number of times on male offender populations. Wallace (1995), in her efforts to validate the SIR on an exclusively female offender population found mixed results. She calculated SIR scores for a female offender population released from a federal institution in 1983-84. Recidivism was defined as reconviction or parole revocation within three years following release. She reported a recidivism rate of 35.8%, however, when she conducted an item analysis of the scale, she concluded that only two items on the scale predicted re-involvement. These items where; age at first conviction, and length of sentence. Items found to be significant for a female offender population ,but not for males, were a history of physical abuse as an adult and a history of self-injurious behaviour. This indicates that while male and female inmates share some similar predictive items, they also demonstrate some differences. (Wallace, 1995) The researches concluded that;

"The most immediate implication of the results in the first study is that the SIR scale may not be particularly useful risk-classification tool for Canadian federally sentenced women. Although the total SIR score was predictive of recidivism, the poor differentiation of risk among the categories and the numerous items that were either too infrequent or simply not predictive of outcome caution against the use of this scale for women" (Bonta et al., 1995, p.289)

The Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) has most probably been the best researched instrument in North America. As already stated it has demonstrated predictive validity with both male and female offender populations. However, research on the LSI-R has shown that the cut off scores based on male offender norms do not work for female offenders. The average cut off scores for a sample of females was 15.5 as compared to a similar sample of male offenders whose scores ranged from 20.9 –25.1. (Bonta et al., 1995)

There has been growing concern on the part of feminists doing research in the area of risk/need assessments for female offenders. Specifically, there is concern around over classifying female offenders based on their high needs rather than risk. We have already acknowledged that female offenders generally approach the system with a greater battery of needs than male offenders. These needs do not necessarily place female offenders at greater risk to society. Additionally, there has been a call for a more in depth assessment of women needs at the intake stage in order to assess need factors that may assist women in coping with the pains of imprisonment as well as improvement their strategies for coping when back in the community. Blanchette (1997) found that one of the best predictors of violent recidivism was a history of suicide attempts. Moreover, Bonta et al. (1995) found

41

that a history of self-injurious behaviour was strongly associated with recidivism. Specifically, 78% of recidivist had a history of self injury as compared to 25% of the non-recidivists. (Bonta et al., 1995)

Adler and Basemore (1980) have questioned the application of guidelines developed for male offenders to women. They contend that criteria guidelines are most valid when tested and applied to a homogeneous population. Yet, the female offender population is very diverse in its cultural make up. Additionally, the types of offences that men and women commit are very different, and their response to incarceration is very different as well. Women are far more likely to engage in self destructive and mutilating behaviours than men, who are far more likely to respond violently towards others. (Adler and Basemore;1980 & Adelberg and Currie, 1987)

Harman and Hann (1986) found that women released on Parole had lower reconviction rates as compared to their male counterparts. Seventy nine percent of women were successful as compared with sixty five percent of the males. Those women who were re-involved committed crimes of a less serious nature than men, one that usually did not require a custodial sentence. Similar findings have been documented in the United States by Spencer and Beracochea (1972), as well as in England and Wales by Posen (1988). (Harman and Hann, 1986)

THE WISCONSIN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The original Wisconsin classification system consisted of two separate assessments, one that measured an offender's risk using exclusively static items, and the second measured an offender's needs. There were 11 risk items (including the variable assault) and 12 need items. Each item was given a scoring weight and the scores were then summed to yield a total score. This total score was then used to classify an offender as belonging to a low, medium, or high risk for re-involvement. In the original scoring format, a conviction for any assault related offence, carried a score of 15 points, which automatically placed an offender in the high-risk category. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994) Also included in the original assessment tool was a re-assessment of both the risk and needs to be completed every six months during an offender's supervision, and a general treatment strategy called the Client Management Classification (CMC), which operated independently of the risk and needs assessments. These will not be discussed further in this report (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

Baird, Heinz and Bemus (1979), the developers of the original Wisconsin Classification System, using a sample of 250 terminated probation and parole cases, identified and isolated a series of factors related to probation/parole outcome. These items were then scored and weighted. The developed scale was then validated on a sample of 4,231 probation and parole cases with a two-year follow-up. While the items identified from the original analysis included both risk and need factors, and the validation sample was assessed for both risk and need factors, only the risk items were analysed. The results

indicated that the risk items did in fact predict re-involvement. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

Following this validation, the Wisconsin system was widely accepted by many jurisdictions. By 1981, the Wisconsin System was in use in over 50 jurisdictions in both Canada and the United States. (Baird, 1981) However, there have been few re-validation studies performed to ensure that the instrument was suitable for the different populations being assessed with it. In two validation studies in Ontario, Andrews, Kiessling, Muckus, and Robinson (1985) demonstrated that the risk items were valid and reliable in predicting the outcome among a sample of probationers. An attempt to validate the instrument with a sample of New York State probationers, however, yielded poor results. The instrument was found to have no predictive validity. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

In 1982, Community & Youth Corrections Division of Manitoba Justice adapted the Wisconsin Risk/Needs Classification System developed in 1979 by Baird et al. While the original assessment was developed and validated on an adult offender population, Manitoba extended its application to include both adult and youth offenders. Of note, Baird et al. (1979) did include a slightly modified version of the Wisconsin classification system to be used with young offenders however, provided no outcome data to substantiate its validity. Ashford and LeCroy, (1988) attempted to validate the youth version in Arizona, however, found the classifications developed by the scale to be unrelated to outcome. (Bonta, Parkinson, Barkwell, and Pang, 1994)

44

In 1986, Sabourin undertook an evaluation of the instrument using a sample of 2,825 terminated probation cases from the years 1983-1985. Assessing both adult and youth offender populations, Sabourin evaluated both items that formed the original Wisconsin risk/need instrument, as well as additional items, and assessed the degree to which these items were related to outcome. The findings indicated that the instrument predicted outcome better for the adult offender population than for the youth population. These findings led to a number of modifications to both the adult and youth versions of the Wisconsin instrument. Specifically, items such as assault were dropped and items such as sex were added. Additionally, the scoring schemes of the instrument were also revised. While these revisions demonstrated improved ability to predict outcome for the adult probation population, there was no corresponding improvement for the youth version. Nevertheless, in January 1987, the Community and Youth Corrections Division of Manitoba Justice implemented the revised Wisconsin Classification System to be used with both adult and youth offenders across the province. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

Bonta and Parkinson (1994) building on Sabourin's work, highlighted that a shortcoming of Sabourin's study was that it evaluated the predictive validity of the items on an individual basis, rather than assessing the items in composition to determine if they formed a reliable scale. Additionally, Bonta and Parkinson noted that there was no evaluation of the needs component of the Wisconsin instrument. In their study they, sought to address these shortcomings. Using a sample of terminated Manitoba probation cases from the years 1990-1991 with a four year follow-up, they found that the need

45

items, when combined, demonstrated predictive validity, although not to the same magnitude as the risk items. They also determined that a number of items on the needs scale could either be deleted entirely or combined. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

Using this information, Bonta and Parkinson (1994) collapsed the risk and needs scale into one form and simplified the scoring. The combined risk/needs instrument was demonstrated to have greater predictive validity than either the risk or the needs scales on their own. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)

Modifications to the youth version of the instrument were more challenging, and continue to demonstrate a significantly lower ability to predict outcome both during the period of supervision and especially post-probation follow-up, than the adult version. The researchers concluded that there currently exists only weak empirical support for the use of the Wisconsin Risk/needs classification system with young offenders. (Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994) The changes in the instrument are summarized in the table below.

TABLE 1 – SUMMARY OF REVISIONS TO THE WISCONSIN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (As displayed by Bonta, Parkinson, and Barkwell, 1994)		
Year		
1982	1986	1994
11 risk items	9 risk items	7 risk items
12 need item	12 needs items	8 need items
Risk/needs separate	Risk/Needs separate	one form
Weighting Scores	Weighting Scores	0-1-2 Scoring

Bonta, LaPrairie and Wallace-Capretta, (1997) undertook the task of validating the

Revised Wisconsin Classification System on an aboriginal offender population using a

three year follow-up period. Using a Manitoba sample 903 offenders, they subdivided

their population into four groups; Metis/non status, Treaty On (living on a reserve at the

time of admission to probation) Treaty Off (Living off reserve at the time of probation

admission), and the non-aboriginal group. While Bonta et al, used both males and

females in their samples, they reported that the sample was composed of approximately

85% male offenders. The researchers concluded that the Revised Manitoba Classification

system was successful in predicting the recidivism rates for aboriginal offenders,

although not with the same consistency for all groups. The researchers identified that

aboriginal offenders had a significantly higher recidivism rate than their non-aboriginal

counterparts. Bonta et al, identified some anomies in their findings. Specifically, they

found that while the Treaty On group scored lowest on the risk/needs assessment, they

surpassed all of the divided groups in their recidivism rates. The researchers cautioned

that while the instrument may be a useful tool to use with the Metis/Non-status and

Treaty Off groups, it is less useful in predicting the recidivism of the Treaty On group.

(Bonta, LaPrairie and Wallace-Capretta, 1997)

HOW IS RISK/NEED CLASSIFICATION CONDUCTED?

In Manitoba, once an offender has been convicted, the court will order a pre-sentence

report, or as in the case of young offenders, a pre-disposition report. If not ordered by

the Court, Probation or institutional staff will complete a post-sentence/ post-disposition

report. The primary purpose of these reports are to provide a social history of the

offender and to locate the offender's law violating behaviour in context with the offender's typical conduct. Risk/needs assessments are completed as part of the pre-sentence/pre-disposition report.

The necessary information to complete the assessments is oobtained through interviews with the offender and collateral (family, employers, school personnel) victim interviews/ impact statements, psychological assessments, Child and Family Services, and finally a comprehensive file review. In the end, the correctional officer must evaluate the information, calculate risk, make recommendations for sentencing, and formulate an offender treatment plan.

The Manitoba Risk/Needs System has a number of components. While the present study will only look at the Primary Risk Assessment, as predictive of general recidivism, it is important to mention that there are additional sections designed specifically to measure violent recidivism, domestic violence and sexual recidivism as well as a risk management review that is administered to measure response to correctional treatment interventions.

Speaking strictly of the Primary Risk Assessment, an offender, once assessed, can be classified as low, medium or high risk for re-involvement. The Manitoba Risk/Needs System is administered twice, once at initial placement on probation, and once at termination. A score of 0-5 is classified as being low risk, scores of 6-11 are classified as medium, and scores of 12 and higher are classified as being high risk. (Bonta et al., 1994)

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions;

> ➤ Is the Primary Risk Assessment used by Manitoba Justice to classify offenders valid and reliable for female offenders

> ➤ Are all items on the scale relevant predictors for all groups under study (i.e. male, female, aboriginal and non-aboriginal groups of offenders)

> ➤ Does the combination of gender and race variables change the validity of the instrument.

> ➤ Are the same predictor variables equally important to male and female offenders, and to aboriginal non aboriginal offenders, and

> ➤ Is the Primary Risk Assessment a reliable tool for prediction of recidivism both during a period of supervision and beyond.

This inquiry sought to answer the above questions for both adult and youth offenders. It should be noted that there are slightly different version of the Primary Risk Assessment administered to adult offenders as compared youth offenders.

RESEARCH DESIGN/ METHODOLOGY

In order to execute this study, two data sets were obtained from Manitoba Justice containing information on adult and youth probationers from the years 1986-1992. This database was selected because it was the most current data on offenders available at the time this study was executed. Furthermore, this was the same data set used by Bonta et al when the instrument was modified and revalidated on a general offender population. As

described earlier in this report, Bonta and his colleagues used a sample 1,076 cases from the years 1990 – 1991 to conduct their study. It is this sample we have used to execute the present study.

The youth data set contains a sample of 595 young offenders from the years 1990-92. Once again, this was the sample used in this study to examine the ability of the revised Manitoba risk/needs Classification System to predict re-involvement rates for young female offenders and assess the strength of the relationship as compared to that of male offenders.

The analyses for both data sets were essentially the same. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and cross-tabulations were used to describe the population under study and to compare all items on the risk/needs scale with probation outcome, as well as reconviction after probation. The items on the scale were correlated with one another to determine they were measuring the same thing, in this case, recidivism. The groups under study were identified and separated, first by gender and then by aboriginal status.

The total risk scores were correlated with outcome variables to assess the strength of the relationship of the total scores with recidivism. The items which form the scale, were then correlated with the outcome variables to examine the psychometric value of the scale. This was performed for both Admission and Termination items. We then examined how each group was classified by risk measures and finally how each group performed on Probation.

In order to determine the PRA's predictive validity following a period of supervision,

data was provided containing information pertaining to criminal records from the RCMP.

New convictions formed the major outcome variable and the sample was followed for

over a 4 year period.

LIST OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES for Primary Risk Assessment (ADULTS & YOUTH)

    1.   The Primary Risk Assessment (Adult and Youth versions)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

1. Re- involvement as measured by conviction for a new offence both during Probation and up to four years following the completion of a probation order. (for both youth and adult offenders)

CONTROL VARIABLES

1. Gender
2. Ethnicity

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT OFFENDER POPULATION -

DEMOGRAPHICS

As stated above, the sample population of adult offenders was 1076 of which 885 were

male offenders and 191 were female offenders. The table below illustrates a clear

breakdown of the study groups separated.

TABLE 2 - NATIVE CANADIAN STATUS

SEX OF PROBATIONER		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
MALE	X-NATIVE	524	59.2%	59.2%	59.2%
	METIS-NT	117	13.2%	13.2%	72.4%
	TRTY-ON	145	16.4%	16.4%	88.8%
	TRTY-OFF	99	11.2%	11.2%	100.0%
	Total	885	100.0%	100.0%	
FEMALE	X-NATIVE	96	50.3%	50.3%	50.3%
	METIS-NT	31	16.2%	16.2%	66.5%
	TRTY-ON	28	14.7%	14.7%	81.2%
	TRTY-OFF	36	18.8%	18.8%	100.0%
	Total	191	100.0%	100.0%	

As we can see the majority of the population was male and Non-Aboriginal (59.9%).

While the sub sample sizes for the remainder of the populations were small, the results

from this study may serve as a useful guide for more in depth investigations into the issue

of validity.

TABLE 3 - AGE OF PROBATIONER

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	MEAN	N
MALES	27.8	885
FEMALES	29.9	191
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	28.4	524
MALE METIS	26.5	117
MALE TREATY ON	26.7	145
MALE TREATY OFF	27.8	99
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	31.0	96
FEMALE METIS	29.0	31
FEMALE TREATY ON	27.5	28
FEMALE TREATY OFF	29.7	36
NON-ABORIGINAL	28.8	620
METIS	27.0	148
TREATY ON	26.8	173
TREATY OFF	28.3	135

Summarizing the above results, we can see that offenders in all sub- populations average in their late twenties. Female offenders on average were slightly older than their male counterparts (29.9 versus 27.8). As well the Non-Aboriginal (28.8) and Treaty Off (28.3) populations were slightly older than the Metis (27.0) and Treaty On (26.8) groups.

TABLE 4 – ADDRESS CHANGES IN THE PREVIOUS 12 MOTHS

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % - (One or more address changes)	N
MALES	63.8%	885
FEMALES	56.5%	191
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	66.6%	524
MALE METIS	62.4%	117
MALE TREATY ON	41.3%	145
MALE TREATY OFF	83.8%	99
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	54.2%	96
FEMALE METIS	48.4%	31
FEMALE TREATY ON	46.4%	28
FEMALE TREATY OFF	77.8%	36
NON-ABORIGINAL	64.7%	620
METIS	59.4%	148
TREATY ON	42.2%	173
TREATY OFF	82.2%	135

While the overall sample population was clearly a highly transient one, our results indicate that offenders in the Treaty Off group appear to be most transient of all other groups under study. Furthermore male offenders in the sample reported a greater number of address changes than their female offender counterparts.

TABLE 5 – DRUG/ALCOHOL USE OF PROBATIONER

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (No use of drugs/ alcohol)	N
MALES	53.2%	885
FEMALES	66.5%	191
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	59.7%	524
MALE METIS	42.7%	117
MALE TREATY ON	46.2%	145
MALE TREATY OFF	41.4%	99
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	76.0%	96
FEMALE METIS	64.5%	31
FEMALE TREATY ON	60.7%	28
FEMALE TREATY OFF	47.2%	36
NON-ABORIGINAL	62.3%	620
METIS	47.3%	148
TREATY ON	48.6%	173
TREATY OFF	43.0%	135

Our results further illustrate that male offenders in the sample were more likely to report regular drug use than female offenders, and Aboriginal offenders more so than non – Aboriginal offenders. The Treaty Off population was most likely to report regular use of drugs.

TABLE 6 – INCOME SOURCE AT ADMISSION

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Public Assistance)	N	MISSING
MALES	35.2%	862	23
FEMALES	49.7%	181	10
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	22.1%	515	9
MALE METIS	45.5%	112	5
MALE TREATY ON	61.3%	137	8
MALE TREATY OFF	55.1%	98	1
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	30.8%	91	5
FEMALE METIS	77.4%	31	0
FEMALE TREATY ON	52.0%	25	3
FEMALE TREATY OFF	73.5%	34	2
NON-ABORIGINAL	23.4%	606	14
METIS	52.4%	143	5
TREATY ON	59.9%	162	11
TREATY OFF	59.8%	132	3

Female offenders in the sample were more likely than male offenders to report public assistance as their primary source of income. As well, Aboriginal offenders were more likely to report a dependence on public assistance than their Non-Aboriginal counterparts. These results come as no surprise, as the research has consistently pointed to the growing femininization of poverty and the growing number of Aboriginal people dependent on the social welfare system for financial income.

TABLE 7 – GRADE IN OR HIGHEST ACHIEVED

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Completed Some high School)	Valid % (Graduated from Grade 12)	N	MISSING
OVERALL POPULATION	68.9%	4.5%	1039	37
MALES	70.0%	4.5%	851	34
FEMALES	63.8%	4.8%	188	3
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	77.2%	6.5%	509	15
MALE METIS	63.2%	.9%	117	0
MALE TREATY ON	51.1%	.8%	131	14
MALE TREATY OFF	66.0%	3.2%	94	5
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	74.7%	7.4%	95	1
FEMALE METIS	67.7%	0.0%	31	0
FEMALE TREATY ON	48.1%	3.7%	27	1
FEMALE TREATY OFF	42.9%	2.9%	35	1
NON-ABORIGINAL	76.8%	6.6%	604	16
METIS	64.2%	.7%	148	0
TREATY ON	50.6%	1.3%	158	15
TREATY OFF	59.7%	3.1%	129	6

Our results demonstrated that Non-Aboriginal offenders in the sample population were likely to have progressed further academically than their Aboriginal counterparts, with 6.6% of Non-Aboriginals having completed high school as compared with .7% of the Metis sub-group, 1.3% of the Treaty On sub-group and finally 3.1% of the Treaty Off group. The data however, informs that the majority of offenders regardless of sub-grouping, had not completed a grade 12 education.

Grouping the results from the next few tables together, we can see that male offenders in the sample were more likely to have had a previous conviction than female offenders and consequently are more likely to have had a previous probation sentence, previous

incarceration, and previous breaches.   Aboriginal offenders also were more likely to

have had prior involvement with the corrections system than their Non-Aboriginal

counterparts.

TABLE 8 – PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Previous Conviction)	N	MISSING
MALES	70.4%	820	65
FEMALES	59.3%	182	9
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	66.3%	498	26
MALE METIS	86.2%	109	8
MALE TREATY ON	63.8%	130	15
MALE TREATY OFF	84.3%	83	16
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	57.0%	93	3
FEMALE METIS	66.7%	30	1
FEMALE TREATY ON	26.9%	26	2
FEMALE TREATY OFF	84.8%	33	3
NON-ABORIGINAL	64.8%	591	29
METIS	82.0%	139	9
TREATY ON	57.7%	156	17
TREATY OFF	84.5%	116	19

TABLE 9 – PREVIOUS PROBATION

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Previous Probation)	N	MISSING
MALES	47.0%	885	0
FEMALES	33.0%	191	0
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	39.9%	524	0
MALE METIS	62.4%	117	0
MALE TREATY ON	51.7%	145	0
MALE TREATY OFF	62.6%	99	0
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	31.3%	96	0
FEMALE METIS	35.5%	31	0
FEMALE TREATY ON	14.3%	28	0
FEMALE TREATY OFF	50.0%	36	0
NON-ABORIGINAL	38.1%	620	0
METIS	56.8%	148	0
TREATY ON	45.7%	173	0
TREATY OFF	59.3%	135	0

TABLE 10 – PREVIOUS JAIL

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Previous Jail)	N	MISSING
MALES	33.9%	835	50
FEMALES	17.8%	185	6
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	29.7%	502	22
MALE METIS	43.1%	109	8
MALE TREATY ON	35.8%	134	11
MALE TREATY OFF	43.3%	90	9
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	9.7%	93	3
FEMALE METIS	20.0%	30	1
FEMALE TREATY ON	17.9%	28	0
FEMALE TREATY OFF	38.2%	34	2
NON-ABORIGINAL	26.6%	595	25
METIS	38.1%	139	9
TREATY ON	32.7%	162	11
TREATY OFF	41.9%	124	11

TABLE 11 – PREVIOUS BREACH

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	Valid % (Previous Breach)	N	MISSING
MALES	15.4%	850	35
FEMALES	15.5%	187	4
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	12.2%	508	16
MALE METIS	28.4%	109	8
MALE TREATY ON	14.4%	139	6
MALE TREATY OFF	19.1%	94	5
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	10.5%	95	1
FEMALE METIS	25.8%	31	0
FEMALE TREATY ON	14.3%	28	0
FEMALE TREATY OFF	21.2%	33	3
NON-ABORIGINAL	11.9%	603	17
METIS	27.9%	140	8
TREATY ON	14.4%	167	6
TREATY OFF	19.7%	127	8

To begin our analysis, a reliability test was run for both the admissions variables and the termination variables. The statistic Alpha was calculated first for the overall sample, and then for each categorical group. Overall, the admissions reliability coefficients for Alpha was .65. For the male offenders, the alpha was computed at .66, while the female offenders Alpha was .60. When dividing the groups further to compare the Aboriginal/ Non-Aboriginal groupings, we computer the alpha scores as follows;

TABLE 12 – ADMISSION ALPHA SCORES

	ALPHA SCORE	N
Male Non – Aboriginals	.63	524
Male Metis	.70	117
Male Treaty On	.67	145
Male Treaty Off	.67	99
Female Non – Aboriginal	.58	96
Female Metis	.58	31
Female Treaty On	.46	28
Female Treaty Off	.48	36
Overall alpha	.65	1076
Overall Male Alpha	.66	885
Overall Female Alpha	.60	191
Overall Alpha for Non – Aboriginal Group	.63	620
Overall Alpha for Metis Group	.69	148
Overall Alpha for Treaty On Group	.65	173
Overall Alpha for Treaty Off Group	.62	135

Similarly the table below shows the results of Alpha for the termination variables;

	ALPHA SCORE	N
TABLE 13 – TERMINATION ALPHA SCORES		
Male Non – Aboriginals	.78	524
Male Metis	.78	117
Male Treaty On	.73	145
Male Treaty Off	.66	99
Female Non – Aboriginal	.76	96
Female Metis	.68	31
Female Treaty On	.65	28
Female Treaty Off	.64	36
Overall alpha	.76	1076
Overall Male Alpha	.77	885
Overall Female Alpha	.72	191
Overall Alpha for Non – Aboriginal Group	.78	620
Overall Alpha for Metis Group	.77	148
Overall Alpha for Treaty On Group	.72	173
Overall Alpha for Treaty Off Group	.66	135

From the above results, we can see that both the admission and termination reliability scores are acceptable, however, do vary from group to group. We will now approach the issue of validity. While presenting the results of our analysis, we will first discuss the validity of the scale from the perspective of total scores obtained at both admissions and termination of Probation, and their correlation to the outcome variables. For the Adult Offender Analysis, the Total Scores available in the data set included; Admission Risk Score, Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, Classified Level at Admission and finally, the Termination Risk/Need Score. Our outcome variables included, Adult Outcome on Probation, in order to assess the validity of the scale for prediction of success during Probation. Reconviction and Re-incarceration for years one to four following probation

variables, served as our outcome criterion for the follow up period. After observing the correlations of the total scores by outcome data, we then analysed the psychometric validity of the scale by correlating each item on first the admission and then the termination scales by the outcome criterion.

After discussing the correlations, we then provide the data for how each sub population under study scored on the scales and follow that with the results of what actually occurred. That is, how each group under study performed both during probation and for the follow-up period. Should the instrument we are evaluating be valid for all groups under study, we would expect that the scores on the scale will be directly related to the behaviour being measured (recidivism). We conclude our analysis with a selection of items that may serve to improve the validity of the instrument.

CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME CRITERION

Correlations were computed to analyze the strength of the relationship between variables *Admission Risk Score, Level Indicated by Risk At Admission, Classified Level at Admissions*, and the *Termination Risk/Need score* by variables *Adult Outcome on Probation, Reconviction,* and *Re- incarceration* in years 1-4. This was done to assess the validity of the scale in predicting both outcome while on probation as well as the post probation reconviction rates. We found the following results;

	Reconviction					Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation N 1076	Year 1 N 1076	Year 2 N 1027	Year 3 N 913	Year 4+ N 870	Year 1 N 1076	Year 2 N 1027	Year 3 N 913	Year 4+ N 870
Admission Risk Score	-.26**	.20**	.24**	.23**	.22**	.26**	.28**	.27**	.26**
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions	-.25**	.20**	.24**	.23**	.23**	.21**	.23**	.22**	.20**
Classified level – Admissions	-.22**	.17**	.18**	.17**	.20**	.19**	.21**	.19**	.18**
Termination Risk/Need	-.29**	.21**	.25**	.27**	.22**	.22**	.22**	.23**	.22**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The above correlations demonstrate that the termination risk/need score is more strongly correlated with recidivism during probation and for reconviction in years 1-4. Re-incarceration variables were most strongly correlated with the admission risk score. We further found that all of the above risk scores were significantly correlated with all of the outcome variables, and produced correlations of acceptable strength. We ran these same correlations separating for all the categorical groups under study. The tables below report our results;

TABLE 15 - CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES SEPARATED BY CATEGORICAL GROUPS

		Reconviction				Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Admission Risk Score MALES	-.22** N 885	.19** N 885	.23** N 848	.22** N 758	.23** N 725	.24** N 885	.26** N 848	.25** N 758	.25** N 725
Level Indicated by Risk at Admission MALES	-.23** N 885	.21** N 885	.23** N 848	.22** N 758	.23** N 725	.20** N 885	.22** N 848	.20** N 758	.18** N 725
Classified level –Admission MALES	-.19** N 885	.17** N 885	.18** N 848	.16** N 758	.20** N 725	.18** N 885	.20** N 848	.16** N 758	.16** N 725
Risk/Need MALES	-.27** N 885	.21** N 885	.24** N 848	.26** N 758	.21** N 725	.21** N 885	.21** N .848	.21** N 758	.21** N 725
Admission Risk FEMALES	-.39** N 191	.14* N 191	.19** N 179	.15 N 155	.10 N 145	.29** N 191	.24** N 179	.27** N 155	.24** N 145
Level Indicated by Risk at Admission FEMALES	-.35** N 191	.10 N 191	.21** N 179	.16* N 155	.14 N 145	.17* N 191	.16* N 179	.18* N 155	.12 N 145
Classified level –Admission FEMALES	-.36** N 191	.08 N 191	.14 N 179	.11 N 155	.13 N 145	.20** N 191	.18* N 179	.20* N 155	.18* N 145
Risk/Need FEMALES	-.36** N 191	.09 N 191	.22** N 179	.20* N 155	.20* N 145	.19* N 191	.18* N 179	.20* N 155	.19* N 145
Admission Risk MALES NON ABORIGINAL	-.19** N 524	.14** N 524	.22** N 499	.23** N 445	.28** N 420	.20** N 524	.25** N 499	.24** N 445	.26** N 420
Level Indicated by Risk at Admission MALES NON-ABORIGINAL	-.23** N 524	.18** N 524	.23** N 499	.24** N 445	.27** N 420	.19** N 524	.22** N 499	.21** N 445	.22** N 420
Classified level –Admissions MALES NON-ABORIGINAL	-.20** N 524	.14** N 524	.20** N 499	.18** N 445	.24** N 20	.16** N 524	.22** N 499	.18** N 445	.20** N 420
Risk/Need MALES NON-ABORIGINAL	-.28** N	.23** N 524	.28** N 499	.31** N 445	.29** N 420	.23** N 524	.25** N 499	.25** N 445	.27** N 420

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

65

TABLE 15 - CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES SEPARATED BY CATEGORICAL GROUPS

	Reconviction					Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Admission Risk MALES METIS	-.32** N 117	.27** N 117	.21* N 114	.16 N 100	.08 N 97	.37** N 117	.33** N 114	.32** N 100	.31** N 97
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions MALES METIS	-.22* N 117	.24** N 117	.23* N 114	.13 N 100	.17 N 97	.30** N 117	.29** N 114	.25* N 100	.23* N 97
Classified level –Admissions MALES METIS	-.11 N 117	.16 N 117	.11 N 114	.12 N 100	.18 N 97	.26** N 117	.25** N 114	.27** N 100	.21* N 97
Risk/Need MALES METIS	-.34** N 117	.25** N 117	.26** N 114	.28** N 100	.10 N 97	.27** N 117	.24** N 114	.26** N 100	.24* N 97
Admission Risk MALES TREATY ON	-.27** N 145	.30** N 145	.27** N 140	.24** N 129	.19* N 126	.25** N 145	.24** N 140	.20* N 129	.16 N 126
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions MALES TREATY ON	-.22** N 145	.25** N 145	.27** N 140	.21* N 129	.24** N 126	.15 N 145	.18* N 140	.11 N 129	.07 N 126
Classified level –Admissions MALES TREATY ON	-.16* N 145	.31** N 145	.21* N 140	.14 N 129	.15 N 126	.20* N 145	.12 N 140	.07 N 129	.03 N 126
Risk/Need MALES TREATY ON	-.22** N 145	.24** N 145	.18* N 140	.20* N 129	.09 N 126	.22** N 145	.14 N 140	.13 N 129	.11 N 126
Admission Risk MALES TREATY OFF	-.18 N 99	.09 N 99	.18 N 95	.13 N 84	-.00 N 82	.18 N 99	.29** N 95	.27* N 84	.18 N 82
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions MALES TREATY OFF	-.16 N 99	.18 N 99	.16 N 95	.10 N 84	-.05 N 82	.19 N 99	.23* N 95	.18 N 84	.07 N 82
Classified level –Admissions MALES TREATY OFF	-.13 N 99	.13 N 99	.06 N 95	.07 N 84	-.08 N 82	.14 N 99	.19 N 95	.14 N 84	.08 N 82

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 15 - CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES SEPARATED BY CATEGORICAL GROUPS

	Reconviction					Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Risk/Need MALES TREATY OFF	-.14 N 99	.08 N 99	.13 N 95	.12 N 84	-.00 N 82	.07 N 99	.15 N 95	.13 N 84	.01 N 82
Admission Risk FEMALE NON ABORIGINAL	-.43** N 96	.08 N 96	.05 N 86	-.01 N 73	-.09 N 68	.09 N 96	.05 N 86	.05 N 73	.05 N 68
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL	-.42** N 96	.04 N 96	.13 N 86	.07 N 73	.02 N 68	-.00 N 96	.00 N 86	-.01 N 73	-.01 N 73
Classified level –Admissions FEMALES NON – ABORIGINAL	-.47** N 96	-.02 N 96	.05 N 86	.01 N 73	-.03 N 68	-.03 N 96	-.03 N 86	-.03 N 73	-.03 N 68
Risk/Need FEMALES NON-ABORIGINAL	-.44** N 96	.13 N 96	.14 N 86	.10 N 73	.06 N 68	.25* N 96	.25* N 86	.26* N 73	.26* N 68
Admission Risk FEMALES METIS	-.24 N 31	.23 N 31	.22 N 30	.20 N 25	.25 N 23	.49** N 31	.50** N 30	.54** N 25	.31 N 23
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions FEMALE METIS	-.18 N 31	.08 N 31	.16 N 30	.17 N 25	.26 N 23	.33 N 31	.33 N 30	.34 N 25	.14 N 23
Classified level –Admissions FEMALES METIS	-.09 N 31	.09 N 31	.08 N 30	.07 N 25	.31 N 23	.37* N 31	.37* N 30	.39 N 25	.35 N 23
Risk/Need FEMALES METIS	-.28 N 31	.09 N 31	.12 N 30	.22 N 25	.53** N 23	.27 N 31	.29 N 30	.40* N 25	.26 N 23
Admission Risk FEMALES TREATY ON	-.30 N 28	-.03 N 28	.05 N 28	-.06 N 27	-.15 N 25	.a N 28	-.11 N 28	-.12 N 27	-.11 N 25
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions FEMALE TREATY ON	-.27 N 28	.08 N 28	.15 N 28	.08 N 27	.00 N 25	.a N 28	.07 N 28	.06 N 27	-.11 N 25

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

67

TABLE 15 - CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES SEPARATED BY CATEGORICAL GROUPS

	Reconviction					Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Classified level –Admissions FEMALES TREATY ON	-.24 N 28	.06 N 28	.12 N 28	.04 N 27	.04 N 25	.a N 28	.06 N 28	.06 N 27	-.13 N 25
Risk/Need FEMALES TREATY ON	-.13 N 28	-.16 N 28	-.01 N 28	-.09 N 27	-.14 N 25	.a N 28	.06 N 28	.05 N 27	.06 N 25
Admission Risk FEMALES TREATY OFF	-.55** N 36	.12 N 36	.33 N 35	.24 N 30	.20 N 29	.36* N 36	.36* N 35	.43* N 30	.51** N 29
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions FEMALE TREATY OFF	-.41* N 36	.07 N 36	.25 N 35	.10 N 30	.12 N 29	.27 N 36	.26 N 35	.30 N 30	.35 N 29
Classified level –Admissions FEMALES TREATY OFF	-.39* N 36	.13 N 36	.21 N 35	.03 N 30	.12 N 29	.39* N 36	.39* N 35	.43* N 30	.48** N 29
Risk/Need FEMALES TREATY OFF	-.39* N 36	-.08 N 36	.24 N 35	.08 N 30	.02 N 29	-.09 N 36	-.09 N 35	-.16 N 30	-.09 N 29
Admission Risk NON ABORIGINALS	-.23** N 620	.15** N 620	.22** N 585	.22** N 518	.25** N 488	.21** N 620	.25** N 585	.25** N 518	.26** N 488
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions NON-ABORIGINAL	-.27** N 620	.18** N 620	.24** N 585	.24** N 518	.26** N 488	.19** N 620	.22** N 585	.21** N 518	.22** N 488
Classified level –Admissions NON-ABORIGINAL	-.25* N 620	.13** N 620	.20** N 585	.18** N 518	.22** N 488	.16** N 620	.21** N 585	.18** N 518	.20** N 488
Risk/Need NON-ABORIGINAL	-.31** N 620	.23** N 620	.28** N 585	.30** N 518	.28** N 488	.25** N 620	.27** N 585	.27** N 518	.29** N 488
Admission Risk METIS	-.32** N 148	.28** N 148	.24** N 144	.21* N 125	.16 N 120	.40** N 148	.37** N 144	.37** N 125	.33** N 120

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

68

	Reconviction					Re-incarceration			
	Adult Outcome on Probation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions METIS	-.23** N 148	.22** N 148	.24** N 144	.19* N 125	.23* N 120	.32** N 148	.31** N 144	.29** N 125	.24** N 120
Classified level –Admissions METIS	-.13 N 148	.16 N 148	.14 N 144	.16 N 125	.23* N 120	.29** N 148	.29** N 144	.31** N 125	.26** N 120
Risk/Need METIS	-.35** N 148	.24** N 148	.26** N 144	.31** N 125	.20* N 120	.29** N 148	.27** N 144	.31** N 125	.27** N 120
Admission Risk TREATY ON	-.25** N 173	.29** N 173	.29** N 168	.25** N 156	.18* N 151	.28** N 173	.26** N 168	.23** N 156	.19* N 151
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions TREATY ON	-.21** N 173	.26** N 173	.29** N 168	.24** N 156	.22** N 151	.18* N 173	.21** N 168	.16* N 156	.10 N 151
Classified level –Admissions TREATY ON	-.17* N 173	.29** N 173	.23** N 168	.17* N 156	.16 N 151	.21** N 173	.15 N 168	.11 N 156	.05 N 151
Risk/Need TREATY ON	-.20** N 173	.22** N 173	.18* N 168	.19* N 156	.08 N 151	.23** N 173	.16* N 168	.16* N 156	.13 N 151
Admission Risk TREATY OFF	-.28** N 135	.11 N 135	.22* N 130	.16 N 114	.05 N 111	.23** N 135	.33** N 130	.32** N 114	.28** N 111
Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions TREATY OFF	-.23** N 135	.15 N 135	.18* N 130	.10 N 114	-.00 N 111	.22* N 135	.26** N 130	.22* N 114	.16 N 111
Classified level –Admissions TREATY OFF	-.20* N 135	.13 N 135	.11 N 130	.06 N 114	-.02 N 111	.21 N 135	.26** N 130	.22* N 114	.19* N 111
Risk/Need TREATY OFF	-.20* N 135	.05 N 135	.16 N 130	.11 N 114	.00 N 111	.04 N 135	.12 N 130	.08 N 114	-.01 N 111

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The above correlations demonstrate that the validity of the assessments vary dramatically from group to group, however, this may be due to the small samples within the various

categories. Summarizing the major trends in the above data we, will discuss the trends produced by each risk score separately.

THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE

For the Admission Risk Score, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores than male offenders for variable; Adult Outcome on Probation. Male offenders however, produced stronger correlations for reconviction variables. No dramatic difference was observed between the correlations for male and female re-incarceration rates.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we find for male offenders the Admission risk score produced correlation scores within acceptable ranges for the male Non-Aboriginal, male Metis, and male Treaty On groups, however the scores were far lower for the male Treaty Off group. For female offender groupings, we found acceptable correlation scores for variable: Adult Outcome on Probation, however the correlations scores for reconviction and re-incarceration variables were less consistent. We did not observe strong correlations between the admission risk score and reconviction or re-incarceration variables for the female Non-Aboriginal and female Treaty On groups. For the female Metis group correlations were all within an acceptable range, however were strongest for the re-incarceration variables. Finally, for the female Treaty Off group we observed acceptable correlation scores for all but the variables reconviction in years 1 and 2.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced strongest correlations for the Metis and Treaty On groups.

LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK AT ADMISSION

For the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation, however male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction and re-incarceration variables.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we find for male offenders the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission produced strongest correlation scores for the male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups, however scores began to drop for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender groupings, we found an acceptable range of correlations for Adult Outcome on Probation however only female Metis and Treaty Off groups produced acceptable correlations for any of the post probation outcome variables. This was primarily observed for the re-incarceration variables. Correlations for female Non-Aboriginal and Treaty On groups were unimpressive.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the non- Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty On groups, however were slightly lower for the Treaty Off group.

CLASSIFIED LEVEL -ADMISSION

For the Classified Level at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation, however male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction variables. We observed no dramatic difference in correlation scores for re-incarceration.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we find for male offenders the Classified Level at Admission produced strongest correlation scores for the male Non-Aboriginal group. Correlations were in an acceptable range for the male Metis re-incarceration variables only, and the correlation strength diminished dramatically for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender groupings, we found acceptable correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation for female Non-Aboriginal, Treaty On and Treaty Off groups, however not for the female Metis group. Additionally for the post probation follow up period, we observed strong correlations only for female Metis and Treaty Off groups and only for the re-incarceration variables.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the non- Aboriginal group. Correlations were less consistent for the other male groups. Specifically, the Metis group produced acceptable range of correlations only for variable reconvicted in year 4 and for the re-incarceration variables. For the Treaty On group we observed acceptable correlations for reconviction variables and re-incarceration in year 1. Finally for the Treaty Off group we found acceptable

correlations for variables: Adult Outcome on Probation, and the re-incarceration variables.

RISK/NEED SCORE

For the Classified Level at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation. While male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction/re-incarceration variables the scores were not dramatically distinguishable.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we find for male offenders the risk/need score produced strongest correlation scores for the male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups. Correlations were lower for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender groupings, we found that variable: Adult Outcome on Probation produced strong correlation scores for female Non-Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty Off groups, but not for the Treaty On group. For the post probation follow up period, we found acceptable correlation scores for female Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups and we only found this for the re-incarceration variables.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the non- Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty On groups, however were slightly lower for the Treaty Off group.

CORRELATION OF ADMISSION/TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME

CRITERION

For the next section we separate the scale to take a closer look at how each item on the scale correlates with variables Adult Outcome on Probation, Reconviction and Re-incarceration for each of the categorical groups under study. We begin with a presentation of the data for the overall sample population and then separate the groups first by gender then by gender and ethnicity and finally by ethnicity alone.

Admission Item	Adult Outcome On Probation N 1076	Re-convicted Year 1 N 1076	Re-convicted Year 2 N 1027	Re-convicted Year 3 N 913	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 870	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 1076	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 1027	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 913	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 870
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21**	.08*	.12**	.12**	.09*	.12**	.15**	.16**	.17**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.19**	.11**	.16**	.15**	.11**	.09**	.12**	.11**	.08*
Attitude to Probation	-.18**	.13**	.13**	.12**	.13**	.11**	.12**	.11**	.12**
Age	.14**	-.16**	-.19**	-.19**	-.19**	-.12**	-.13**	-.12**	-.11**
Sex	.05	-.09**	-.11**	-.14**	-.12**	-.11**	-.14**	-.16**	-.15**
Prior Convictions	-.18**	.12**	.15**	.19**	.17**	.15**	.15**	.16**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.20**	.14**	.18**	.17**	.13**	.19**	.18**	.16**	.15**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.06	.05	.03	.02	.04	.03	.02	.01	.03
Financial Management	-.11**	.12**	.12**	.15**	.13**	.12**	.11**	.11**	.09**
Emotional Stability	-.06*	.03	-.01	-.01	-.02	.04	.01	.01	.00
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.08**	.07*	.06*	.07*	.05	.07*	.05	.07*	.05
Peer and Companions	-.19**	.16**	.21**	.19**	.18**	.15**	.17**	.16**	.15**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.11**	.07*	.09**	.10**	.08*	.06	.07*	.07*	.06
Employment	-.16**	.15**	.16**	.19**	.17**	.17**	.16**	.16**	.14**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.01	.06	.03	.03	.03	.02	.01	.02	.02

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The above data demonstrates that nearly all item on the scale are significantly correlated

with the outcome variables, however not strongly. Items that did not produce a

75

significant correlation were variables: Family/Marital Relations and Academic/vocational Skills.

TABLE 17 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 885	Re-convicted Year 1 N 885	Re-convicted Year 2 N 848	Re-convicted Year 3 N 758	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 725	Re-incarcerated Year 1 885	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 848	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 758	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 725
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.19**	.10**	.15**	.16**	.12**	.12**	.16**	.17**	.17**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.19**	.12**	.16**	.14**	.12**	.09*	.11**	.10**	.07
Attitude to Probation	-.18**	.13**	.13**	.12**	.13**	.10**	.12**	.11**	.11**
Age	.13**	-.17**	-.21**	-.23**	-.20**	-.11**	-.13**	-.12**	-.11**
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.16**	.12**	.12**	.15**	.15**	.14**	.14**	.14**	.13**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.14**	.17**	.15**	.12**	.20**	.18**	.16**	.15**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.05	.06	.03	.01	.02	.04	.03	.02	.04
Financial Management	-.12**	.13**	.10**	.13**	.11**	.13**	.10**	.10**	.10**
Emotional Stability	-.07	.03	-.01	.00	-.02	.03	.00	-.00	-.01
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.08*	.08*	.06	.06	.04	.08*	.06	.07	.06
Peer and Companions	-.20**	.16**	.21**	.21**	.17**	.15**	.17**	.16**	.14**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.12**	.07*	.09**	.11**	.10**	.06	.08*	.08*	.08*
Employment	-.15**	.17**	.15**	.20**	.18**	.16**	.15**	.16**	.14**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.00	.07*	.04	.03	.02	.03	.01	.02	.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

76

For male offenders, we see generally the same results as that observed for the overall population. Variables Family/Marital Relations and Emotional stability failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables.

TABLE 18 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 191	Re-convicted Year 1 N 191	Re-convicted Year 2 N 179	Re-convicted Year 3 N 155	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 145	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 191	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 179	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 155	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 145
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.30**	-.06	-.03	-.08	-.09	.09	.07	.09	.15
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.17*	.00	.09	.13	.04	.08	.08	.06	.02
Attitude to Probation	-.18*	.11	.10	.09	.12	.16*	.15*	.15	.18*
Age	.20**	-.06	-.05	.01	-.09	-.10	-.10	-.06	-.07
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.27**	.08	.19*	.28**	.23**	.14	.17*	.20*	.11
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16*	.08	.19*	.18*	.15	.12	.12	.10	.09
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14	.04	.07	.09	.16	.07	.05	.06	.08
Financial Management	-.10	.14	.24**	.26**	.27**	.14	.17*	.19*	.10
Emotional Stability	-.05	.05	-.00	.01	.02	.10	.11	.13	.14
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.09	-.00	.07	.10	.09	-.06	-.06	.04	.01
Peer and Companions	-.13	.08	.14	.09	.21*	.10	.11	.08	.14
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.08	-.02	.01	-.02	-.06	-.07	-.10	-.12	-.13
Employment	-.19*	.04	.17*	.13	.13	.16*	.15*	.18*	.13
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.02	-.01	.01	.04	.12	-.04	-.05	.07	.15

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

We can observe from the above results that a far greater number of items fail to be significantly correlated with the outcome variables for female offenders as compared to their male offender counterparts. Variables Family/Marital Relations, Emotional Stability, Mental Ability, Drugs and Alcohol, and Academic/Vocational skills all failed to demonstrate significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. All of the remaining items, while demonstrating significant relationships for some of the outcome variable, rarely meet statistical significance for all outcome variables.

TABLE 19 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 524	Re-convicted Year 1 N 524	Re-convicted Year 2 N 499	Re-convicted Year 3 N 445	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 420	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 524	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 499	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 445	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 420
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.16**	.11*	.15**	.20**	.16**	.15**	.18**	.20**	.22**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.23**	.15**	.19**	.15**	.13**	.12**	.14**	.12**	.11*
Attitude to Probation	-.19**	.16**	.17**	.15**	.17**	.17**	.16**	.15**	.17**
Age	.14**	-.12**	-.16**	-.19**	-.16**	-.08	-.11*	-.12*	-.12*
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.10*	.15*	.18**	.20**	.11*	.16**	.15**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.09*	.14**	.18**	.16**	.15**	.17**	.18**	.18**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.02	.08	.04	.04	.08	.06	.04	.02	.05
Financial Management	-.11**	.17**	.18**	.20**	.18**	.13**	.11*	.12**	.14**
Emotional Stability	-.02	.05	.01	.03	.03	.06	.02	.01	.02
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.10*	.09*	.07	.07	.04	.10	.07	.07	.06
Peer and Companions	-.18**	.16**	.24**	.25**	.20**	.12**	.16**	.15**	.15**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.14**	.06	.11*	.12*	.14**	.03	.07	.06	.08
Employment	-.19**	.15**	.17**	.21**	.20**	.17**	.17**	.19**	.19**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.02	.03	.02	.03	.02	.07	.04	.07	.06

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Male Non-Aboriginal offenders demonstrate the same trend as observed for the overall male offender population, with only 3 items on the scale failing to produce significant correlations. These items were: Family/Marital Relations, Emotional Stability and

79

Academic/Vocational Skills.

TABLE 20 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION								

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 117	Re-convicted Year 1 N 117	Re-convicted Year 2 N 114	Re-convicted Year 3 N 100	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 97	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 117	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 114	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 100	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 97
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.26**	.28**	.29**	.23**	.17	.20*	.20*	.19	.20
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.18*	.06	.13	.15	.19	.14	.17	.22*	.18
Attitude to Probation	-.17	.11	.08	.06	.04	.06	.03	.03	.05
Age	.18	-.15	-.22*	-.22*	-.18	-.13	-.16	-.11	-.09
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.21*	.16	.20*	.24*	.10	.20*	.15	.19	.16
Type of Prior Conviction	-.28**	.24**	.28**	.19	.14	.30*	.27**	.20	.18
Family/ Marital Relations	-.19*	.13	.13	.08	.00	.09	.09	.07	.09
Financial Management	-.13	.13	.12	.18	.11	.21*	.19*	.18	.16
Emotional Stability	-.28**	.19*	.15	.13	-.02	-.19*	.20*	.19	.12
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.10	.13	.06	.18	.13	.08	.06	.18	.15
Peer and Companions	-.26**	.23*	.18	.10	.04	.27**	.25**	.26**	.24*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.16	.09	.08	.07	-.11	.14	.14	.12	.11
Employment	-.13	.15	.06	.13	.11	.24**	.18	.18	.13
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.03	.00	-.06	-.10	-.09	-.00	-.02	-.03	-.06

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Metis offender population we found 4 items that failed to produce

significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were; Attitude to

Probation, Mental Ability, Drugs/Alcohol use, and Academic/Vocational skills.

TABLE 21 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 145	Re-convicted Year 1 N 145	Re-convicted Year 2 N 140	Re-convicted Year 3 N 129	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 126	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 145	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 140	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 129	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 126
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.18*	.10	.13	.22*	.14	.08	.11	.16	.13
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.05	.10	.13	.12	-.01	-.04	.01	-.03	-.07
Attitude to Probation	-.16	.11	.10	.06	.06	.08	.11	.10	.08
Age	.09	-.29**	-.34**	-.34**	-.36**	-.16	-.13	-.10	-.08
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.16	.16	.06	.09	.03	.15	.12	.12	.10
Type of Prior Conviction	-.13	.31**	.25**	.09	.03	.25**	.16	.07	.06
Family/ Marital Relations	-.02	.08	.03	.01	-.04	.05	.00	.03	.04
Financial Management	-.05	.13	-.11	-.05	-.04	.11	-.01	.01	.03
Emotional Stability	-.08	-.03	-.08	-.00	.04	-.01	-.07	-.03	-.04
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.04	.03	.00	-.02	-.08	.10	.04	.04	.03
Peer and Companions	-.19*	.13	.17*	.15	.18*	.13	.13	.08	.05
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.10	.08	.07	.06	.04	.15	.10	.08	.08
Employment	-.06	.18*	.09	.14	.07	.13	.04	.04	.02
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.04	.03	-.06	-.04	-.11	-.05	-.09	-.08	-.09

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Departing drastically from what we observed for the general male offender population,

we find that for male Treaty On offenders almost no item on the scale demonstrated

81

significant correlations with outcome variables. In fact, only items; Address Changes, Age, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Employment produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables.

TABLE 22 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 95	Re-convicted Year 3 N 84	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 82	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 99	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 95	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 84	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 82
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.22*	.07	.22*	-.02	-.06	.16	.24*	.17	.10
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.16	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.14	-.01	-.06	-.06	-.15
Attitude to Probation	-.09	.07	.09	.11	.03	-.08	.03	.00	-.04
Age	.06	-.18	-.24*	-.23*	-.17	-.11	-.12	-.12	-.05
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.01	.08	-.10	-.05	-.10	.20**	.07	.09	.03
Type of Prior Conviction	-.22*	.12	.15	.13	.06	.30**	.23*	.22*	.16
Family/ Marital Relations	-.06	-.04	.02	.00	-.01	-.05	.07	.07	.03
Financial Management	-.14	.02	.14	.08	-.05	.10	.19	.11	.01
Emotional Stability	-.06	.09	.08	.09	.05	-.05	.02	.00	-.03
Mental Ability of Probationer	.02	.12	.12	.05	.12	.03	.07	.04	.02
Peer and Companions	-.26**	.03	.05	-.01	-.09	.09	.14	.10	.03
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.06	-.05	-.06	.05	-.03	-.15	-.07	-.01	-.07
Employment	-.10	.12	.15	.13	.08	.06	.13	.06	-.03
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.08	.21*	.23*	.18	.13	-.01	.04	.00	-.02

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Male Treaty Off offenders show closest resemblance to trends observed with the male Treaty On group, than those for male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups. Again we can see that very few items on the scale show a significant relationship to the outcome variables, and those that do are not consistently significant with all outcome variables. The 5 items that do show significant relationships are; Address Changes, Age, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Academic/Vocational skills.

We should not be surprised by the above results, the trends observed on the item analysis were similar to that observed for the total scores. While many of the items on the scale produced significant correlations for the male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups, the number of items found to be significantly correlated with outcome variables were diminished for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. We will now discuss the trends observed for the female offender samples.

TABLE 23 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 96	Re-convicted Year 1 N 96	Re-convicted Year 2 N 86	Re-convicted Year 3 N 73	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 68	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 96	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 86	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 73	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 68
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.20**	-.10	-.19	-.28*	-.30*	.05	-.01	-.03	.05
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.15	.01	.07	.11	-.06	.13	.19	.22	.15
Attitude to Probation	-.24*	-.06	-.17	-.13	-.08	.09	.05	.08	.14
Age	.18	-.08	-.01	.09	-.03	-.16	-.16	-.17	-.21
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.25*	.15	.28**	.28*	.18	.04	.09	.09	.02
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16	.06	.26*	.19	.07	.03	.08	.08	.11
Family/ Marital Relations	-.27**	.10	.20	.25*	.29*	.17	.21	.23	.26*
Financial Management	-.27**	.14	.20	.19	.13	.16	.19	.20	.11
Emotional Stability	-.14	.24*	.10	.08	.12	.11	.06	.05	.00
Mental Ability of Probationer	.01	-.08	-.09	-.11	.03	-.04	-.03	-.04	-.05
Peer and Companions	-.16	.12	.06	.01	.06	.20*	.16	.16	.26*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.13	.12	.08	.07	.12	.11	.07	.06	.03
Employment	-.11	-.02	.10	.02	-.03	.12	.18	.17	.11
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Similar to the trend we observed for the general female offender sample, we see that for

female Non-Aboriginal offenders many of the items on the scale show no significant

relationship with any of the outcome variables. Variables % of Time employed, Age, Mental Ability, Drugs/Alcohol use, Employment, and Academic/Vocational skills all fail to produce significant correlations. The items remaining only demonstrate significant correlations with some of the outcome variables. We must be cautious about relying exclusively on whether significance is established. As we discussed earlier in the report the sample sizes for female offenders are dramatically smaller than those for male offenders. Examining the above correlation scores, we find that the scores are of comparable strength to that observed for male offenders.

TABLE 24 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 31	Re-convicted Year 1 N 31	Re-convicted Year 2 N 30	Re-convicted Year 3 N 25	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 23	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 31	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 30	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 25	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 23
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.35	.07	.04	.03	.06	.24	.26	.32	.20
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.25	-.06	.04	.01	-.02	.01	.02	.04	-.08
Attitude to Probation	.11	.12	.06	.10	.30	.63**	.63**	.77**	.81**
Age	.25	-.11	-.13	-.06	-.29	-.11	-.12	-.12	-.23
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.24	.08	.15	.27	.56**	.20	.20	.24	.08
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21	.21	.30	.39	.41	.25	.27	.28	.15
Family/ Marital Relations	.29	-.12	-.21	-.20	-.02	-.10	-.09	-.11	.01
Financial Management	-.06	.21	.30	.39	.56**	.25	.27	.28	.08
Emotional Stability	.21	-.21	-.24	-.10	-.34	-.10	-.11	-.13	-.18
Mental Ability of Probationer	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Peer and Companions	.03	-.18	-.11	-.16	.28	.03	.02	.04	.22
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.14	-.12	-.15	-.19	-.14	-.18	-.18	-.19	-.24
Employment	-.37*	.21	.30	.34	.70**	.25	.27	.33	.18
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.10	-.10	-.11	-.15	.17	-.05	-.05	-.06	-.08

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For female Metis offenders a large number of items on the scale fail to produce

significant correlations with outcome criterion. Only items Attitude to Probation, Prior

Convictions, Financial Management, Mental Ability, and Employment showed a

significant relationship to the outcome criterion. Here again, however, we find that the

correlation scores are of sufficient strength to be considered, and our inability to produce

a significant relationship may well be the result of a small sample size.

TABLE 25 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 28	Re-convicted Year 1 N 28	Re-convicted Year 2 N 28	Re-convicted Year 3 N 27	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 25	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 28	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 28	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 27	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 25
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21	-.01	-.01	-.16	-.17	.a	.08	.07	.32
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.13	.20	.02	.21	.10	.a	-.13	-.14	-.22
Attitude to Probation	.17	.07	.16	.02	-.03	.a	.20	.19	.01
Age	.34	.00	-.10	-.26	-.37	.a	.09	.08	-.05
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.29	.01	.18	.05	-.24	.a	.28	.28	.09
Type of Prior Conviction	-.09	.10	.13	.20	.51**	.a	-.11	-.12	.14
Family/ Marital Relations	-.10	-.21	-.43**	-.47*	-.36	.a	-.21	-.22	-.33
Financial Management	.10	.04	.28	.26	.36	.a	.21	.20	-.01
Emotional Stability	.19	-.36	-.31	-.27	-.07	.a	.28	.28	.39
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.26	-.10	-.13	-.16	-.25	.a	-.04	-.04	-.60
Peer and Companions	.14	-.06	.07	.15	.33	.a	.24	.26	.06
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.11	-.13	-.06	-.19	-.33	.a	-.14	-.15	-.01
Employment	-.11	.08	.18	.17	-.10	.a	-.17	-.18	-.26
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.14	-.10	-.13	-.16	-.25	.a	-.04	-.04	-.06

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For female Treaty On offenders, only 2 items on the scale produced significant correlations with the outcome variables. These items were Type of Prior Conviction and Family/Marital Relations. While the remainder of the items failed to produce a significant relationship, the strength of the correlation scores are comparable that that observed for other female offender samples.

TABLE 26 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 36	Re-convicted Year 1 N 36	Re-convicted Year 2 N 35	Re-convicted Year 3 N 30	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 29	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 36	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 35	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 30	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 29
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.29	-.33*	-.11	-.24	-.07	-.07	-.07	-.06	.01
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.18	-.22	.08	-.09	-.01	-.20	-.03	-.18	-.09
Attitude to Probation	-.39*	.31	.46**	.28	.28	-.03	-.03	-.15	-.12
Age	.13	.06	-.05	.20	.25	-.04	-.04	.13	.30
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.39*	.17	.26	.29	.35	.17	.18	.20	.20
Type of Prior Conviction	-.27	.10	.15	.18	.08	.20	.21	.12	.02
Family/ Marital Relations	-.03	-.02	.13	-.12	-.09	-.21	-.21	-.42*	-.37*
Financial Management	.20	.10	.12	.16	.17	.00	.01	.04	.09
Emotional Stability	-.04	.10	-.03	.03	.08	.20	.19	.30	.36
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.10	.03	.11	.29	.21	-.16	-.16	.04	-.01
Peer and Companions	-.30	.14	.31	-.05	-.14	-.02	-.03	-.22	-.17
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.17	-.27	-.16	-.16	-.50**	-.34*	-.33	-.38*	-.44*
Employment	-.26	-.14	.08	.02	.14	.14	.15	.21	.29
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.08	-.04	-.03	.04	.18	-.13	-.13	.09	.29

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty Off group, we found only 4 items demonstrated significant correlations with outcome variables. These items were Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Family/Marital Relations, and Drugs/Alcohol use. Again, many of the items that did not produce significant correlations, produced scores of sufficient strength to be comparable to other female offender groups.

TABLE 27 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 620	Re-convicted Year 1 N 620	Re-convicted Year 2 N 585	Re-convicted Year 3 N 518	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 488	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 620	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 585	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 518	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 488
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.19**	.09*	.11**	.15**	.10*	.14**	.17**	.19**	.21**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.23**	.14*	.18**	.16**	.12**	.13**	.15**	.15**	.13**
Attitude to Probation	-.20**	.13**	.13**	.13**	.15**	.17**	.16**	.16**	.17**
Age	.15**	-.12**	-.15**	-.16**	-.15**	-.09*	-.12**	-.13**	-.14**
Sex	.07	-.10*	-.12**	-.14**	-.15**	-.09*	-.12**	-.14**	-.14**
Prior Convictions	-.19**	.11**	.17**	.20**	.21**	.11**	.16**	.15**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.20**	.09*	.16**	.18**	.14**	.13**	.16**	.17**	.17**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.05	.09*	.07	.07	.11*	.07	.06	.04	.07
Financial Management	-.14**	.16*	.18**	.19**	.17**	.13**	.12**	.13**	.13**
Emotional Stability	-.04	.07	.02	.04	.04	.07	.02	.01	.02
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.09*	.07	.07	.06	.05	.09*	.07	.07	.06
Peer and Companions	-.18**	.17**	.23**	.24**	.20**	.13**	.17**	.17**	.18**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.15**	.08	.11**	.12**	.15**	.04	.08*	.07	.08
Employment	-.18**	.14**	.17**	.19**	.17**	.16**	.17**	.19**	.19**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.02	.04	.02	.03	.03	.07	.05	.08	.06

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Non-Aboriginal sample, nearly all items on the scale generally produced significant results. The only 2 items that did not produce significant results were; Emotional Stability and Academic/Vocational skills.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="10">TABLE 28 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION</th></tr>
<tr>
<th>Admission Item</th>
<th>Adult Outcome on Probation N 148</th>
<th>Re-convicted Year 1 N 148</th>
<th>Re-convicted Year 2 N144</th>
<th>Re-convicted Year 3 N 125</th>
<th>Re-convicted Year 4 + N 120</th>
<th>Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 148</th>
<th>Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 144</th>
<th>Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 125</th>
<th>Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 120</th>
</tr>
<tr><td>Address Changes in last 12 months</td><td>-.28**</td><td>.25**</td><td>.26**</td><td>.22*</td><td>.16</td><td>.21**</td><td>.22**</td><td>.22*</td><td>.21*</td></tr>
<tr><td>% Time Employed in Previous Year</td><td>-.20*</td><td>.05</td><td>.13</td><td>.15</td><td>.16</td><td>.13</td><td>.16</td><td>.21*</td><td>.16</td></tr>
<tr><td>Attitude to Probation</td><td>-.12</td><td>.12</td><td>.08</td><td>.08</td><td>.11</td><td>.15</td><td>.11</td><td>.13</td><td>.17</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age</td><td>.21*</td><td>-.15</td><td>-.22**</td><td>-.21*</td><td>-.22*</td><td>-.14</td><td>-.17*</td><td>-.13</td><td>-.13</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gender</td><td>.14</td><td>-.10</td><td>-.16</td><td>-.20*</td><td>-.14</td><td>-.12</td><td>-.14</td><td>-.17</td><td>-.16</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prior Convictions</td><td>-.23**</td><td>.16</td><td>.21*</td><td>.28**</td><td>.25**</td><td>.21*</td><td>.18*</td><td>.22*</td><td>.18</td></tr>
<tr><td>Type of Prior Conviction</td><td>-.27**</td><td>.24**</td><td>.30**</td><td>.24**</td><td>.21*</td><td>.30**</td><td>.28**</td><td>.22*</td><td>.19*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Family/ Marital Relations</td><td>-.09</td><td>.08</td><td>.05</td><td>.00</td><td>-.01</td><td>.05</td><td>.05</td><td>.03</td><td>.07</td></tr>
<tr><td>Financial Management</td><td>-.13</td><td>.15</td><td>.17*</td><td>.23**</td><td>.21*</td><td>.22**</td><td>.21*</td><td>.20*</td><td>.15</td></tr>
<tr><td>Emotional Stability</td><td>-.22**</td><td>.14</td><td>.11</td><td>.11</td><td>-.06</td><td>.17*</td><td>.18*</td><td>.17</td><td>.09</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mental Ability of Probationer</td><td>-.10</td><td>.13</td><td>.07</td><td>.18*</td><td>.13</td><td>.09</td><td>.07</td><td>.18*</td><td>.15</td></tr>
<tr><td>Peer and Companions</td><td>-.21*</td><td>.16</td><td>.13</td><td>.07</td><td>.11</td><td>.23**</td><td>.22**</td><td>.24**</td><td>.25**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer</td><td>-.17*</td><td>.07</td><td>.07</td><td>.06</td><td>-.09</td><td>.12</td><td>.12</td><td>.12</td><td>.10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Employment</td><td>-.18*</td><td>.16</td><td>.11</td><td>.18*</td><td>.25**</td><td>.24**</td><td>.19*</td><td>.21*</td><td>.15</td></tr>
<tr><td>Academic/ Vocational Skills</td><td>.03</td><td>-.01</td><td>-.06</td><td>-.10</td><td>-.04</td><td>-.00</td><td>-.01</td><td>-.03</td><td>-.06</td></tr>
</table>

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Nearly all items demonstrated significant correlations for the Metis sample. Items that

were not significantly correlated were; Attitude to Probation, Family/Marital Relations,

and Academic/Vocational skills.

Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 173	Re-convicted Year 1 N 173	Re-convicted Year 2 N 168	Re-convicted Year 3 N 156	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 151	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 173	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 168	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 156	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 151
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.19*	.08	.09	.12	.06	.07	.09	.12	.14
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.06	.14	.15	.18*	.05	.00	.03	.02	-.04
Attitude to Probation	-.11	.10	.10	.04	.03	.07	.11	.09	.06
Age	.13	-.26**	-.30**	-.32**	-.37**	-.15*	-.12	-.10	-.09
Sex	-.04	-.17*	-.23**	-.28**	-.23**	-.21**	-.22**	-.26**	-.23**
Prior Convictions	-.16*	.17*	.13	.14	.02	.18*	.18*	.18*	.14
Type of Prior Conviction	-.12	.30**	.26**	.16	.15	.26**	.17*	.10	.10
Family/ Marital Relations	-.03	.02	-.06	-.10	-.13	.03	-.03	-.02	-.02
Financial Management	-.02	.12	-.05	.00	.04	.10	.01	.02	.01
Emotional Stability	-.03	-.12	-.16*	-.13	-.05	-.05	-.07	-.05	-.04
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.07	.02	-.01	-.03	-.11	.09	.05	.04	.03
Peer and Companions	-.14	.11	.17*	.17*	.22**	.13	.15	.11	.07
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.10	.07	.07	.03	-.02	.15*	.10	.08	.08
Employment	-.06	.17*	.12	.16	.05	.13	.04	.04	.01
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.01	.02	-.06	-.06	-.13	-.04	-.08	-.07	-.08

Table 29 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The above correlations, again appear to be very sporadic. That is while the items may correlate with one outcome variable, all items fail to correlation with all outcome variables. Items Attitude to Probation, Family/Marital relations, Financial Management, Mental Ability and Academic/Vocational skills failed to correlate with any of the outcome variables.

TABLE 30 - CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION									
Admission Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 135	Re-convicted Year 1 N 135	Re-convicted Year 2 N 130	Re-convicted Year 3 N 114	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 111	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 135	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 130	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 114	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 111
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.24**	-.04	.13	-.08	-.06	.10	.17	.11	.08
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.17*	-.08	-.00	-.06	-.10	-.01	-.02	-.07	-.11
Attitude to Probation	-.17	.14	.20*	.16	.10	-.07	.01	-.50	-.08
Age	.08	-.12	-.18*	-.11	-.06	-.10	-.11	-.07	.03
Sex	.04	-.05	-.01	-.01	-.00	-.05	-.17	-.16	-.15
Prior Convictions	-.10	.17*	.13	.14	.02	.18*	.18*	.18*	.14
Type of Prior Conviction	-.24**	.30**	.26**	.16	.15	.26**	.17*	.10	.10
Family/ Marital Relations	-.03	.02	-.06	-.10	-.13	.03	-.03	-.02	-.02
Financial Management	-.06	.12	-.05	.00	.04	.10	.01	.02	.01
Emotional Stability	-.04	-.12	-.16*	-.13	-.05	-.05	-.07	-.05	.04
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.02	.07	.11	.13	.14	-.04	-.04	.01	-.02
Peer and Companions	-.27**	.06	.12	-.02	-.10	.06	.09	.02	-.03
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.08	-.10	-.09	-.00	-.15	-.18*	-.10	-.08	-.14
Employment	-.14	.06	.13	.10	.09	.08	.15	.11	.07
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.03	.13	.14	.13	.14	-.04	-.02	.01	.05

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

93

As we observed for the Treaty On group, we again observe very sporadic correlations for the Treaty Off group. Correlations scores overall are weaker than those observed for other groups. Items Family/Marital Relations, Financial Management, Mental Ability, Employment and Academic/Vocational skills failed to correlate with any of the outcome variables.

From the above tables we observed that the association between individual items on the PRA and the outcome criterion vary with both gender and ethnicity. We now assess the correlations of termination items by Adult Outcome on Probation, reconviction and re-incarceration variables. Given this information was collected at the completion of a community supervision period, we would expect that these items show stronger correlations with the outcome variables than we saw for the admissions items.

Beginning once again by assessing the correlation for the overall sample we find the following pattern:

TABLE 31 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 1076	Re-convicted Year 1 N 1076	Re-convicted Year 2 N 1027	Re-convicted Year 3 N 913	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 870	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 1076	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 1027	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 913	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 870
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.34**	.11**	.16**	.15**	.13**	.15**	.18**	.18**	.17**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.14**	.13**	.15**	.17**	.15**	.12**	.11**	.12**	.10**
Attitude to Probation	-.59**	.20**	.26**	.24**	.21**	.22**	.24**	.24**	.24**
Age	.03	-.16**	-.19**	-.19**	-.19**	-.12**	-.13**	-.12**	-.11**
Sex	.05	-.09**	-.11**	-.14**	-.12**	-.11**	-.14**	-.16**	-.15**
Prior Convictions	-.18**	.13**	.15**	.19**	.17**	.15**	.15**	.16**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.20**	.14**	.18**	.17**	.13**	.19**	.18**	.16**	.15**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.25**	.10**	.12**	.12**	.11**	.11**	.13**	.14**	.14**
Financial Management	-.25**	.10**	.12**	.15**	.17**	.08**	.09**	.11**	.11**
Emotional Stability	-.22**	.05	.01	.02	.04	.11**	.08*	.08*	.09**
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.08**	.07*	.07*	.08*	.06	.06	.05	.06	.07*
Peer and Companions	-.35**	.22**	.28**	.27**	.25**	.22**	.26**	.26**	.25**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.26**	.14**	.19**	.19**	.16**	.17**	.22**	.21**	.20**
Employment	-.21**	.17**	.23**	.24**	.23**	.17**	.18**	.19**	.17**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.05	.04	.08**	.08**	.06	.04	.07*	.09**	.08*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

As expected we found that correlation scores were stronger for termination items as compared to those observed at admission. All items on the scale produced significant correlations with most of the outcome variables. Below we will compare the above correlations with those produced when each categorical group is separated and compared to the overall pattern. If the instrument is equally reliable and valid for all groups of offenders, then we would expect very similar numbers in the tables below as we see here.

95

TABLE 32 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Items	Adult Outcome on Probation N 885	Re-convicted Year 1 N 885	Re-convicted Year 2 N 848	Re-convicted Year 3 N 758	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 725	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 885	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 848	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 758	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 725
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.34**	.13**	.18**	.19**	.17**	.14**	.17**	.17**	.16**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.16**	.15**	.16**	.18**	.15**	.14**	.13**	.13**	.12**
Attitude to Probation	-.58**	.20**	.26**	.23**	.21**	.22**	.24**	.23**	.23**
Age	.05	-.17**	-.21**	-.23**	-.20**	-.11**	-.13**	-.12**	-.11**
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.16**	.12**	.12**	.15**	.15**	.14**	.14**	.14**	.13**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.14**	.17**	.15**	.12**	.20**	.18**	.16**	.15**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.27**	.12**	.13**	.12**	.11**	.13**	.15**	.15**	.15**
Financial Management	-.26**	.09**	.09**	.11**	.15**	.09*	.08*	.11**	.11**
Emotional Stability	-.22**	.07*	.03	.02	.06	.12**	.08*	.07*	.08*
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.09**	.08*	.08*	.08*	.05	.06	.05	.06	.06
Peer and Companions	-.36**	.22**	.28**	.28**	.25**	.22**	.27**	.27**	.25**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.28**	.14**	.19**	.18**	.16**	.17**	.22**	.22**	.21**
Employment	-.22**	.20**	.25**	.27**	.26**	.18**	.19**	.19**	.18**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.05	.06	.08**	.09*	.07	.05	.07*	.09*	.09*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

All items on the PRA produced significant correlations for the male offender population.

Here again we find that the correlation scores are generally stronger than those observed at admission.

TABLE 33 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Items	Adult Outcome on Probation N 191	Re-convicted Year 1 N 191	Re-convicted Year 2 N 179	Re-convicted Year 3 N 155	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 145	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 191	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 179	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 155	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 145
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.35**	.04	.05	.00	-.02	.23**	.26**	.28**	.28**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.02	.02	.13	.15	.15	.00	-.01	.02	-.01
Attitude to Probation	-.64**	.20**	.22**	.27**	.18*	.26**	.26**	.27**	.25**
Age	-.04	-.06	-.05	.01	-.09	-.10	-.10	-.06	-.07
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.27**	.14	.26**	.28**	.23**	.14	.17*	.20*	.11
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16*	.08	.19*	.18*	.15*	.12	.12	.10	.09
Family/ Marital Relations	-.15*	.03	.05	.11	.14	.02	.02	.04	.10
Financial Management	-.19**	.14	.29**	.33**	.26**	.11	.16*	.17*	.10
Emotional Stability	-.24**	-.02	-.07	.02	-.03	.09	.11	.15	.20*
Mental Ability of Probationer	.00	-.02	.01	-.00	.09	-.04	-.05	-.05	.05
Peer and Companions	-.24**	.11	.21**	.16*	.20*	.13	.14	.12	.22*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.11	.03	.17*	.16	.12	.10	.07	.05	.07
Employment	-.18*	.03	.11	.12	.13	.12	.15	.19	.16
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.06	-.12	.02	-.02	-.02	-.09	-.04	-.00	.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Nearly all items on the PRA demonstrated significant correlations for the female offender population. Items that failed to produce significant results included; % of time employed, Age, Mental Ability, and Academic/Vocational skills.

TABLE 34 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 524	Re-convicted Year 1 N 524	Re-convicted Year 2 N 499	Re-convicted Year 3 N 445	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 420	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 524	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 499	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 445	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 420
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.36**	.16**	.22**	.24**	.22**	.19**	.22**	.22**	.22**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.18**	.14**	.18**	.18**	.20**	.14**	.16**	.16**	.17**
Attitude to Probation	-.68**	.21**	.29**	.24**	.26**	.25**	.27**	.24**	.26**
Age	.04	-.12**	-.16**	-.19**	-.16**	-.08	-.11*	-.12*	-.12*
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.10*	.15**	.18**	.20**	.11*	.16**	.15**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.09*	.14**	.18**	.16**	.15**	.17**	.18**	.18**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.29**	.12**	.17**	.15**	.16**	.15**	.19**	.18**	.19**
Financial Management	-.28**	.12**	.18**	.18**	.24**	.12**	.15**	.18**	.20**
Emotional Stability	-.24**	.10*	.06	.04	.10*	.13**	.08	.06	.07
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.12**	.05	.06	.07	.05	.07	.05	.09	.10*
Peer and Companions	-.39**	.21**	.27**	.26**	.25**	.21**	.28**	.27**	.27**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.31**	.08	.14**	.10*	.12*	.11*	.19**	.18**	.19**
Employment	-.28**	.19**	.26**	.29**	.31**	.21**	.24**	.28**	.30**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.12**	.07	.12**	.15**	.14**	.07	.11*	.16**	.17**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

All item on the PRA produced significant results for at least some of the outcome variables.

TABLE 35 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 117	Re-convicted Year 1 N 117	Re-convicted Year 2 N 114	Re-convicted Year 3 N 100	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 97	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 117	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 114	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 100	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 97
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.26**	.26**	.33**	.25*	.20*	.24*	.27**	.26**	.24*
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.13	.19*	.17	.21*	.08	.19*	.14	.21*	.15
Attitude to Probation	-.59**	.25**	.30**	.29**	.13	.24*	.23*	.18	.17
Age	.06	-.15	-.22*	-.22*	-.18	-.13	-.16	-.11	-.09
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.21*	.16	.20*	.24*	.10	.20*	.15	.19	.16
Type of Prior Conviction	-.28**	.24**	.28**	.19	.14	.30**	.27**	.20	.18
Family/ Marital Relations	-.23*	.29**	.25**	.21*	.08	.31**	.28**	.28**	.25*
Financial Management	-.15	.14	.06	.08	.07	.12	.06	.09	.07
Emotional Stability	-.26**	.28**	.18	.17	.11	.26**	.23*	.19	.18
Mental Ability of Probationer	.01	.08	-.00	-.03	-.9	.08	.06	.05	.04
Peer and Companions	-.33**	.36**	.29**	.33**	.17	.41**	.40**	.43**	.38**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.36**	.32**	.29**	.28**	.13	.37**	.36**	.30**	.23*
Employment	-.25**	.32**	.33**	.34**	.21*	.25**	.21*	.13	.08
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.15	-.04	-.13	-.18	-.28**	-.03	-.05	-.06	-.10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The vast majority of the items produced significant correlations. Only 2 items failed to produce a significant relationship. These items were Financial Management and Mental Ability.

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 145	Re-convicted Year 1 N 145	Re-convicted Year 2 N 140	Re-convicted Year 3 N 129	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 126	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 145	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 140	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 129	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 126
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.30**	.05	.09	.11	.10	.07	.07	.10	.09
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.30**	.14	.07	.08	-.07	.11	.05	.02	-.01
Attitude to Probation	-.33**	.16	.06	.09	.03	.15	.12	.12	.10
Age	-.05	-.29**	-.34**	-.34**	-.34**	-.16	-.13	-.10	-.08
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.16	.16	.06	.09	.03	.15	.12	.12	.10
Type of Prior Conviction	-.13	.31**	.25**	.09	.03	.25**	.16	.07	.06
Family/ Marital Relations	-.27**	.08	.00	.09	.07	.06	.02	.10	.07
Financial Management	-.24**	-.01	-.17*	-.09	-.13	-.04	-.14	-.06	-.09
Emotional Stability	-.12	.05	-.05	.03	.09	.05	-.01	.03	.04
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.06	.09	.10	.16	.12	-.08	-.12	-.14	-.15
Peer and Companions	-.29**	.17*	.22*	.24**	.25**	.14	.13	.12	.10
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.22**	.03	.09	.14	.10	.13	.14	.20*	.18*
Employment	-.08	.09	.04	.08	.06	.13	.05	.04	.02
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.11	.07	.05	-.03	.02	.08	.04	.01	-.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Similar to the trends we observed when discussing the admission items, we again find that the Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups appear to produce more similar patterns than the Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. The male Treaty On group generally did not produce as many significant correlations as the male non- Aboriginal and Metis groups. Items; Prior Conviction, Emotional Stability, Mental Ability, Employment, and Academic/Vocational skills failed to produce significant correlations. While item Prior

Convictions failed to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables, the correlation scores were of sufficient strength to be comparable to other groups. The remainder of the items that failed to produce significance however did not produce correlation scores of acceptable strength.

TABLE 37 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 95	Re-convicted Year 3 N 84	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 82	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 99	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 95	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 84	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 82
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.34**	.10	.12	.20	.16	.07	.09	.10	.04
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.06	.01	.02	.01	-.02	-.01	.01	-.08	-.10
Attitude to Probation	-.40**	.03	.13	.10	.11	.05	.16	.20	.19
Age	.19	-.18	-.24*	-.23*	-.17	-.11	-.12	-.12	-.05
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.01	.08	-.10	-.05	-.10	.20*	.07	.09	.03
Type of Prior Conviction	-.22*	.12	.15	.13	.06	.30**	.23*	.22*	.16
Family/ Marital Relations	-.17	-.07	-.07	-.07	-.10	-.07	-.01	.01	-.04
Financial Management	-.27**	.02	.01	.09	.04	.09	.13	.09	.01
Emotional Stability	-.17	-.08	-.00	.04	.05	.08	.22*	.27*	.24*
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.12	.16	.20	.15	.11	.17	.22*	.19	.17
Peer and Companions	-.40**	.09	.26*	.25*	.16	.06	.20	.18	.12
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.14	.13	.20	.25*	.18	.10	.20	.21	.15
Employment	-.11	.07	.25*	.12	.02	-.05	.06	-.04	-.10
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.07	-.10	.01	.01	-.10	-.12	-.03	-.02	-.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favourable results than those observed at

101

admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while some items still fail to meet

significant levels, 11 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome

variables. Items Percentage of time employed in previous year, and

Academic/Vocational Skills failed to produce acceptable correlations with any of the

outcome variables.

TABLE 38 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Items	Adult Outcome on Probation N 96	Re-convicted Year 1 N 96	Re-convicted Year 2 N 86	Re-convicted Year 3 N 73	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 68	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 96	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 86	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 73	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 68
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.40**	.14	.07	.01	-.08	.20	.26*	.26*	.30*
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.23*	.01	.04	.10	.06	.02	-.02	-.04	.03
Attitude to Probation	-.63**	.21*	.25*	.27*	.21	.27**	.34**	.35**	.40
Age	-.06	-.08	-.01	.09	-.03	-.16	-.16	-.17	-.21
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.25*	.15	.28**	.28*	.18	.04	.09	.09	.02
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16	.06	.26*	.19	.07	.03	.08	.08	.11
Family/ Marital Relations	-.17	.02	.14	.21	.21	.02	.08	.08	.17
Financial Management	-.28**	.06	.23*	.26*	.19	.09	.14	.13	.17
Emotional Stability	-.37**	.08	.09	.16	.15	.19	.14	.15	.21
Mental Ability of Probationer	.11	-.07	.10	.07	.03	-.03	-.03	-.04	-.05
Peer and Companions	-.17	.05	.03	.03	.08	.06	.04	.03	.25*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.09	.14	.14	.16	.08	.07	.03	.02	-.00
Employment	-.25*	-.06	.08	.05	.04	.08	.21*	.20	.31*
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.01	-.11	-.16	-.20	-.26*	-.05	-.07	-.07	-.09

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Nearly all items on the PRA demonstrated significant correlations for at least some of the

outcome variables. The items that were not significantly correlated include: Age, Family/Marital Relations, Mental Ability, Drugs/Alcohol use, and Academic/ Vocational skills. These items while failing to produce significance, produced correlations of sufficient strength to be comparable to other groups.

TABLE 39 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 31	Re-convicted Year 1 N 31	Re-convicted Year 2 N 30	Re-convicted Year 3 N 25	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 23	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 31	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 30	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 25	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 23
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.35	-.08	-.01	-.08	-.06	.25	.27	.30	.17
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.03	.05	.12	.16	.20	.02	.02	.06	-.05
Attitude to Probation	-.72**	.32	.40*	.39	.23	.42*	.45*	.50*	.34
Age	-.21	-.11	-.13	-.06	-.29	-.11	-.12	-.12	-.23
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.24	.08	.15	.27	.56**	.20	.20	.24	.08
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21	.21	.30	.39	.41	.25	.27	.28	.15
Family/ Marital Relations	.05	.07	.00	.10	.20	.03	.02	.09	.21
Financial Management	.05	.39*	.33	.43*	.42*	.26	.27	.29	.11
Emotional Stability	-.02	.02	-.02	-.02	-.22	.29	.29	.35	.23
Mental Ability of Probationer	.10	-.10	-.11	-.15	.17	-.05	-.05	-.06	-.08
Peer and Companions	-.08	.08	.20	.25	.42*	.17	.17	.22	.42*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.11	.03	.11	.18	.30	.34	.34	.42*	.30
Employment	-.18	.18	.12	.15	.47*	.49**	.49**	.58**	.39
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.18	.08	.05	-.02	.31	-.09	-.09	-.11	-.15

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Many of the items on the PRA did not produce significant correlation with the outcome variables for female Metis offenders. In fact, only 6 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Financial Management, Peers & Companions, Drugs/Alcohol, and Employment. These items, while failing to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables, produced correlations scores of comparable strength to be considered for some of the outcome variables.

TABLE 40 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 28	Re-convicted Year 1 N 28	Re-convicted Year 2 N 28	Re-convicted Year 3 N 27	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 25	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 28	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 28	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 27	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 25
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.30	-.33	-.18	-.22	-.14	.a	.14	.14	.22
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.35	-.07	.05	-.10	.22	.a	.09	.11	-.01
Attitude to Probation	-.61**	-.02	-.17	.03	-.02	.a	-.25	-.24	-.34
Age	.00	.00	-.10	-.26	-.37	.a	.09	.09	-.05
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.29	.01	.18	.05	-.24	.a	.28	.28	.09
Type of Prior Conviction	-.09	.10	.13	.20	.51**	.a	-.11	-.12	.14
Family/ Marital Relations	-.13	-.07	-.25	-.19	-.23	.a	-.16	-.17	-.25
Financial Management	-.16	-.06	.23	.23	.07	.a	.24	.24	.04
Emotional Stability	-.13	-.15	-.12	.06	-.10	.a	.26	.26	.11
Mental Ability of Probationer	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Peer and Companions	-.33	-.02	.25	.13	.09	.a	.23	.22	.07
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.09	.06	.14	.01	-.13	.a	-.13	-.14	-19
Employment	.04	-.15	.02	-.01	-.22	.a	-.14	-.15	-.24
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.06	-.34	-.03	-.15	-.29	.a	.23	.23	.05

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The female Treaty On group had even fewer significant correlations than the female Metis group. Only 2 items on the scale produced significant correlations. These items were: Attitude to Probation and Type of Prior Conviction. Many of the items that failed to produce a significant correlation, however produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be considered

TABLE 41 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 36	Re-convicted Year 1 N 36	Re-convicted Year 2 N 35	Re-convicted Year 3 N 30	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 29	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 36	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 35	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 30	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 29
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21	-.01	-.11	-.22	-.12	.25	.26	.29	.32
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.13	.00	.35*	.28	.23	-.08	-.09	-.03	-.12
Attitude to Probation	-.61**	.12	.14	.23	.14	.19	.19	.21	.23
Age	.11	.06	-.05	.20	.25	-.04	-.04	.13	.30
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.39*	.17	.26	.29	.35	.17	.18	.20	.20
Type of Prior Conviction	-.27	.10	.15	.18	.08	.20	.21	.12	.02
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14	-.04	-.09	-.18	-.03	-.08	-.07	-.07	.05
Financial Management	-.14	.14	.31	.38	.36	.02	.02	.05	-.04
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.10	-.38*	-.30	-.26	-.06	-.06	.10	.31
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.17	.02	-.13	-.12	.12	-.11	-.11	-.12	.20
Peer and Companions	-.32	.18	.26	.09	.11	.16	.16	.05	.10
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.21	-.23	.10	.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.10	.05
Employment	-.14	.07	.10	.17	.15	-.06	-.07	.07	-.01
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.18	-.17	.17	.19	.26	-.17	-.18	-.04	.11

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The vast majority of items on the scale failed to produce significant correlations with outcome variables. Only 4 items on the scale showed any significant relationship. These items were: % of time employed, Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, and Emotional Stability. Many of the items that failed to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables, produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be comparable to other female offender samples.

TABLE 41 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 36	Re-convicted Year 1 N 36	Re-convicted Year 2 N 35	Re-convicted Year 3 N 30	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 29	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 36	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 35	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 30	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 29
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21	-.01	-.11	-.22	-.12	.25	.26	.29	.32
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.13	.00	.35*	.28	.23	-.08	-.09	-.03	-.12
Attitude to Probation	-.61**	.12	.14	.23	.14	.19	.19	.21	.23
Age	.11	.06	-.05	.20	.25	-.04	-.04	.13	.30
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.39*	.17	.26	.29	.35	.17	.18	.20	.20
Type of Prior Conviction	-.27	.10	.15	.18	.08	.20	.21	.12	.02
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14	-.04	-.09	-.18	-.03	-.08	-.07	-.07	.05
Financial Management	-.14	.14	.31	.38	.36	.02	.02	.05	-.04
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.10	-.38*	-.30	-.26	-.06	-.06	.10	.31
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.17	.02	-.13	-.12	.12	-.11	-.11	-.12	.20
Peer and Companions	-.32	.18	.26	.09	.11	.16	.16	.05	.10
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.21	-.23	.10	.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.10	.05
Employment	-.14	.07	.10	.17	.15	-.06	-.07	.07	-.01
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.18	-.17	.17	.19	.26	-.17	-.18	-.04	.11

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 620	Re-convicted Year 1 N 620	Re-convicted Year 2 N 585	Re-convicted Year 3 N 518	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 488	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 620	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 585	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 518	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 488
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.37**	.16**	.20**	.21**	.19**	.19**	.23**	.22**	.23**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.19**	.12**	.15**	.16**	.17**	.12**	.14**	.14**	.15**
Attitude to Probation	-.67**	.22**	.29**	.25**	.26**	.26**	.28**	.25**	.27**
Age	.03	-.12**	-.15**	-.16**	-.15**	-.09**	-.12**	-.13**	-.14**
Sex	.07	-.10*	-.12**	-.14**	-.15**	-.09*	-.12**	-.14**	-.14**
Prior Convictions	-.19**	.11**	.17**	.20**	.21**	.11**	.16**	.15**	.14**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.20**	.09*	.16**	.18**	.14**	.13**	.16**	.17**	.17**
Family/ Marital Relations	-.27**	.11**	.17**	.16**	.17**	.14**	.18**	.17**	.18**
Financial Management	-.28**	.12**	.19**	.20**	.24**	.12**	.16**	.17**	.20**
Emotional Stability	-.25**	.09*	.06	.06	.10*	.13**	.08*	.06	.08
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.10	.05	.06	.08	.05	.07	.05	.09*	.10*
Peer and Companions	-.37**	.20**	.26**	.24**	.24**	.21**	.27**	.26**	.28**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.29**	.10*	.15**	.12**	.13**	.12**	.19**	.18**	.19**
Employment	-.27**	.16**	.24**	.26**	.27**	.19**	.23**	.26**	.29**
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.11**	.05	.10*	.12**	.10*	.06	.10*	.15**	.16**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Non-Aboriginal population, we find that all items on the scale are significantly correlated with outcome variables.

TABLE 43 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 148	Re-convicted Year 1 N 148	Re-convicted Year 2 N 144	Re-convicted Year 3 N 125	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 120	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 148	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 144	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 125	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 120
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.28**	.20*	.27**	.20*	.16	.24**	.27**	.27**	.24**
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.11	.17*	.16	.21*	.12	.17*	.12	.21*	.14
Attitude to Probation	-.61**	.27**	.33**	.32**	.17	.27**	.27**	.24**	.21*
Age	-.00	-.15	-.22**	-.21*	-.22*	-.14	-.17*	-.13	-.13
Sex	.14	-.10	-.16	-.20*	-.14	-.12	-.14	-.17	-.16
Prior Convictions	-.23**	.16	.21*	.28**	.25**	.21*	.18*	.22*	.18
Type of Prior Conviction	-.27**	.24**	.30**	.24**	.21*	.30**	.28**	.22*	.19*
Family/ Marital Relations	-.19*	.26**	.21*	.22*	.12	.28**	.24**	.28**	.26**
Financial Management	-.12	.19*	.12	.15	.14	.14	.10	.12	.07
Emotional Stability	-.24**	.25**	.17*	.16	.07	.28*	.25**	.22*	.19*
Mental Ability of Probationer	.01	.06	.00	-.03	-.04	.08	.06	.05	.03
Peer and Companions	-.31**	.33**	.30**	.34**	.22*	.40**	.39**	.44**	.40**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.30**	.28**	.28**	.30**	.18*	.38**	.37**	.34**	.26**
Employment	-.23**	.29**	.29**	.30**	.27**	.28**	.24**	.20*	.13
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.14	-.02	-.10	-.14	-.17	-.03	-.04	-.06	-.10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Metis offender population, we find that the majority of item on the scale were significantly correlated with outcome variables. The 2 items that failed to produce significant results were: Mental Ability, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination Item	Adult Outcome on Probation N 173	Re-convicted Year 1 N 173	Re-convicted Year 2 N 168	Re-convicted Year 3 N 156	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 151	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 173	Re-incarcerate d Year 2 N 168	Re-incarcera ted Year 3 N 156	Re-incarcerat ed Year 4 + N 151
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.30**	-.01	.03	.02	.03	.06	.06	.08	.09
% Time Employed in Previous Year	-.19*	.12	.08	.10	.02	.11	.07	.06	.03
Attitude to Probation	-.37**	.15*	.13	.13	.07	.16*	.16*	.19*	.15
Age	-.04	-.26**	-.30*8	-.32**	-.37**	-.15*	-.12	-.10	-.09
Sex	-.04	-.17*	-.23*	-.28**	-.23**	-.21**	-.22**	-.26**	-.23**
Prior Convictions	-.16*	.17*	.13	.14	.02	.18*	.18*	.18*	.14
Type of Prior Conviction	-.12	.30**	.26**	.16	.15	.26**	.17*	.10	.10
Family/ Marital Relations	-.24**	.05	-.05	.01	-.01	.05	-.00	.06	.02
Financial Management	-.22**	-.01	-.11	-.03	-.90	-.04	-.11	-.04	-.08
Emotional Stability	-.12	-.01	-.09	-.02	.00	.02	-.02	.00	.00
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.05	.10	.12	.17*	.13	-.05	-.09	-.10	-.11
Peer and Companions	-.29**	.16*	.23**	.23**	.23**	.14	.15	.14	.12
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.19*	.05	.12	.13	.08	.14	.14	.18*	.16*
Employment	-.06	.07	.05	.08	.01	.13	.05	.05	.01
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.10	.02	.04	-.05	-.04	.07	.05	.02	-.10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Only 3 items on the scale failed to produce significant correlations for the Treaty On sample population. These items were: Emotional Stability, Employment, and Academic/vocational skills.

TABLE 45 - CORRELATIONS OF TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Items	Adult Outcome on Probation N 135	Re-convicted Year 1 N 135	Re-convicted Year 2 N 130	Re-convicted Year 3 N 114	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 111	Re-incarcerated Year 1 N 135	Re-incarcerated Year 2 N 130	Re-incarcerated Year 3 N 114	Re-incarcerated Year 4 + N 111
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.30**	.07	.06	.09	.09	.11	.11	.12	.09
% Time Employed in Previous Year	.07	.01	.11	.08	.05	-.02	-.00	-.06	-.10
Attitude to Probation	-.45**	.05	.13	.14	.12	.08	.17*	.21*	.21*
Age	.16	-.12	-.18*	-.11	-.06	-.10	-.11	-.07	.03
Sex	-.04	-.05	-.01	-.01	-.00	-.05	-.17	-.16	-.15
Prior Convictions	-.16*	.10	.01	.04	.02	.19*	.10	.12	.07
Type of Prior Conviction	-.12	.12	.15	.14	.07	.27**	.25**	.23*	.15
Family/ Marital Relations	-.24**	-.07	-.07	-.10	-.08	-.07	-.03	-.02	-.04
Financial Management	-.24**	.05	.10	.17	.13	.07	.10	.07	-.01
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.09	-.13	-.07	-.05	.03	.11	.20*	.24*
Mental Ability of Probationer	-.13	.13	.12	.10	.11	.11	.15	.14	.18
Peer and Companions	-.39**	.11	.26**	.21*	.14	.09	.21*	.17	.13
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.16	.05	.17	.19*	.13	.08	.17*	.16	.14
Employment	-.12	.08	.21*	.14	.06	-.05	.05	.01	-.05
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.02	-.11	.05	.05	-.02	-.13	-.04	-.01	.02

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty Off population, nearly all items on the scale demonstrated significant correlations. Items that failed to produce significant correlations were: % of time employed, Sex of Probationer, Mental Ability, and Academic/Vocational skills.

In summary, we found that termination items did in fact produce stronger correlations that were more significant, than those observed for admission items. Additionally, the PRA instrument appears to perform reasonably well for all groups when only one control factor is introduced (gender or ethnicity), however, the scale's validity seems to diminish significantly when both gender and ethnicity are examined together. In the next section, we report on how each sub sample scored on the various risk measurements.

HOW THE GROUPS SCORE

We ran frequencies of how each categorical group was classified by each of the risk scores.

TABLE 46 – HOW CATEGORICAL GROUPS WERE CLASSIFIED BY RISK SCORES					
CATEGORICAL GROUP	LEVEL	ADMISSION RISK SCORE	LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK – ADMISSION	CLASSIFIED LEVEL – ADMISSION	RISKNEED
OVERALL POPULATION N 1076	LOW	4.6%	20.7%	18.8%	32.6%
	MED	14.0%	39.7%	44.4%	57.6%
	HIGH	81.3%	39.4%	36.8%	9.9%
MALES N 885	LOW	3.5%	16.5%	15.6%	30.3%
	MED	10.7%	40.6%	44.7%	58.6%
	HIGH	85.8%	42.7%	39.7%	11.1%
FEMALES N 191	LOW	9.9%	40.3%	33.5%	43.5%
	MED	29.3%	35.6%	42.9%	52.4%
	HIGH	60.7%	24.1%	23.6%	4.2%

TABLE 46 – HOW CATEGORICAL GROUPS WERE CLASSIFIED BY RISK SCORES

MALES NON ABORIGINAL N 524	**LOW**	4.0%	19.5%	16.6%	30.9%
	MED	12.4%	41.6%	47.9%	60.3%
	HIGH	83.6%	38.7%	35.5%	8.8%
MALES – METIS N 117	**LOW**	.9%	8.5%	9.4%	26.5%
	MED	8.5%	41.0%	39.3%	57.3%
	HIGH	90.6%	50.4%	51.3%	16.2%
MALES - TREATY ON N 145	**LOW**	5.5%	20.0%	22.8%	39.3%
	MED	9.7%	39.3%	41.4%	52.4%
	HIGH	84.8%	40.7%	35.9%	8.3%
MALES - TREATY OFF N 99	**LOW**	1.0%	5.1%	7.1%	18.2%
	MED	6.1%	36.4%	39.4%	60.6%
	HIGH	92.9%	57.6%	53.5%	21.2%
FEMALES NON – ABORIGINAL N 96	**LOW**	11.5%	49.0%	39.6%	51.0%
	MED	33.3%	34.4%	42.7%	45.8%
	HIGH	55.2%	16.7%	17.7%	3.1%
FEMALES – METIS N 31	**LOW**	9.7%	29.0%	22.6%	41.9%
	MED	19.4%	38.7%	51.6%	58.1%
	HIGH	71.0%	32.3%	25.8%	0.0%
FEMALES – TREATY ON N 28	**LOW**	10.7%	50.0%	46.4%	57.1%
	MED	42.9%	28.6%	32.1%	39.3%
	HIGH	46.4%	21.4%	21.4%	3.6%

however, placed the majority of offenders in the medium risk category, where we would expect the majority of offenders to be.

When we observe the separated groups, we find that female offenders are more likely to be classified as low risk than male offenders regardless of risk score. From the male offender sample groups, we found that the male Treaty On group was most likely to be classified as low risk, followed by the male Non-Aboriginal, Metis, and Treaty Off groups by all four risk scores. For the female offender groups, we found that while the Admission risk score most commonly classified female Non-Aboriginals as low risk, all of the remainder risk scores most commonly classified the female Treaty On group as low risk.

When making comparison of the groups by ethnicity, we find that the Treaty On group was most likely to be classified as low risk, followed by the Non-Aboriginal, Metis, and Treaty Off groups by all four risk scores.

The above information is only useful if it corresponds to actual behaviour. This is the topic of our next section.

HOW THE GROUPS ACTUALLY PERFORM

Given one of the primary objectives of this study was to assess the validity of the Primary

Risk Assessment both during the period of supervision and beyond, for male and female,

and Aboriginal/Non-Aboriginal subgroups, we now present these results for how each

categorical group performed.

As we can see from the table below the majority of offenders successfully completed

their probation. This is true for all categorical groups under study. Male Treaty On

offenders, however, performed better than all other male sub-groups. Male Treaty Off

offenders performed worse than all other groups. Female Metis offenders appeared to

perform best on probation as indicated by this sample. The performance of the female

Metis group is somewhat surprising given that the female Treaty On and Non-Aboriginal

groups were most commonly assessed as low risk. When we take a more longitudinal

approach, we find that the longer the period of follow-up, the greater number of

reconvictions and re-incarcerations.

TABLE 47 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION

GROUP	% SUCCEEDED
OVERALL POPULATION N 1076	66.1%
MALE OFFENDERS OVERALL N 885	65.1%
FEMALE OFFENDERS OVERALL N 191	70.7%
MALE NON-ABORIGINAL N 524	66.0%
MALE METIS N 117	61.5%
MALE TREATY ON N 145	69.7%
MALE TREATY OFF N 99	57.6%
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL 96	74.0%
FEMALE METIS N 31	77.4%
FEMALE TREATY ON N 28	64.3%
FEMALE TREATY OFF N 36	61.1%
NON ABORIGINAL POPULATION N 620	67.3%
METIS POPULATION N 148	64.9%
TREATY ON POPULATION N 173	68.8%
TREATY OFF POPULATION N 135	58.5%

TABLE 48 – GENERAL POST – PROBATION OUTCOME

% Reconviction   % Re-incarceration

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +
27.8%	43.2%	55.5%	68.2%	12.2%	18.0%	22.5%	25.6%

(N 1076)

116

From the above table we can see that as the follow up period increases, so does the corresponding number of reconvictions and re-incarcerations. When we divide the sample to assess the impact of gender on reconviction and re-incarceration, we find that female offenders are less likely to be reconvicted or re-incarcerated during the follow up period.

TABLE 49 – POST PROBATION RECIDIVISM SEPARATED BY GENDER

% Reconviction

Gender of Offender	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +
Male	29.7% N 885	45.8% N 848	58.6% N 758	70.6% N 425
Female	18.8% N 191	31.3% N 179	40.6% N 155	55.9% N 145

% Re-incarceration

Gender of Offender	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +
Male	13.8% N 885	20.5% N 848	25.5% N 758	28.6% N 725
Female	4.7% N 191	6.1% N 179	7.7% N 155	11.0% N 145

Again, we observe the same trend we saw for the overall sample population. As the follow up period increases, so does the corresponding number of re-convictions and re-incarcerations. We found this to be consistent for both male and female offender samples.

When separating the data further by Native Canadian Status and gender we find the following:

TABLE 50 - POST PROBATION RECIDIVISM SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

% Reconviction

Offender Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +
Male Non-Aboriginal	23.9% N 524	39.3% N 499	50.8% N 445	62.9% N 420
Male Metis	33.3% N 117	45.6% N 114	61.0% N 100	76.3% N 97
Male Treaty On	44.1% N 145	62.1% N 140	75.2% N 129	84.1% N 126
Male Treaty Off	35.4% N 99	55.8% N 95	71.4% N 84	82.9% N 82
Female Non-Aboriginal	12.5% N 96	23.3% N 86	30.1% N 73	41.2% N 68
Female Metis	22.6% N 31	26.7% N 30	36.0% N 25	60.9% N 23
Female Treaty On	21.4% N 28	32.1% N 28	40.7% N 27	60.0% N 25
Female Treaty Off	30.6% N 36	54.3% N 35	70.0% N 30	82.8% N 29
Non Aboriginal Overall	22.1% N 620	36.9% N 585	47.9% N 518	59.8% N 488
Metis Overall	31.1% N 148	41.7% N 144	56.0% N 125	73.3% N 120
Treaty On Overall	40.5% N 173	57.1% N 168	69.2% N 156	80.1% N 151
Treaty Off Overall	34.1% N 135	55.4% N 130	71.1% N 114	82.9% N 111

% Re-incarceration

Offender Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 +
Male Non-Aboriginal	10.7% N 524	17.0% N 499	21.1% N 445	24.0% N 420
Male Metis	17.1% N 117	19.3% N 114	26.0% N 100	30.9% N 97
Male Treaty On	21.4% N 145	29.3% N 140	34.9% N 129	36.5% N 126
Male Treaty Off	15.2% N 99	27.4% N 95	33.3% N 84	36.6% N 82
Female Non-Aboriginal	3.1% N 96	4.7% N 86	5.5% N 73	7.4% N 68
Female Metis	6.5% N 31	6.7% N 30	8.0% N 25	13.0% N 23
Female Treaty On	0% N 28	3.6% N 28	3.7% N 27	8.0% N 25
Female Treaty Off	11.1% N 36	11.4% N 35	16.7% N 30	20.7% N 29
Non Aboriginal Overall	9.5% N 620	15.2% N 585	18.9% N 518	21.7% N 488
Metis Overall	14.9% N 148	16.7% N 144	22.4% N 125	27.5% N 120
Treaty On Overall	17.9% N 173	25.0% N 168	29.5% N 156	31.8% N 151
Treaty Off Overall	14.1% N 135	23.1% N 130	28.9% N 114	32.4% N 111

Examining the male offender samples, we can see that the male Non-Aboriginal group performed best in the post probation follow up period. Surprisingly, we found that the male Treaty On group performed worse in the follow up period. This sample group was most commonly classified as low risk for re-involvement and had the greatest success on probation, yet we found they surpassed all other groups in the post probation period.

118

Examining the female offender samples, we found that the female Non-Aboriginal group performed best in the post probation follow up period. The female Treaty Off sample was least successful in the post probation follow up period.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the Non-Aboriginal group performed best in the post probation follow up period, and the Treaty On group was least successfully in the post probation follow up period.

Presenting the information above in a slightly different manner, we ran cross tabulations of the Admissions Risk Score, The Classified Level at Admission, The Level Indicated by Risk at Admissions and the Termination Risk Need Score by Adult Outcome on Probation and Reconviction/ Re-incarceration in years 1-4. We performed these for the overall population and then separated the population by categorical groups. The first set of results presented are; the Admission and Termination risk scores by Adult Outcome on Probation. With this we hope to be able to assess the degree to which the Primary Risk Assessment is a valid and reliable tool for the prediction of recidivism while on Probation. We would expect that as the designated risk level rises the number of successful outcomes on probation should decrease. We present the results first for the overall population and then proceed to separate the categorical groups under study.

TABLE 51- ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED))
Low	82.2%**
Medium	82.8%**
High	62.3%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION	
Low	89.2%**
Medium	65.8%**
High	54.5%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION	
Low	85.6%**
Medium	66.9%**
High	55.1%**
RISK/NEED	
Low	81.8%**
Medium	61.1%**
High	43.4%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *, N 1076)

As we can see, all scores other than the Admission risk score, appear to be valid predictors of actual performance on probation. That is, the assigned risk level corresponds to the expected number of successes and failures on probation. We now compare the overall results to the individual group results.

120

TABLE 52 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER

ADMISSION RISK SCORE MALES N 885	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED)
Low	74.2%**
Medium	80.0%**
High	62.8%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION MALES N 885	
Low	89.0%**
Medium	66.3%**
High	55.0%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION MALES N 885	
Low	83.3%**
Medium	66.7%**
High	56.1%**
RISK/NEED MALES N 885	
Low	80.6%**
Medium	61.1%**
High	43.9%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE FEMALES N 191	
Low	94.7%**
Medium	87.5%**
High	58.6%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION FEMALES N 191	
Low	89.6%**
Medium	63.2%**
High	50.0%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION FEMALES N 191	
Low	90.6%**
Medium	68.3%**
High	46.7%**
RISK/NEED FEMALES N 191	
Low	85.5%**
Medium	61.0%**
High	37.5%**

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

121

The above results suggest that the admission risk score is not a reliable measure for recidivism at least for the male offender population. The remainder of the risk scores appear to be reliable measures of recidivism as measured by success on probation.

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY	
ADMISSION RISK SCORE **MALES NON ABORIGINAL** **N 524**	**ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED)**
Low	76.2%
Medium	76.9%
High	63.9%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION **MALES NON ABORIGINAL** **N 524**	
Low	89.2%
Medium	65.1%
High	55.7%
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION **MALES NON ABORIGINAL** **N 524**	
Low	86.2%**
Medium	66.9%**
High	55.4%**
RISK/NEED **MALES NON ABORIGINAL** **N 524**	
Low	79.6%**
Medium	63.0%**
High	39.1%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE **MALES METIS** **N 117**	
Low	0.0%
Medium	90.0%
High	59.4%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION **MALES METIS** **N 117**	
Low	90.0%**
Medium	66.7%**
High	52.5%**

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION MALES METIS N 117	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED)
Low	81.8%
Medium	60.9%
High	58.3%
RISK/NEED MALES METIS N 117	
Low	90.3%**
Medium	55.2%**
High	36.8%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE MALES TREATY ON N 145	
Low	87.5%
Medium	92.9%
High	65.9%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION MALES TREATY ON N 145	
Low	89.7%*
Medium	68.4%*
High	61.0%*
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION MALES TREATY ON N 145	
Low	81.8%
Medium	70.0%
High	61.5%
RISK/NEED MALES TREATY ON N 145	
Low	80.7%
Medium	63.2%
High	58.3%
ADMISSION RISK SCORE MALES TREATY OFF N 99	
Low	0.0%
Medium	66.7%
High	57.6%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION MALES TREATY OFF N 99	
Low	80.0%*
Medium	69.4%*
High	49.1%*

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION MALES TREATY OFF N 99	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED)
Low	57.1%
Medium	66.7%
High	50.9%
RISK/NEED MALES TREATY OFF N 99	
Low	72.2%
Medium	55.0%
High	52.4%
ADMISSION RISK SCORE FEMALES NON ABORIGINAL N 96	
Low	100%**
Medium	84.4%**
High	62.3%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION FEMALES NON ABORIGINAL N 96	
Low	91.5%**
Medium	63.6%**
High	43.8%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION FEMALES NON ABORIGINAL N 96	
Low	94.7%**
Medium	70.7%**
High	35.3%**
RISK/NEED FEMALES NON ABORIGINAL N 96	
Low	87.8%**
Medium	61.4%**
High	33.3%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE FEMALES Metis N 31	
Low	100%
Medium	100%
High	68.2%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION FEMALES Metis N 31	
Low	100%
Medium	58.3%
High	80.0%

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

124

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION FEMALES Metis N 31	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED
Low	100%
Medium	62.5%
High	87.5%
RISK/NEED FEMALES Metis N 31	
Low	100%**
Medium	61.1%**
High	∅**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE FEMALES TREATY ON N 28	
Low	66.7%
Medium	83.3%
High	46.2%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION FEMALES TREATY ON N 28	
Low	71.4%
Medium	75.0%
High	33.3%
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION FEMALES TREATY ON N 28	
Low	69.2%
Medium	77.8%
High	33.3%
RISK/NEED FEMALES TREATY ON N 28	
Low	62.5%
Medium	63.3%
High	100%
ADMISSION RISK SCORE FEMALES TREATY OFF N 36	
Low	100%*
Medium	100%*
High	50.0%*
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION FEMALES TREATY OFF N 36	
Low	100%*
Medium	60.0%*
High	42.9%*

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

125

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION FEMALES TREATY OFF N 36	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED
Low	100%
Medium	62.5%
High	42.9%
RISK/NEED FEMALES TREATY OFF N 36	
Low	100%
Medium	59.3%
High	25.0%
ADMISSION RISK SCORE NON ABORIGINAL N 620	
Low	84.4%**
Medium	79.4%**
High	63.7%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION NON ABORIGINAL N 620	
Low	89.9%**
Medium	64.9%**
High	54.8%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION NON ABORIGINAL N 620	
Low	88.8%**
Medium	67.5%**
High	53.7%**
RISK/NEED NON ABORIGINAL N 620	
Low	81.5%**
Medium	62.8%**
High	38.8%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE Metis N 148	
Low	75.0%*
Medium	93.8%*
High	60.9%*
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION Metis N 148	
Low	94.7%**
Medium	65.0%**
High	56.5%**

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

126

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION Metis N 148	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED
Low	88.9%
Medium	61.3%
High	61.8%
RISK/NEED **Metis** **N 148**	
Low	93.2%**
Medium	56.5%**
High	36.8%**
ADMISSION RISK SCORE **TREATY ON** **N 173**	
Low	81.8%*
Medium	88.5%*
High	64.0%*
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION **TREATY ON** **N 173**	
Low	83.7%*
Medium	69.2%*
High	58.5%*
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION **TREATY ON** **N 173**	
Low	78.3%
Medium	71.0%
High	58.6%
RISK/NEED **TREATY ON** **N 173**	
Low	76.7%
Medium	63.2%
High	61.5%
ADMISSION RISK SCORE **TREATY OFF** **N 135**	
Low	66.7%
Medium	83.3%
High	55.8%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION **TREATY OFF** **N 135**	
Low	91.7%
Medium	66.7%
High	47.9%

(Significance level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION TREATY OFF N 135	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED
Low	76.9%
Medium	65.5%
High	49.3%
RISK/NEED TREATY OFF N 135	
Low	78.3%
Medium	56.3%
High	48.0%

TABLE 53 – ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION SEPARATED BY GENDER & ETHNICITY

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The above table demonstrates that all risk scores other than the Admission Risk Score generally follow expected results. There are however some anomalies in the results. The male Treaty Off sample was most likely to succeed on Probation if classified as medium risk rather than low as measured by the Classified Level at Admissions. Furthermore, the female Metis population was more successful on probation if classified as high risk than medium risk on the Level indicated by Risk at Admission and the Classified Level at Admission. The female Treaty On sample failed to follow expected patterns for any of the risk scores. Finally, the Metis group overall appeared to perform better on Probation when classified as high rather than medium as classified by the Classified Level at Admission.

We now examine the same risk scores to determine how helpful they are in predicting post Probation outcomes.

TABLE 54 – POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 1076	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 1027	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 913	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 870	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 1 N 1076	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 2 N 1027	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 3 N 913	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 4 + N 870
Low	10.0%**	14.3%**	27.3%**	51.2%**	0.0%**	2.0%**	6.8%**	14.0%**
Medium	17.9%**	31.3%**	41.0%**	51.4%**	3.3%**	6.7%**	7.7%**	9.2%**
High	30.5%**	46.8%**	59.4%**	71.7%**	14.4%**	20.7%**	25.7%**	28.8%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	13.0%**	20.7%**	29.3%**	42.7%**	4.0%**	5.4%**	8.4%**	12.0%**
Medium	26.2%**	42.7%**	58.7%**	69.4%**	7.7%**	12.9%**	17.6%**	19.9%**
High	37.7%**	54.7%**	63.8%**	76.7%**	21.0%**	28.9%**	32.3%**	35.3%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	15.3%**	26.1%**	35.9%**	46.9%**	5.4%**	8.7%**	12.2%**	16.1%**
Medium	25.9%**	42.3%**	57.2%**	69.0%**	7.5%**	12.4%**	17.5%**	19.9%**
High	36.4%**	52.4%**	62.1%**	75.8%**	21.2%**	28.9%**	32.0%**	35.4%**
RISK/NEED								
Low	16.5%**	28.3%**	38.8%**	54.2%**	4.8%**	8.8%**	12.0%**	14.9%**
Medium	31.2%**	47.7%**	61.5%**	73.4%**	13.4%**	19.1%**	24.3%**	27.4%**
High	45.3%**	65.7%**	73.7%**	81.3%**	29.2%**	41.2%**	44.2%**	48.4%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

From the above table, we observe that the overall population generally followed expected patterns of reconviction and re-incarceration. That is as the classified level of risk increased so did the corresponding rate of reconviction/re-incarceration. We do, however, observe two exceptions to this pattern. For the Admission Risk Score we see an incompatible pattern for the variable re-incarceration in year 4, where the medium risk category was re-incarcerate at the lowest level followed by the low and high risk groups. Additionally, we also observed an unexpected pattern for the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission. For variable re-incarcerated in year 1, we found that the medium risk group was re-incarcerated at the lowest rate, followed by the low and high risk categories.

129

TABLE 55 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE MALE OFFENDER
SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 885	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 848	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 758	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 725	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 1 N 885	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 2 N 848	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 3 N 758	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 4 + N 725
Low	6.5%**	10.0%**	25.0%**	50.0%**	0.0%**	3.3%**	10.7%**	17.9%**
Medium	21.1%**	34.1%**	40.8%**	50.0%**	4.2%**	7.1%**	7.9%**	9.7%**
High	31.8%**	48.6%**	62.1%**	73.9%**	15.5%**	22.8%**	28.1%**	31.2%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	13.0%**	22.6%**	31.8%**	44.1%**	4.8%**	6.8%**	10.9%**	13.7%**
Medium	26.7%**	42.9%**	59.0%**	69.3%**	8.9%**	14.4%**	19.8%**	22.3%**
High	39.2%**	56.6%**	66.5%**	79.3%**	22.0%**	30.8%**	34.4%**	37.5%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	15.2%**	28.3%**	38.5%**	49.0%**	6.5%**	11.0%**	15.6%**	22.7%**
Medium	27.5%**	43.7%**	59.3%**	70.1%**	9.1%**	14.4%**	20.5%**	37.1%**
High	37.9%**	54.3%**	64.5%**	78.1%**	21.9%**	30.6%**	33.6%**	28.6%**
RISK/NEED								
Low	18.7%**	31.5%**	42.0%**	57.9%**	6.0%**	11.2%**	15.2%**	18.1%**
Medium	32.0%**	49.0%**	63.7%**	74.6%**	14.6%**	20.9%**	26.5%**	29.4%**
High	48.0%**	66.3%**	75.0%**	83.3%**	30.6%**	43.2%**	46.6%**	51.2%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male offender population, we see expected patterns of reconviction/re-incarceration for variables Classified Level at Admission, and for the Termination Risk/ Need, however, continue to see problems with Admission Risk Score and the Level indicated by Risk at Admission. For the Admission Risk scores, we observe inconsistent patterns for variables re-incarcerated in years 2-4, where the pattern shows the medium risk group being re-incarcerated at the lowest rate, followed by the low and high risk groups. For the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, we see a change in expected pattern only for variable re-incarcerated in year 1, where the medium risk group was re-incarcerated at the lowest rate followed by the low and high risk groups.

TABLE 56 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER
SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 191	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 179	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 155	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 145	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 191	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 179	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 155	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 145
Low	15.8%	21.1%	31.3%	53.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Medium	12.5%	26.5%	41.5%	54.1%	1.8%	6.1%	7.3%	8.1%
High	22.4%	35.1%	41.8%	57.0%	6.9%	7.2%	9.2%	12.9%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	13.0%	17.1%**	24.6%**	39.6%**	2.6%**	2.9%	3.5%	8.3%
Medium	23.5%	41.3%**	56.6%**	69.8%**	1.5%**	4.8%	5.7%	7.5%
High	21.7%	39.1%**	42.2%**	56.8%**	13.0%**	13.0%	15.6%	18.2%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	15.6%	21.1%	29.8%	41.5%	3.1%**	3.5%**	4.3%**	7.3%*
Medium	18.3%	35.1%	47.0%	63.5%	0.0%**	2.6%**	3.0%**	6.3%*
High	24.4%	37.8%	42.9%	58.5%	15.6%**	15.6%**	19.0%**	22.0%*
RISK/NEED								
Low	9.6%**	17.9%**	28.4%*	40.7%**	1.2%	1.3%*	1.5%*	3.4%*
Medium	27.0%**	40.4%**	49.4%*	67.1%**	7.0%	9.6%*	12.3%*	16.5%*
High	12.5%**	57.1%**	57.1%*	57.1%**	12.5%	14.3%*	14.3%*	14.3%*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

While male offenders generally followed expected patterns, we can see that the results for female offenders are more difficult to interpret. The Admission Risk score only demonstrated inconsistent patterns for reconviction in year 1, where the medium risk group was reconvicted at the lowest rate followed by the low and high risk groups.

The Level Indicated by Risk at Admission only resulted in expected patterns for variables re-incarceration in years 2 and 3. For variables reconviction in years 1-4, we find that the medium risk group is reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and low risk groups. Additionally, variable; re-incarceration in year four, we find the medium risk group is least likely to be re-incarcerated followed by the low and high risk groups.

Variable Classified Level at Admission failed to result in expected patterns for all but variables; reconviction in year 1 and 2. For variables; reconviction in years three and four, we find that the medium risk group is reconvicted at the highest rate, followed by the high and low risk groups. For variables; re-incarceration in years 1-4, we find the medium risk group is re-incarcerated at the lowest rate, followed by the low and high risk groups.

Finally, for risk/need score, where we see the closest resemblance to the expected patterns, we see unexpected results for variables; reconviction in year 1 and 4, and re-incarceration in year four. For these three variables we find the medium risk group being reconvicted/re-incarcerated at the highest rate followed by the high and low risk groups.

TABLE 57 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 524	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 499	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 445	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 420	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 524	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 499	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 445	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 420
Low	4.8%*	10.0%**	22.2%**	38.9%**	0.0%*	5.0%**	11.1%**	11.1%**
Medium	18.5%*	27.1%**	32.7%**	40.4%**	4.6%*	5.1%**	5.5%**	5.8%**
High	25.6%*	42.4%**	54.8%**	67.4%**	12.1%*	19.3%**	23.9%**	27.4%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	9.8%**	17.2%**	23.4%**	34.3%**	2.9%**	4.3%**	6.5%**	7.1%**
Medium	23.4%**	38.2%**	51.4%**	62.0%**	7.3%**	12.3%**	16.2%**	19.0%**
High	31.5%**	50.2%**	60.8%**	74.2%**	18.2%**	27.4%**	30.9%**	34.4%**
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	12.6%**	21.0%**	27.5%**	34.9%**	4.6%**	6.2%**	8.7%**	9.5%*
Medium	23.1%**	37.4%**	52.7%**	63.4%**	7.6%**	12.3%**	18.4%**	20.4%*
High	30.1%**	49.7%**	57.7%**	72.9%**	17.7%**	27.9%**	29.1%**	33.7%*
RISK/NEED								
Low	12.3%**	21.3%**	58.4%**	43.0%**	3.1%**	7.3%**	10.4%**	11.7%**
Medium	27.2%**	45.1%**	69.0%**	70.4%**	12.0%**	17.8%**	22.3%**	25.3%**
High	41.3%**	60.0%**	50.8%**	79.5%**	28.3%**	44.4%**	47.6%**	56.4%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Non-Aboriginal population, we see incompatible results only for the Admission risk score, and only for variables; re-incarceration in year three and four. All other risk scores resulted in expected patterns of reconviction/re-incarceration.

TABLE 58 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE MALE METIS SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 117	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 100	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 97	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 117	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 114	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 100	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 97
Low	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	30.0%	33.3%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
High	34.0%	47.1%	62.4%	76.7%	18.9%	21.2%	28.0%	32.2%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	10.0%*	11.1%*	16.7%	50.0%	0.0%**	0.0%**	0.0%*	16.7%
Medium	25.0%*	41.3%*	64.9%	73.0%	6.3%**	8.7%**	16.2%*	18.9%
High	44.1%*	54.2%*	63.2%	81.5%	28.8%**	30.5%**	35.1%*	40.7%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	18.2%**	30.0%	37.5%	62.5%	9.1%**	10.0%**	12.5%**	25.0%
Medium	28.3%**	43.2%	61.1%	69.4%	4.3%**	6.8%**	11.1%**	16.7%
High	40.0%**	50.0%	64.3%	83.0%	28.3%**	30.0%**	37.5%**	41.5%
RISK/NEED								
Low	16.1%**	26.7%**	40.0%**	72.0%	0.0%**	0.0%**	4.0%**	8.0%**
Medium	32.8%**	44.6%**	62.1%**	73.2%	17.9%**	21.5%**	29.3%**	35.7%**
High	63.2%**	78.9%**	88.2%**	93.8%	42.1%**	42.1%**	47.1%**	50.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Metis group, we see expected patterns only for the risk/need score. All other scores failed to predict result for all outcome variables. For the Admission Risk Score we observe incompatible results for variable; reconviction in year four, where the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and medium risk groups.

For the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, we see problems with variable; reconviction in year three, where the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and low risk groups. Finally, for the Classified Level at Admission, we found incompatible results for all of the re-incarceration variables.

134

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 145	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 140	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 129	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 126	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 145	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 140	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 3 N 129	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 126
Low	12.5%*	12.5%**	37.5%*	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%
Medium	21.4%*	53.8%**	63.6%*	70.0%	7.1%	23.1%	27.3%	30.0%
High	48.8%*	66.4%**	79.1%*	87.0%	24.4%	31.9%	37.3%	38.0%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	24.1%**	39.3%**	58.3%	69.6%*	13.8%	17.9%	29.2%	34.8%
Medium	40.4%**	60.0%**	74.0%	81.3%*	17.5%	25.5%	30.0%	31.3%
High	57.6%**	75.4%**	83.6%	92.7%*	28.8%	38.6%	41.8%	41.8%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	18.2%**	43.8%*	64.3%	74.1%	12.1%*	25.0%	35.7%	40.7%
Medium	28.3%**	63.8%*	75.5%	84.3%	16.7%*	24.1%	28.3%	29.4%
High	40.0%**	72.0%*	81.3%	89.6%	32.7%*	38.0%	41.7%	41.7%
RISK/NEED								
Low	33.3%	54.5%	68.0%	81.3%	15.8%	25.5%	32.0%	35.4%
Medium	48.7%	66.2%	79.7%	86.8%	22.4%	29.7%	34.8%	35.3%
High	66.7%	72.7%	80.0%	80.0%	41.7%	45.5%	50.0%	50.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty On population, only the Admission risk score resulted in expected patterns for all outcome variables. Variable; Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, failed to result in an expected pattern for re-incarceration in year four. Variable Classified Level at Admission failed to result in expected patterns for re-incarceration in years 2-4. Finally, for the risk/need score we observe problems with variables reconviction in year four and re-incarceration in year four.

TABLE 60 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 95	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 84	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 82	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 95	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 84	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 82
Low	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Medium	33.3%	75.0%	75.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High	35.9%	55.6 %	72.2%	81.8%	16.3%	28.9%	35.4%	37.7%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	20.0%	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	27.8%	45.7%	71.4%	88.5%	8.3%	17.1%	28.6%	30.8%
High	42.1%	62.5%	73.1%	80.8%	21.1%	35.7%	38.5%	40.4%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	14.3%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Medium	33.3%	52.6%	71.9%	90.0%	12.8%	21.1%	31.3%	33.3%
High	39.6%	58.5%	72.9%	79.2%	18.9%	34.0%	37.5%	39.6%
RISK/NEED								
Low	33.3%	56.3%	66.7%	86.7%	1.1%	18.8%	20.0%	33.3%
Medium	35.0%	52.5%	72.0%	81.3%	15.0%	25.4%	34.0%	35.4%
High	38.1%	65.0%	73.7%	84.2%	19.0%	40.0%	42.1%	42.1%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty Off sample group, we find that no risk score validly predicts outcome for all outcome variables. Admission risk scores failed to result in expect patterns for variables reconviction in years 2-4, and re-incarceration in year four. Variable Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, failed to result in expected patterns for reconviction in years two and four. Variable Classified Level at Admission produced incompatible patterns for reconviction in year four. Finally, the risk/need score failed to result in expected patterns for reconviction in year two and four.

TABLE 61 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 96	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 86	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 73	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 68	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 1 N 96	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 2 N 86	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 3 N 73	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 4 + N 68
Low	9.1%	9.1%	22.2%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	9.4%	28.0%	38.1%	50.0%	3.1%	8.0%	9.5%	11.1%
High	15.1%	24.0%	27.9%	39.0%	3.8%	4.0%	4.7%	7.3%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	10.6%	12.5%*	18.8%**	29.6%**	4.3%	5.0%	6.3%	7.4%
Medium	15.2%	40.0%*	52.0%**	64.0%**	0.0%	3.3%	4.0%	8.0%
High	12.5%	18.8%*	18.8%**	25.0%**	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	13.2%	16.1%	23.1%	34.8%	5.3%	6.5%	7.7%	8.7%
Medium	12.2%	31.6%	40.6%	53.3%	0.0%	2.6%	3.1%	6.7%
High	11.8%	17.6%	20.0%	26.7%	5.9%	5.9%	6.7%	6.7%
RISK/NEED								
Low	6.1%	15.9%	24.3%	37.5%	0.0%**	0.0%**	0.0%**	0.0%**
Medium	18.2%	30.0%	35.3%	44.1%	4.5%**	7.5%**	8.8%**	11.8%**
High	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%**	50.0%**	50.0%**	50.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Only the Termination risk/need score resulted in expected patterns for the female Non-Aboriginal population. For the Admission Risk Score we found incompatible results for variables; re-conviction in years 2-4 and re-incarceration in years 2-4, in which case the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and low risk groups. For the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission and the Classified Level at Admission, we found incompatible results for all outcome variables.

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 30	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 25	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 23	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 31	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 30	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 25	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 23
Low	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Medium	16.7%	16.7%	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High	27.3%	33.3%	41.2%	68.8%	9.1%	9.5%	11.8%	12.5%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	11.1%	11.1%	12.5%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Medium	33.3%	36.4%	62.5%	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High	20.0%	30.0%	33.3%	62.5%	20.0%	200.0%	22.2%	25.0%
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	14.3%	14.3%	16.7%	20.0%	0.0%*	0.0%**	0.0%	8.3%
Medium	25.0%	33.3%	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%*	0.0%**	0.0%	33.3%
High	25.0%	25.0%	28.6%	66.7%	25.0%*	25.0%**	28.6%	13.0%
RISK/NEED								
Low	7.7%	7.7%*	16.7%*	27.3%**	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Medium	33.3%	41.2%*	53.8%*	91.7%**	11.1%	11.8%	15.4%	16.7%
High	∅	∅*	∅*	∅**	∅	∅*	∅*	∅*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Once again only the risk/need score resulted in expected patterns for the female Metis offender sample. The Admission risk score failed to produce expected results for variables re-convicted and re-incarcerated in year 4, where the medium risk group was re-convicted and re-incarcerated at the lowest level. The Level Indicated by risk at Admission and the Classified Level at Admission failed to produce expected results for all but variables; re-incarcerated in years 1-3. Even in these years, we saw no distinction between the low and medium risk groups.

TABLE 63 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE								
ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 28	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 28	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 27	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 25	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 28	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 28	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 27	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 25
Low	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	8.3%	25.0%	45.5%	60.0%	0.0%	80.3%	9.1%	10.0%
High	23.1%	30.8%	30.8%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	21.4%	28.6%	38.5%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Medium	12.5%	25.0%	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
High	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	23.1%	30.8%	41.7%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Medium	11.1%	22.2%	33.3%	55.6%	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
High	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RISK/NEED								
Low	18.8%	25.0%	40.0%	53.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	27.3%	45.5%	45.5%	72.7%	0.0%	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%
High	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

All of the risk scores failed to result in expected patterns for the female Treaty On group.

TABLE 64 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 36	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 35	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 30	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 29	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 36	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 35	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 30	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 29
Low	0.0%	50.0%	100%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High	32.1%	59.3%	72.0%	83.3%	14.3%	14.8%	20.0%	25.0%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	14.3%	28.6%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium	40.0%	57.1%	75.0%	83.3%	6.7%	7.1%	8.3%	8.3%
High	28.6%	64.3%	71.4%	85.7%	21.4%'	21.4%	28.6%	35.7%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	16.7%	33.3%	66.7%	66.7%	0.0%*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%*
Medium	31.3%	53.3%	69.2%	83.3%	0.0%*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%*
High	35.7%	64.3%	71.4%	85.7%	28.6%*	28.6%	35.7%	42.9%*
RISK/NEED								
Low	20.0%	40.0%	66.7%	66.7%	20.0%	20.0%	33.3%	33.3%
Medium	37.0%	53.8%	69.6%	86.4%	11.1%	11.5%	17.4%	22.7%
High	0.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Only the Classified Level at Admission produced expected results for the female Treaty Off offender sample.

TABLE 65 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE								
ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 620	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 585	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 518	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 488	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 1 N 620	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 2 N 585	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 3 N 518	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 4 + N 488
Low	6.3%**	9.7%**	22.2%**	37.0%**	0.0%*	3.2%**	7.4%**	7.4%**
Medium	15.5%**	27.4%**	34.2%**	42.9%**	4.1%*	6.0%**	6.6%**	7.1%**
High	24.4%**	40.4%**	52.0%**	64.5%**	11.2%*	17.7%**	21.9%**	25.3%**
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	10.0%**	15.8%**	22.0%**	33.0%**	3.4%**	4.5%**	6.4%**	7.2%**
Medium	22.3%**	38.5%**	51.5%**	62.2%**	6.4%**	11.1%**	14.6%**	17.6%**
High	30.1%**	47.9%**	57.6%**	70.3%**	17.4%**	25.8%**	29.0%**	32.2%**
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	12.8%**	19.6%**	26.3%**	34.9%**	4.8%**	6.3%**	8.4%**	9.3%**
Medium	21.6%**	36.6%**	51.1%**	62.0%**	6.5%**	11.0%**	16.3%**	18.6%**
High	28.6%**	47.0%**	54.7%**	69.1%**	16.7%**	26.0%**	27.4%**	31.5%**
RISK/NEED								
Low	10.9%**	20.1%**	28.7%**	41.9%**	2.4%**	5.7%**	8.2%**	9.4%**
Medium	26.1%**	43.3%**	55.8%**	67.2%**	11.1%**	16.6%**	20.8%**	23.7%**
High	40.8%**	59.6%**	68.2%**	78.0%**	28.6%**	44.7%**	47.7%**	56.1%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

All risk scores except the Admission Risk scores resulted in expected patterns for the Non-Aboriginal group. For the Admission Risk score only variables re-incarceration in years three and four failed to produce expected patterns.

TABLE 66 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE METIS SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 148	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 144	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 125	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 120	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 1 N 148	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 2 N 144	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 3 N 125	RE-INCARCERATED YEAR 4 + N 120
Low	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%*	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Medium	25.0%	26.7%	45.5%*	54.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
High	32.8%	44.8%	59.1%*	75.5%	17.2%	19.2%	25.5%	29.2%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	10.5%*	11.1%**	14.3%**	38.5%**	0.0%**	0.0%**	0.0%**	15.4%*
Medium	26.7%*	40.4%**	64.4%**	75.6%**	5.0%**	7.0%**	13.3%**	15.6%*
High	40.6%*	50.7%**	59.1%**	79.0%**	27.5%**	29.0%**	33.3%**	38.7%*
CLASSIFIED LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	16.7%	23.5%	28.6%	46.2%*	5.6%**	5.9%**	7.1%**	15.4%**
Medium	27.4%	40.7%	58.3%	70.8%*	3.2%**	5.1%**	8.3%**	14.6%**
High	38.2%	47.1%	60.3%	81.4%*	27.9%**	29.4%**	36.5%**	40.7%**
RISK/NEED								
Low	13.6%**	20.9%**	32.4%**	58.3%*	0.0%**	0.0%**	2.7%**	8.3%**
Medium	32.9%**	43.9%**	60.6%**	76.5%*	16.5%**	19.5%**	26.8%**	32.4%**
High	63.2%**	78.9%**	88.2%**	93.8%*	42.1%**	42.1%**	47.1%**	50.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The Level Indicated by Risk at Admission and the Risk/Need scores produced expected results for the Metis offender sample. The Admission risk score failed to produce expected patters for variables; reconviction and re-incarceration in year 4, where the medium risk group was reconvicted/re-incarcerated at the lowest rate. For the Classified Level at Admission, we found incompatible results for variables re-incarcerated in years 1, 2, and 4, where the medium risk group was re-incarcerated at the lowest rate, followed by the low and high risk groups.

TABLE 67 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE TREATY ON SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 173	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 168	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 156	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 151	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 173	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 168	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 3 N 156	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 1551
Low	27.3%**	27.3%**	45.5%*	73.3%	0.0%*	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%
Medium	15.4%**	40.0%**	54.5%*	72.7%	3.8%*	16.0%	18.2%	20.0%
High	46.3%**	62.9%**	74.0%*	65.0%	22.1%*	28.8%	33.3%	35.0%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	23.3%**	35.7%**	51.4%**	67.6%*	9.3%	11.9%*	18.9%	26.5%
Medium	36.9%**	55.6%**	69.0%**	76.8%*	15.4%	23.8%*	27.6%	28.6%
High	55.4%**	73.0%**	80.3%**	90.2%*	26.2%	34.9%*	37.7%	37.7%
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	21.7%**	40.0%**	57.5%	70.3%	8.7%*	17.8%	25.0%	32.4%
Medium	37.7%**	58.2%**	69.4%	80.0%	14.5%*	22.4%	25.8%	26.7%
High	58.6%**	69.6%**	77.8%	87.0%	29.3%*	33.9%	37.0%	37.0%
RISK/NEED								
Low	30.1%*	47.9%	61.5%	75.4%	12.3%	19.7%	24.6%	27.9%
Medium	46.0%*	63.5%	75.0%	84.8%	19.5%	27.1%	31.3%	32.9%
High	61.5%*	66.7%	72.7%	72.7%	38.5%	41.7%	45.5%	45.5%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty On population, we found that the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, and the Risk/Need scores followed expected patterns. The Admission Risk Score failed to produce expected results for variables; reconvicted in years 1 and 4, where the medium risk group was reconvicted at the lowest rate followed by the low and high risk groups. The Classified Level at Admission failed to produce expected results for variable; re-incarcerated in year 4, where the medium risk group was re-incarcerated at the lowest rate followed by the low and high risk groups.

143

TABLE 68 - POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

ADMISSION RISK SCORE	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 135	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 130	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 + N 111	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 1 N 135	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 2 N 130	RE-INCARCER ATED YEAR 3 N 114	RE-INCARCE RATED YEAR 4 + N 111
Low	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Medium	33.3%	50.0%	62.5%	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High	35.0%	56.4%	72.1%	82.2%	15.8%	25.6%	31.7%	34.7%
LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK ADMISSION								
Low	16.7%	40.0%	57.1%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%*	0.0%	0.0%*
Medium	31.4%	49.0%	72.5%	86.8%	7.8%	14.3%*	22.5%	23.7%*
High	39.4%	62.9%	72.7%	81.8%	21.1%	32.9%*	36.4%	39.4%*
CLASSIFIE D LEVEL AT ADMISSION								
Low	15.4%	40.0%	57.1%	71.4%	0.0%*	0.0%**	0.0%*	14.3%
Medium	32.7%	52.8%	71.1%	88.1%	9.1%*	15.1%**	22.2%*	23.8%
High	38.8%	59.7%	72.6%	80.6%	20.9%*	32.8%**	37.1%*	40.3%
RISK/NEED								
Low	30.4%	52.4%	66.7%	83.3%	13.0%	19.0%	22.2%	33.3%
Medium	35.6%	52.9%	71.2%	82.9%	13.8%	21.2%	28.8%	31.4%
High	32.0%	66.7%	73.9%	82.6%	16.0%	33.3%	34.8%	34.8%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

We found for the Treaty Off group, all risk scores resulted in expected patterns for all outcome variables except reconviction and re-incarceration in year four, where in all cases the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate.

SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

As we saw from all of the above results, the sample population was composed primarily of male Non-Aboriginal offenders (48.7%). The majority of offenders averaged in their late 20's, with female offenders averaging slightly older than male offenders (29.9 versus 27.8). The vast majority of the sample had not achieved a high school diploma. Male offenders in the sample were more likely to report regular drug use than female offenders, and Aboriginal offenders were more likely than Non-Aboriginals to report

144

regular drug use. Female and Aboriginal offenders were more likely to report a dependence on social assistance than males and Non-Aboriginal offenders. Finally, male offenders in our sample were more likely to have had a previous conviction and consequently more likely to have had a previous probation sentence, previous incarceration, and previous breach. Furthermore, Aboriginal offenders in the sample were more likely to have had previous criminal justice involvement than Non-Aboriginal offenders.

When analyzing the overall sample, we found that the Primary Risk Assessment was significantly correlated with re-involvement both during probation and in the post probation follow up period. We also found that of the four risk scores (Admission Risk Score, Level indicated by Risk at Admission, Classified Level at Admission and the Risk/Need Score), the Risk/Need score was most strongly correlated with our outcome variables. This was true for both the Adult Outcome on Probation and for the post probation follow up period. Summarizing the trends observed by each risk score we found;

THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE

For the Admission Risk Score, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores than male offenders for variable; Adult Outcome on Probation. Male offenders however, produced stronger correlations for reconviction variables. No dramatic difference was observed between the correlations for male and female re-incarceration rates.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity, we find for male offenders the Admission risk score produced correlation scores within acceptable ranges for the male Non-Aboriginal, male Metis, and male Treaty On groups, however the scores were far lower for the male Treaty Off group. For female offender groupings, we found acceptable correlation scores for variable: Adult Outcome on Probation. Correlations scores for reconviction and re-incarceration variables were less consistent. We did not observe strong correlations between the admission risk score and reconviction or re-incarceration variables for the female Non-Aboriginal and female Treaty On groups. For the female Metis group correlations were all within an acceptable range, however were strongest for the re-incarceration variables. Finally, for the female Treaty Off group we observed acceptable correlation scores for all but the variables reconviction in years 1 and 2.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced strongest correlations for the Metis and Treaty On groups.

LEVEL INDICATED BY RISK AT ADMISSION

For the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation, however male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction and re-incarceration variables.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we found that from all male offender sample, the Level Indicated by Risk at Admission produced strongest correlation scores for the male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups, however scores began to drop for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender samples, we found an acceptable range of correlations for Adult Outcome on Probation, however, only female Metis and Treaty Off groups produced acceptable correlations for any of the post probation outcome variables. This was primarily observed for the re-incarceration variables. Correlations for female Non-Aboriginal and Treaty On groups were unimpressive.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the Non- Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty On groups, however were slightly lower for the Treaty Off group.

CLASSIFIED LEVEL -ADMISSION

For the Classified Level at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation, however male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction variables. We observed no dramatic difference in correlation scores for re-incarceration.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we found that from all male offender samples, the Classified Level at Admission produced strongest correlation

147

scores for the male Non-Aboriginal group. Correlations were in an acceptable range for the male Metis re-incarceration variables only, and the correlation strength diminished dramatically for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender samples, we found acceptable correlation scores for variable Adult Outcome on Probation for female Non-Aboriginal, Treaty On and Treaty Off groups, however not for the female Metis group. Additionally, for the post probation follow up period, we observed strong correlations only for female Metis and Treaty Off groups and only for the re-incarceration variables.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the Non- Aboriginal group. Correlations were less consistent for the other groups. Specifically, the Metis group produced acceptable range of correlations only for variable reconvicted in year 4 and for the re-incarceration variables. For the Treaty On group, we observed acceptable correlations for reconviction variables and re-incarceration in year 1. Finally, for the Treaty Off group, we found acceptable correlations for variables: Adult Outcome on Probation, and the re-incarceration variables.

RISK/NEED SCORE

For the Classified Level at Admission, female offenders produced stronger correlation scores for Adult Outcome on Probation. While male offenders produced stronger correlations for the reconviction/re-incarceration variables, the scores were not

dramatically distinguishable.

Examining the combined influence of gender and ethnicity we found that from all male offender samples, the risk/need score produced strongest correlation scores for the male Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups. Correlations were lower for the male Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. For female offender samples, we found that variable: Adult Outcome on Probation produced strong correlation scores for female Non-Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty Off groups, but not for the Treaty On group. For the post probation follow up period, we found acceptable correlation scores for female Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups and we only found this for the re-incarceration variables. These findings are consistent with the results we saw in the risk score's ability to reliably predict the post probation behaviour for the Treaty On and Treaty Off sample groups.

Examining ethnicity alone, we found that the risk score produced correlations of consistent strength for the Non- Aboriginal, Metis and Treaty On groups, however, were slightly lower for the Treaty Off group.

Item analysis of the Admission and Termination risk items produced significant results for nearly all items when the overall population was assessed, however, this could not be reproduced for each categorical group under study when separated. We found that while male offenders continued to produce significant correlations with all or most of the outcome variables, female offenders did not. Assessing both gender and ethnicity

149

together, we found acceptable correlation scores only for male Non-Aboriginal and Metis offender. For female offender groups, we found acceptable correlation scores for all groups, however could not produce statistically significant correlations for most of the items.

We found that the Risk/Need score identified the greatest proportion of each sample as medium risk for re-involvement. Exceptions to this were the female Non-Aboriginal and Treaty On groups, both were most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement. From our results, we observed that the majority of offenders successfully completed their probation period, however, as the follow up period increased, so did the rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. We found that female offenders were reconvicted at a lower rate than male offenders. This finding is consistent with findings presented by other research studies of provincial and federally sentenced women. Furthermore, we also saw that while Treaty On offenders were most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement and were most successful during Probation, they surpassed all other groups for reconviction in the follow up period. When separated by gender, we found that both male and female Non-Aboriginal offenders were reconvicted less than their Aboriginal counterparts. This highlights the same trend we find in the literature, where studies consistently find a greater rate of recidivism for Aboriginal versus Non-Aboriginal populations.

TABLE 69 – POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS - OVERALL SAMPLE

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 1076	-.12**	.11**
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 968	.21**	-.21**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 1002	-.17**	.14**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 1076	-.12	.13**
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 1020	-.19**	.10**
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 1037	-.15**	.16**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 1039	.03	-.12**
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 1002	-.19**	.14**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 1076	-.17**	.19**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 1020	-.21**	.14**
PREVIOUS BREACH N 1037	-.14**	.12**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Clearly all of the above items demonstrate significant correlations with the outcomes variables.

TABLE 70 – POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS MALE OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 885	-.12**	.13**
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 792	.17**	-.21**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 820	-.18**	.11**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 885	-.12**	.13**
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 835	-.20**	.09*
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 850	-.16**	.14**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 851	.04	-.14**
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 820	-.16**	.13**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 885	-.16**	.20**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 835	-.22**	.13**
PREVIOUS BREACH N 850	-.13**	.11**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

With the exception of grade in or achieved at admission, all items were significantly correlated for male offenders.

TABLE 71 - POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS FEMALE OFFENDER		
ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 191	-.12	-.07
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 176	.33**	-.18*
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 182	-.12	.25**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 191	-.07	.09
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 185	-.09	.14
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 187	-.13	.26**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 188	-.01	-.03
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 182	-.28**	.15*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 191	-.18*	.12
PREVIOUS JAIL N 185	-.13	.14
PREVIOUS BREACH N 187	-.20**	.17*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

While not all of the above items produced a significant correlation for the female offender sample, some items did demonstrate sufficient strength to be considered for inclusion in future alterations to the scale. These items are: Actual number of previous convictions, and Number of previous breaches.

As we observe the tables below, we can clearly see that while the items we have selected show strong correlations with some groups, they fail to show any correlation for others.

Our only explanation for this is that more research is required to assess which variables can be fairly applied to all groups. Perhaps, as some authors have suggested, it is unreasonable to perceive that one instrument will be valid for all groups. However, we must continue to look for improvements to instruments that try to identify those variables that are strongly correlated with criminal conviction regardless of gender and ethnicity.

TABLE 72 - POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS -MALE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 524	-.08	.12**
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 493	.18**	-.17**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 498	-.15**	.11*
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 524	-.17**	.11*
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 502	-.17**	.05
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 508	-.09	.10*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 509	.10*	-.12**
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 498	-.18**	.12**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 524	-.19**	.19**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 502	-.21**	.10*
PREVIOUS BREACH N 508	-.09*	.09*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 73 - POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS MALE METIS OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 117	-.20*	.16
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 99	.08	-.30**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 109	-.25**	-.30**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 117	-.14	.15
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 109	-.21*	.25**
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 109	-.21*	.25**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 117	-.13	.04
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 109	-.15	.17
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 117	-.22*	.21*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 109	-.21*	.20*
PREVIOUS BREACH N 109	-.17	.19*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 74 - POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS MALE TREATY ONOFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 145	-.28**	.12
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 122	.15	-.34**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 130	-.13	.20*
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 145	.01	.15
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 134	-.22*	.04
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 139	-.28**	.15
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 131	.12	-.15
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 130	-.14	.18*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 145	-.07	.19*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 134	-.30**	.10
PREVIOUS BREACH N 139	-.17*	.10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 99	-.03	.03
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 78	.16	-.07
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 83	-.29**	-.00
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 99	-.07	.02
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 90	-.29**	.09
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 94	-.25*	.07
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 94	-.21*	-.02
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 83	.00	-.02
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 99	-.08	.05
PREVIOUS JAIL N 90	-.15	.15
PREVIOUS BREACH N 94	-.19	.03

TABLE 75 - POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS MALE TREATY OFF OFFENDER

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 76- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 96	-.28**	-.05
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 94	.28**	-.15
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 93	-.03	.23
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 96	.01	.14
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 93	-.07	.11
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 95	-.01	.35**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 95	-.07	-.02
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 93	-.23*	.14
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 96	-.16	.22*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 93	-.13	-.02
PREVIOUS BREACH N 95	-.11	.28**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

159

TABLE 77- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS FEMALE METIS OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 31	.07	-.07
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 26	.33	-.31
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 30	.02	.08
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 31	-.18	.18
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 30	-.07	.07
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 31	-.49**	.21
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 31	-.37*	.07
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 30	-.35	.18
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 31	-.08	.08
PREVIOUS JAIL N 30	-.17	.17
PREVIOUS BREACH N 31	-.39*	.03

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
TABLE 78- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS FEMALE TREATY ON OFFENDER		
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 28	.21	-.27
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 26	.41*	-.11
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 26	-.41*	-.02
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 28	-.25	-.20
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 28	.09	-.08
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 28	-.35	-.01
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 27	.09	-.05
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 26	-.41*	.08
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 28	-.34	-.21
PREVIOUS JAIL N 28	-.30**	-.02
PREVIOUS BREACH N 28	-.17*	.04

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 79- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS FEMALE TREATY OFF OFFENDER

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 36	-.18	-.02
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 30	.46*	-.11
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 33	-.23	.36*
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 36	-.10	-.03
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 34	-.21	.29
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 33	-.13	.23
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 35	.04	.17
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 33	-.36*	.12
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 36	-.23	.06
PREVIOUS JAIL N 34	-.08	.23
PREVIOUS BREACH N 33	-.16	.11

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 80- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER SAMPLE

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 620	-.11	.11**
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 587	.20**	-.17**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 591	-.14**	.13**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 620	-.16**	.12**
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 595	-.16**	.06
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 603	-.07	.14**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 604	.08	-.11**
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 591	-.19**	.13**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 620	-.19**	.20**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 595	-.21**	.10*
PREVIOUS BREACH N 603	-.10*	.12**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 81- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 148	-.14	.11
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 125	.18*	-.31**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 139	-.24**	.29**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 148	-.16*	.17**
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 139	-.22*	.25**
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 140	-.25**	.25**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 148	-.17*	.05
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 139	-.22**	.19*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 148	-.21**	.20*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 139	-.23**	.21*
PREVIOUS BREACH N 140	-.21*	.16

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

164

TABLE 82- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS - TREATY ON OFFENDER SAMPLE

ITEM	ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 173	-.20**	.08
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 148	.18*	-.33**
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 156	-.13	.21**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 173	.01	.16*
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 162	-.14	.02
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 167	-.29**	.13
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 158	.11	-.12
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 156	-.16*	.20*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 173	-.08	.19*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 162	-.25**	.11
PREVIOUS BREACH N 167	-.20*	.09

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 83- POSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS -TREATY OFF OFFENDER SAMPLE		
ITEM	**ADULT OUTCOME ON PROBATION**	**CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE**
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 135	-.07	.02
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 108	.25**	-.08
ACTUAL # OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 116	-.25**	.14
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 135	-.08	.01
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 124	-.14	.13
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 127	-.29**	.10
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 129	.11	.05
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 116	-.16*	.02
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 135	-.08	.06
PREVIOUS JAIL N 124	-.25**	.17
PREVIOUS BREACH N 127	-.20*	.05

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

In conclusion of the adult offender section for the purpose of clarity, we feel it helpful to summarize some for the key points regarding each sample population.

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDERS – ADULT SAMPLE

The male Non-Aboriginal group of offenders accounted for 48.7% of our total adult offender sample, and 59.2% of the male offender sample. Their mean age was 28.4, and 66.6% of the sample reported at least one address change in the previous 12 months.

Just under 60% of the sample reported no use of drugs or alcohol, and the vast majority of the sample 88% had some means of financial support other than social assistance. While the majority (77.2%) had reported some high school education, (93.5%) had not graduated with a high school diploma.

While the majority (66.3%) had a previous conviction, only 39.9% had reported a previous probation term, and only 29.7% had reported a previous term of incarceration.

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found significant correlations for all of the outcome variables. Correlations consistently ranged from .23 - .31. (similar to that observed for the overall population).

Admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. In fact, only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Family/Marital Relations, Emotional Stability, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis revealed that all of the items produced significant results for at least some of the outcome variables. This demonstrates that all of the items on the scale contribute something important to the prediction model.

The male non-aboriginal group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by the risk/need score. The majority of the sample successfully completed their Probation term (66%), however, as the follow up period increased so did their rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism. Both the total risk score and item analysis demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with our outcome variables. Additional variables found to be significantly correlated with outcome on Probation and reconviction in year one included; Actual age at first conviction, Actual number of previous convictions, Actual number of previous probation orders, grade in or highest achieved, previous convictions, previous probation, previous jail and previous breach.

MALE METIS – ADULT SAMPLE

The male Metis offender accounted for 10.9% of the total adult offender sample and 13.2% of the male offender sample. Their mean age was 26.5, and 62.4% of the sample reported at least one address change in the previous 12 months. (42.7%) of the sample reported no use of drugs or alcohol, and about half of the sample (45.5%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission. While the majority (63.2%) of the sample had completed some high school, (99.1%) had not graduated from grade 12.

The majority of offender in this group had a previous conviction (86.2%) and previous probation order (62.4%). Just under half of the group (43.1%) had a previous jail sentence, and 28.4% had a previous breach.

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found significant correlations for nearly all of the variables. The exception to this was for reconviction in year four. Correlations consistently ranged from .24 - .34.

Admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. We found that significant correlations were sporadic, in that an item may be significantly correlation with one of the outcome variables, however rarely more than that. We further found that 4 items failed to produce significance with any of the outcome variables. These items were;

Attitude to Probation, Mental Ability, Drugs/Alcohol use, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Significant correlations were far more consistent for all outcome variables, and we found only two items that failed to produce a significant relationship with any outcome variables. These item were; Financial Management and Mental Ability.

The male Metis sample was most commonly classified as medium risk for re-involvement, as measured by the risk/need score. The majority of offenders in this group (61.5%) successfully completed their Probation orders, however, as the follow up period increased so did the rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism, however not to the same degree as that observed for the male non-aboriginal group. Additional variables found to be significantly correlated with outcome on Probation and reconviction in year one included; Actual age at first conviction, Actual number of terms of incarceration, Actual number of previous breaches, previous probation, and previous jail.

MALE TREATY ON – ADULT SAMPLE

The male Treaty On offender accounted for 16.4% of the male offender sample and 13.5% of the total adult offender sample. Their mean age was 26.7 placing them as the youngest sample in our population. Just under half of the sample (41.3%) reported at least one address change in the previous 12 month period. Approximately half of the sample (46.2%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. Over half of the sample (61.3%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

While approximately half of the sample (51.1%) reported completing some high school, only .8% had graduated from grade 12. Over half of the sample (63.8%) had a previous conviction and previous probation (51.7%). (35.8%) had a previous jail sentence and 14.4% had a previous breach.

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found significant correlations for nearly all of the variables. The exception to this was for reconviction in year four and re-incarceration for years 2-4. Correlations consistently ranged from .09 - .24, slightly lower than observed for the overall, male non-aboriginal and male Metis groups.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were Address changes, Age, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Employment. Here we may be beginning to see the

drawbacks of our smaller sample size. We did find acceptable range of correlations for variables Attitude to probation, prior convictions, and drug and alcohol use, though they did not reach significant levels.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while some items still failed to meet significant levels, 9 items were significantly correlated with at least some of the outcome variables. While variable; Prior convictions failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables the correlation scores are within an acceptable range, implying that sample size may be of issue. We did however also observe that some items did not appear to produce sufficiently high correlation scores with any of the outcome variables. These item were; Employment and Academic/Vocational skills.

The male Treaty On sample was most commonly classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. When we compare the percentage of offenders classified at each risk level, we find that a greater proportion of male offender from the Treaty On group were classified as low risk than any other male offender group. We found that the male Treaty On group was most successful of all male offender sub samples during the Probation period. (69.7%) successfully completed their Probation. This is what we would expect given they were most commonly assessed as low risk for re-involvement. Surprisingly, however, they surpassed all other male offender groups in the post probation follow up period. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of

172

outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. That is, those offenders classified as low risk were reconvicted and re-incarcerated at a lower rate than those classified as medium or high risk.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument may not be as useful as it was for the male non-aboriginal and Metis offender groups, especially for prediction in the post probation follow up period. The PRA did however reliably distinguish within the group which offenders were of greater risk for re-involvement. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on Probation and reconviction in year one included; Incarceration preceding order, Actual age at first conviction, Actual number of previous convictions, Actual number of terms of incarceration, Actual number of previous breaches, and previous jail.

MALE TREATY OFF – ADULT SAMPLE

The male Treaty Off offender accounted for 11.2% of the male offender sample and 9.2% of the total adult offender sample. Their mean age was 27.8 placing them as the second oldest sample in our male offender population. A sizable majority of the sample (83.8%) reported at least one address change in the previous 12 month period. Approximately half of the sample (41.4%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. Over half of the sample (55.1%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

While the majority of the sample (66.0%) reported completing some high school, only 3.2% had graduated from grade 12. The vast majority of the sample (84.3%) had a previous conviction and previous probation (62.6%). (43.3%) had a previous jail sentence and 19.1% had a previous breach.

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found no significant correlations for any of the outcome variables. Overall, we observed correlations of weaker strength than observed for all other male offender samples. Correlations ranged from .00 - .15.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 5 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were: Address changes, Age, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Academic/Vocational skills. While our significantly smaller sample size may explain some of the loss in significance, we find that the strength of the correlations is not as high as that observed for the other male offender groups. While variables such as Financial Management and Employment appear to maintain some reasonable correlations, many others do not.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while some items still failed to meet significant levels, 11 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. Items: Percentage of time employed in previous year, and

Academic/Vocational skills failed to produce acceptable correlations with any of the outcome variables.

The male Treaty Off sample was most commonly classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. When we compare the percentage of offenders classified at each risk level, we find that a greater proportion of male offenders from the Treaty Off group were classified as high risk than any other male offender group. We found that the male Treaty Off group was least successful of all male offender sub samples during the probation period, however the majority (57.6%) still successfully completed their Probation. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however not the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. While the risk score successfully predicted the re-involvement patterns for reconviction in years 1 and 3, and re-incarceration in years 1-4, we found that offenders in this sample were more likely to be reconvicted in year 2 if classified as medium risk rather than low risk. Furthermore, for variable reconviction in year 4, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and medium risk groups. Finally, for variable re-incarceration in year 4, we see very little differentiation between the performance of the low and medium risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument has limited utility, and is clearly not as valid for this group of offenders as for male non-aboriginal and male Metis groups. While the instrument was useful in predicting outcome on

Probation, it is only able to predict recidivism behaviour for some years in the post probation follow up period. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; actual number of previous convictions, actual number of terms of incarceration, number of previous breaches, and grade in or highest achieved.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL – ADULT SAMPLE

The female Non-Aboriginal offender accounted for 50.3% of the female offender sample and 8.9% of the total adult offender sample. Their mean age was 31.0 placing them as the oldest sample in both the female offender groups, and the overall adult offender population. Just over half of the sample (54.2%) reported at least one address change in the previous 12 month period. The majority (76.0%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. (30.8%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

While the majority of the sample (74.7%) reported completing some high school, only 7.4% had graduated from grade 12. The majority of the sample (57.0%) had a previous conviction. (31.3%) had a previous Probation order. Only 9.7% had a previous jail sentence and 10.5% had a previous breach.

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found significant correlations for just over half of the outcome variables. Overall, we observed significantly stronger correlations for the variable Adult Outcome on Probation than that

176

observed for male non-aboriginal offenders. When examining the reconviction results however, we found weaker correlations than that observed with the male non-aboriginal group. Finally, we found comparable correlation strength when examining the re-incarceration outcome variables. Correlations ranged from .06 - .44.

Admission item analysis revealed that 8 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were: Address changes, Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior, Family/Marital Relations, Financial Management, Emotional Stability, and Peers & Companions. Additionally, we found that items Age, Drugs and Alcohol use, and Employment produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered. Specifically, small sample sizes may be the reason we cannot establish a significant relationship between these items and the outcome variables.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and nearly all items reached significance with at least one outcome variable. Items that continued to lack significance were generally within an acceptable range to be considered.

The female non-aboriginal sample was most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk need score. The majority of offenders in this sample (74.0%) successfully completed their Probation period. Next to the female Metis offenders, the female non-aboriginal offenders were the second most successful group in

our female offender population. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation and in the entire post probation follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reasonably good instrument for the prediction of recidivism. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on Probation and reconviction in year one included; Incarceration preceding order, Actual age at first conviction, Actual number of previous convictions, number of previous breaches, Previous convictions, and Previous Probation.

FEMALE METIS – ADULT SAMPLE

The female Metis offender accounted for 16.2% of the female offender sample and 2.9% of the total adult offender sample. Their mean age was 29.0. Just under half of the sample (48.4%) reported at least one address change in the previous 12 month period. The majority (64.5%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. The vast majority of this sample (77.4%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

While the majority of the sample (67.7%) reported completing some high school, none had graduated from grade 12. The majority of the sample (66.7%) had a previous conviction. (35.5%) had a previous probation order, (20.0%) had a previous jail sentence and 25.8% had a previous breach.

178

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found significant correlations for only two items. This however was likely the result of a small sample size. The strength of the correlations observed were quite comparable to those observed for the male Metis sample and in many cases stronger than that observed for the female non-aboriginal sample. Correlations were particularly strong for variables reconviction in year 4 and re-incarceration in year 3. Correlations ranged from .09- .53.

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were, Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Financial Management, Mental Ability, and Employment. Additionally, we found that almost all of the other items produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered. Specifically, small sample sizes may be the reason we cannot establish a significant relationship between these items and the outcome variables.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 6 items reached significance with at least one outcome variable, many of the remaining items produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be considered.

The female Metis sample was most likely to be classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk need score. Of note however, offenders in this sample were classified as either low or medium risk. No member form this sample group

was classified as high risk for re-involvement. The majority of offenders in this sample (77.40%) successfully completed their probation period, placing them as the most successful female offender sample measured on probation. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation and for the post probation follow up period, however only if we assess the low and medium risk classifications. As no member of this group was assigned to a high risk category, we found we could only compare the low and medium risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reasonably good instrument for the prediction of recidivism. We do however have some concern with regard to the high risk classification for this group. Given we had no members to compare, it is difficult to see if a larger sample size would have made these results different. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; actual age at first conviction, actual number of previous probation orders, number of previous breaches, grade in or highest achieved, previous convictions, and previous breach.

FEMALE TREATY ON – ADULT SAMPLE

The female Treaty On offender accounted for 14.7% of the female offender sample and 2.6% of the total adult offender sample. Here we have the smallest sample group in the entire adult offender population. Their mean age was 27.5, placing them as the youngest female offender sample. Just under half of the sample (46.4%) reported at least one

address change in the previous 12 month period. The majority (60.7%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. (52.0%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

Just under half of the sample (48.1%) reported completing some high school. Only (3.7%) had graduated from grade 12. The female Treaty On group had the lowest percentage of previous convictions from all other male and female sample groups (26.9%). They were also less likely to have had a previous probation order (14.3%), previous jail sentence (17.9%) or a previous breach (14.3%).

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found no significant correlations. While this may be a result of the small sample size as compared to all other sample groups, we find that the strength of the correlations are also significantly lower than that observed for the female non-aboriginal and Metis groups. Correlations were strongest for variables reconviction in years 2 and 4. Correlations ranged from .01- .16.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were: Type of Prior Conviction and Family/Marital Relations. While the remainder of the admission items failed to produce significant correlations, the strength of the correlations are comparable to those observed in other female offender samples.

181

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 2 items reached significance with at least one outcome variable, many of the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

The female Treaty On sample was most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. The majority of offenders in this sample (64.3%) successfully completed their probation period, however not as high a percentage as we might expect given their risk classification. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however, we found that there was virtually no discrimination between the low and medium risk groups performance. There was a one percent difference between the two groups. The risk need score was not found to be reliable in predicting any of the post probation performance. We found that the high risk groups were reconvicted at the lowest level followed by the low and medium risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is not overly useful for predicting recidivism in the post probation period. The tool did demonstrate some utility in predicting adult outcome on Probation. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; incarceration preceding order, actual age at first conviction, actual number of previous convictions, actual number of previous probation orders, number of previous

182

breaches, previous convictions, previous probation, and previous jail.

FEMALE TREATY OFF – ADULT SAMPLE

The female Treaty Off offender accounted for 18.8% of the female offender sample and 3.3% of the total adult offender sample. Their mean age was 29.7. Well over half of the sample (77.8%) reported at least one address change in the previous 12 month period. Just under half of the sample (47.2%) reported no use of drugs or alcohol. (73.5%) reported public assistance as their primary source of income at admission.

Less than half of the sample (42.9%) reported completing some high school, and only 2.9% had graduated from grade 12. The female Treaty Off group had the highest percentage of previous convictions from all other female offender samples (84.8%). They were also more likely to have had a previous Probation order (50.0%), previous jail sentence (38.2%) or a previous breach (21.2%).

When we ran correlations of the total risk scores by the outcome variables, we found only one significant correlation for variable Adult Outcome on Probation. While this may be a result of the small sample size as compared to all other sample groups, we find that the strength of the correlations are also significantly lower than that observed for the female non-aboriginal and Metis groups. Correlations were strongest for variables Adult Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in year 2. Correlations ranged from .02- .39.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items were significantly correlation with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Family/Marital Relations, and Drugs/Alcohol use. Many of the remainder items, while failing to produce significant relationships were of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 4 items reached significance with at least one outcome variable, many of the remaining items produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be considered.

The female Treaty Off sample was most likely to be classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. The majority of offenders in this sample (61.1%) successfully completed their probation period. Comparing all of the female offender samples, the Treaty Off group was least successful in the probation period. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however, not for the post probation follow up period. We found that the risk need score was unrelated to outcome in all but variables reconviction in years 2 and 3. We found that for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4, the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate. For variables re-incarceration in years 1-4, we found that the low risk group was actually re-incarcerated at the highest rate followed by the medium and finally high risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is not overly useful for predicting recidivism in the post probation period. The tool did demonstrate ability to predict adult outcome on Probation. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; incarceration preceding order, actual age at first conviction, actual number of previous convictions, actual number of previous terms of incarceration, number of previous breaches, previous convictions, previous probation, previous jail, and previous breach.

We now turn our attention to the characteristics of the young offender sample population.

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA ANALYSIS

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUNG OFFENDER POPULATION-

DEMOGRAPHICS

The total sample consisted of a total of 595 youth offenders. Male offenders account for

496 of the sample, and female offenders account for 99 members of the sample. The

table below illustrates a clear breakdown of the study groups.

TABLE 84 – NATIVE CANADIAN STATUS

SEX OF PROBATIONER		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
MALE	X-NATIVE	241	48.6%	48.6%	48.6%
	METIS-NT	99	20.0%	20.0 %	68.5%
	TRTY-ON	116	23.4%	23.4%	91.9%
	TRTY-OFF	40	8.1%	8.1%	
	Total	496	100%	100%	100%
FEMALE	X-NATIVE	33	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
	METIS-NT	15	15.2%	15.2%	48.5%
	TRTY-ON	31	31.3%	31.3%	79.8%
	TRTY-OFF	20	20.2%	20.2%	
	Total	99	100%	100%	100%

As we can see the largest single group in the sample is the male non- Aboriginal (48.6%).

As with the adult offender sample, we acknowledge that while the sample sizes for the

remainder of the sub-populations are small, the results from this study may serve to be

useful for a more in depth look at the issue of validity.

Preliminary analysis of the data reveals, that all young offenders in the sample are over

the age of 15. In fact the overall mean for the sample is 15.9, with an N value of 594.

The mean ages for each group are presented below.

TABLE 85 – AGE OF PROBATIONER		
CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	MEAN	N
MALES	15.9	496
FEMALES	16.1	99
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	16.1	241
MALE METIS	15.9	99
MALE TREATY ON	15.7	116
MALE TREATY OFF	15.3	40
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	15.8	33
FEMALE METIS	15.3	15
FEMALE TREATY ON	17.1	31
FEMALE TREATY OFF	15.5	20
NON-ABORIGINAL	16.1	274
METIS	15.8	114
TREATY ON	16.0	147
TREATY OFF	15.3	60

From the above table, we observe that there is no dramatic difference between the above

groups. While the Metis and Treaty Off offenders appear to be slightly younger than the

other groups, all groups averaged in their mid teens. Female offenders averaged slightly

older than male offenders in the sample (16.1 versus 15.9).

TABLE 86 - EDUCATION

CATEGORICAL GROUP UNDER STUDY	MEAN (GRADE)	N
MALES	8.4	484
FEMALES	8.2	97
MALE NON-ABORIGINALS	9.0	239
MALE METIS	8.2	98
MALE TREATY ON	7.4	109
MALE TREATY OFF	7.8	38
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINALS	8.6	33
FEMALE METIS	8.3	15
FEMALE TREATY ON	7.9	29
FEMALE TREATY OFF	8.1	20
NON-ABORIGINAL	8.9	272
METIS	8.3	113
TREATY ON	7.5	138
TREATY OFF	7.9	58

From the above table we can see that there no significant difference in educational attainment between the groups under study. The overall mean for the sample was grade 8.4, with an N value of 581. Treaty On offenders appear to have progressed less academically than the other groups.

As a starting point for our analysis, we began by running reliability tests for both admissions and termination variables. The statistic Alpha was calculated, first the overall sample, and then by each categorical group. Overall, the admissions reliability coefficient for Alpha was .69. For the male offenders, the Alpha score was computed at .70. For female offenders, Alpha was .71. When dividing the groups further to compare the Aboriginal Non-Aboriginal groupings, we computer alpha scores as follows;

TABLE 87 – ADMISSION ALPHA SCORES

CATEGORICAL GROUP	ALPHA	N
Male Non – Aboriginals	68	241
Male Metis	.71	99
Male Treaty On	.71	116
Male Treaty Off	.73	40
Female Non – Aboriginal	.67	33
Female Metis	.81	15
Female Treaty On	.77	31
Female Treaty Off	.58	20
Overall alpha	.69	595
Overall Male Alpha	.70	496
Overall Female Alpha	.71	99
Overall Alpha for Non – Aboriginal Group	.67	274
Overall Alpha for Metis Group	.72	114
Overall Alpha for Treaty On Group	.71	147
Overall Alpha for Treaty Off Group	.68	60

Similarly the table below shows the results of standardized Alpha for the termination variables;

TABLE 88 – TERMINATION ALPHA

CATEGORICAL GROUP	ALPHA	N
Male Non – Aboriginals	.79	241
Male Metis	.75	99
Male Treaty On	.80	116
Male Treaty Off	.74	40
Female Non – Aboriginal	.77	33
Female Metis	81	15
Female Treaty On	.74	31
Female Treaty Off	.66	20
Overall Alpha	.77	595
Overall Male Alpha	.79	496
Overall Female Alpha	.74	99
Overall Alpha for Non – Aboriginal Group	.78	274
Overall Alpha for Metis Group	.75	114
Overall Alpha for Treaty On Group	.78	147
Overall Alpha for Treaty Off Group	.70	60

From the above, we can see that both the admission and termination scores are in an acceptable range. We will now approach the issue of validity. While presenting the results of our analysis, we will first discuss the validity of the scale from the perspective of total scores obtained at both admissions and termination of probation, and their correlation to the outcome variables. For the youth analysis, the total scores used will be the Admission Risk/Need score and the Termination Risk/Need score. Our outcome variables included, Youth Outcome on Probation, in order to assess the validity of the scale for prediction of success during Probation. Reconviction for years one to four following probation variables, served as our outcome variables for the follow up period.

After observing the correlations of the total scores by outcome data, we then analysed the psychometric validity of the scale by correlating each item on first, the admission and then the termination scales by the outcome variables.

We then provide the data for how each group under study scored on the scales, and finally the results of what actually occurred. That is, how each group under study performed both during probation and for the follow-up period. Should the PRA be valid for all groups under study, we would expect that the scores on the scale are directly related to the behaviour being measured (Recidivism). We conclude our analysis with a selection of items that may serve to improve the validity of the instrument.

CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME CRITERION

Correlations were generated to analyze the relationship between the Admission/ Termination Risk Need scores, and Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in years one through four. The tables below summarize our results.

TABLE 89 – CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE OVERALL POPULATION					
OVERALL POPULATION	Youth Outcome on Probation N 595	Reconvicted Year 1 N 594	Reconvicted Year 2 N 594	Reconvicted Year 3 N 551	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 547
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.33**	.19**	.24**	.15**	.17**
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.47**	.25**	.30**	.27**	.28**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

From the above, we can see that the Termination Risk/Need score is more strongly related to the outcome criterion. This is not surprising as this score is calculated toward

191

the end of the probationary period, and therefore is most telling of where the offender is

at in addressing their criminogenic needs.

TABLE 90– CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

FEMALE OFFENDERS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Reconvicted Year 1 N 99	Reconvicted Year 2 N 99	Reconvicted Year 3 N 86	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 83
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.34**	.07	.06	.06	.17
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.42**	.15	.13	.17	.25*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

From the above results, we can see that only Youth Outcome on Probation was

significantly correlated with the admission/termination scores. We found no significant

relationship between the admission/termination scores and reconviction in the post

probation period. The exception to this was observed for the termination Risk/Need

score and variable: reconviction in year 4.

TABLE 91– CORRELATION OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

MALE OFFENDERS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 496	Reconvicted Year 1 N 495	Reconvicted Year 2 N 495	Reconvicted Year 3 N 465	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 464
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.32**	.18**	.25**	.15**	.15**
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.48**	.25**	.32**	.28**	.27**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For male offenders in the sample, we found a significant relation between the

admission/termination risk scores and all of the outcome variables.

TABLE 92 – CORRELATIONS OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES - FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLES

FEMALE NON ABORIGINALS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 33	Reconvicted Year 1 N 33	Reconvicted Year 2 N 33	Reconvicted Year 3 N 28	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 26
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.07	-.08	.09	.00	.23*
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.31	.12	.13	.10	.15
FEMALE METIS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 15	Reconvicted Year 1 N 15	Reconvicted Year 2 N 15	Reconvicted Year 3 N 11	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 11
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.42	.a	-.07	.06	.37
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.39	.a	-.02	.06	.07
FEMALE TREATY ON	Youth Outcome on Probation N 31	Reconvicted Year 1 N 31	Reconvicted Year 2 N 31	Reconvicted Year 3 N 28	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 27
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.62**	.27	.14	.15	.18
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.75**	.37*	.22	.39*	.47*
FEMALE TREATY OFF	Youth Outcome on Probation N 20	Reconvicted Year 1 N 20	Reconvicted Year 2 N 20	Reconvicted Year 3 N 19	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 19
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.20	-.05	-.10	-.23	-.27
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.13	-.03	.01	-.21	-10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Examining all of the female sub-samples, we found that for female Non-Aboriginal offenders we only established a statistically significant relationship between the admission Risk/Need score and reconviction in year 4. The termination Risk/Need score however did produce correlation a score of sufficient strength for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation.

For the female Metis offender sample we saw correlation scores of sufficient strength between the admission risk score and variables: Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in year 4. The termination risk score produced sufficiently high correlation score for Youth Outcome on Probation.

For the female Treaty On sample we found that all correlations were of sufficient strength to be significant though not necessarily statistically. Finally, for the female Treaty Off sample we found no statistically significant relationships, however the correlation scores were acceptable for variables: Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in years 3 and 4.

TABLE 93– CORRELATIONS OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES - MALE OFFENDER SAMPLES					
MALE NON ABORIGINALS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 241	Reconvicted Year 1 N 240	Reconvicted Year 2 N 240	Reconvicted Year 3 N 222	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 221
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.34**	.18**	.27**	.15*	.11
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.54**	.28**	.32**	.24**	.24**
MALE METIS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Reconvicted Year 1 N 99	Reconvicted Year 2 N 99	Reconvicted Year 3 N 96	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 96
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.22*	.07	.18	.12	.20*
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.42**	.14	.27**	.30**	.31*
MALE TREATY ON	Youth Outcome on Probation N 116	Reconvicted Year 1 N 116	Reconvicted Year 2 N 116	Reconvicted Year 3 N 110	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 110
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.31**	.27**	.26**	.18	.18
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.40**	.34**	.35**	.33**	.26**
MALE TREATY OFF	Youth Outcome on Probation N 40	Reconvicted Year 1 N 40	Reconvicted Year 2 N 40	Reconvicted Year 3 N 37	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 37
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.36*	.25	.19	.07	-.02
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.56**	.03	.09	-.00	-.06

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

When examining all of the male offender sub-samples, we found that nearly all correlations demonstrated statistically significant results. For the non- Aboriginal and Metis male offender groups, we see generally stronger relationship for Youth Outcome on Probation than for the reconviction variables. The Treaty On male offender group shows the strongest correlations for reconviction variables than all other male offender groups. Male Treaty Off offenders demonstrate no significant relationships for the

194

reconviction variables. We observed a statistically significant relationship for all male

offender for variable Youth Outcome on Probation.

TABLE 94– CORRELATIONS OF TOTAL SCORES BY OUTCOME VARIABLES SEPARATED BY ETHNICITY					
NON ABORIGINALS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 274	Re-convicted Year 1 N 273	Re-convicted Year 2 N 273	Reconvicted Year 3 N 250	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 247
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.31**	.18**	.27**	.15*	.15*
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.52**	.27**	.31**	.23**	.24**
METIS	Youth Outcome on Probation N 114	Re-convicted Year 1 N 114	Reconvicted Year 2 N 114	Reconvicted Year 3 N 107	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 107
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.25**	.09	.16	.12	.22*
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.41**	.16	.25**	.28**	.28**
TREATY ON	Youth Outcome on Probation N 147	Re-convicted Year 1 N 147	Reconvicted Year 2 N 147	Reconvicted Year 3 N 138	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 137
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.37**	.28**	.25**	.18*	.19*
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.45**	.37**	.36**	.38**	.34**
TREATY OFF	Youth Outcome on Probation N 60	Re-convicted Year 1 N 60	Reconvicted Year 2 N 60	Reconvicted Year 3 N 56	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 56
Admission Risk/Need Score	-.37**	20	.14	.03	-.03
Termination Risk/Need Score	-.47**	.04	.10	-.02	-.02

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

When examining ethnicity alone, we found that admission/ termination Risk/Need scores

are most strongly correlated for the Non- Aboriginal and Treaty On groups. We found a

significant relationship for all groups between the admission/ termination Risk/Need

scores and Youth Outcome on Probation. The relationship was less clear for the

reconviction variables. Specifically, for the Non-Aboriginal and Treaty On samples both

the admission and termination risk scores produced statistically significant correlations

with all of the outcome variables. For The Metis offender sample, the admission risk

195

score produced a statistically significant correlation only with variables: Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in year 4. The termination risk score produced statistically significant correlations with all outcome variables except for Reconviction in year 1. Finally, for the Treaty Off group we found a statistically significant correlation only for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation.

CORRELATIONS OF ADMISSION/TERMINATION ITEMS BY OUTCOME CRITERION

In this next section, we present the results on the psychometric properties of the scale. We ran correlations between each item on the scale with Youth Outcome on Probation and reconviction up to four years past the period of supervision. This will be useful for assessment of which items and how many items, on the scale contribute to the prediction of recidivism, both during and after the period of supervision. We begin by presenting the results for the overall sample and then continue to separate the groups under study in order to make comparison.

TABLE 95 – ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 595	Re-convicted Year 1 N 594	Re-convicted Year 2 N 594	Re-convicted Year 3 N 551	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 547
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21**	.03	.09*	.04	.04
Attitude to Probation	-.20**	.10*	.11*	.06	.07
Sex	-.06	.17**	.15**	.15**	.16**
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.18**	.19**	.17**	.17**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.09*	.13**	.08	.09*
Family/ Marital Relations	-.15**	.08*	.13**	.03	.04
Financial Management	-.17**	.06	.05	-.01	.01
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.08	.08	.09*	.07	.09*
Emotional Stability	-.11**	.04	.04	-.03	-.06
Peer and Companions	-.16**	.14**	.16**	.12**	.12**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.10*	.15**	.14**	.13**	.08
School, if >16	-.16**	.01	.06	.04	.07
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.17**	.07	.09*	.06	.06
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.06	.07	.11**	.07	.12**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

From the above table we can see that while all items on the scale significantly correlation with at least some outcome variables, few items significantly correlate with all of them.

197

TABLE 96– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 99	Re-convicted Year 3 N 86	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 83
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.26**	-.10	-.18	-.12	-.07
Attitude to Probation	-.19	.09	.03	.05	.18
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.10	.12	.06	.16	.17
Type of Prior Conviction	-.04	.05	.18	.04	.03
Family/ Marital Relations	-.21*	.01	.09	.05	.12
Financial Management	-.36**	.09	-.05	.00	.12
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.30**	-.01	.05	.09	.15
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.00	-.07	-.02	-.01
Peer and Companions	-.09	.07	-.06	-.08	.05
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.02	.18	.08	.11	.01
School, if >16	-.16	-.08	.01	.05	.10
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.28**	-.04	-.01	-.01	.09
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.11	.16	.18	.16	.24*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Many items on the scale failed to produce significant correlations for female offenders.
In fact only 5 items on the scale show significant correlations with any of the outcome
variables. It is clear that the scale items correlate far better with Youth Outcome on
Probation than with the reconviction variables.

TABLE 97– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 496	Re-convicted Year 1 N 495	Re-convicted Year 2 N 495	Re-convicted Year 3 N 465	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 464
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.20**	.06	.12*	.08	.10*
Attitude to Probation	-.21**	.11*	.13*	.08	.06
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.16**	.18**	.15**	.15**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.24**	.07	.09*	.06	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14**	.10*	.15**	.03	.03
Financial Management	-.13**	.05	.06	-.02	-.01
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.04	.10*	.11*	.09	.09*
Emotional Stability	-.11*	.04	.05	-.03	-.07
Peer and Companions	-.17**	.16**	.20**	.16**	.15**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.12**	.16**	.16**	.14**	.11*
School, if >16	-.16**	.02	.07	.04	.07
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.15**	.07	.09*	.05	.04
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.05	.04	.08	.05	.08

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Only one item on the scale failed to produce any significant relationships with any of the outcome variables for male offenders. This item was Academic/Vocational skills.

TABLE 98– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 33	Re-convicted Year 1 N 33	Re-convicted Year 2 N 33	Re-convicted Year 3 N 28	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 26
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.28	-.29	-.16	-.25	-.22
Attitude to Probation	.25	.01	.15	.13	.31
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.08	.45**	.40*	.32	.42*
Type of Prior Conviction	-.06	.29	.47**	.35	.30
Family/ Marital Relations	-.20	-.20	-.07	-.19	-.03
Financial Management	-.30	.28	.02	.07	.26
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.18	-.15	.14	.06	.02
Emotional Stability	.00	-.21	-.18	-.31	-.24
Peer and Companions	.13	-.22	-.14	-.18	.04
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.33	.07	.05	.18	.32
School, if >16	-.06	-.03	.09	.07	.28
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.10	-.08	-.13	-.12	.a
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.18	-.10	.09	.04	-.04

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that only two items on the scale produced statistically significant correlations with some of the outcome variables. These items were: Prior Convictions, and Type of Prior Conviction. Many of the items, while failing to produce statistical significance, produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be considered. We feel that given the small sample sizes involved here, it would be unfair to ignore the magnitude of the correlation score.

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 15	Re-convicted Year 1 N 15	Re-convicted Year 2 N 15	Re-convicted Year 3 N 11	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 11
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.08	.a	-.05	-.34	-.48
Attitude to Probation	-.32	.a	-.18	.07	.54
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.22	.a	.12	.07	.04
Type of Prior Conviction	-.07	.a	.26	.21	.13
Family/ Marital Relations	-.47	.a	.30	.42	.67*
Financial Management	-.46	.a	-.26	-.31	.04
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.38	.a	.11	.13	.39
Emotional Stability	-.04	.a	-.36	.46	.29
Peer and Companions	-.36	.a	-.07	-.13	.22
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.08	.a	.17	.52	.33
School, if >16	-.38	.a	-.21	.05	.39
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.54*	.a	-.30	-.62*	.22
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.54*	.a	.08	.04	.29

TABLE 99– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE FEMALE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

When examining the female Metis offender sample, we observed very few items on the scale produced a significant correlation with the outcome variables. These items were: Family/Marital Relations, Employment, and Academic/Vocational Skills. Again, we found that while many of the remaining items did not produce statistically significant results, they produced correlations scores of sufficient magnitude to be considered. We find that the sample size (15) is extremely small, and therefore establishing significance becomes difficult.

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 31	Re-convicted Year 1 N 31	Re-convicted Year 2 N 31	Re-convicted Year 3 N 28	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 27
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.24	.09	-.01	-.10	.03
Attitude to Probation	-.67**	.25	.21	.19	.27
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.36*	-.03	-.18	.08	.02
Type of Prior Conviction	-.13	.16	.03	-.17	-.27
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14	.02	.26	.25	.28
Financial Management	-.53**	.16	.18	.21	.26
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.26	-.02	.03	.06	.11
Emotional Stability	-.28	.45*	.41*	.43*	.56**
Peer and Companions	-.32	.28	.00	-.05	-.12
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.29	.28	.03	.04	-.07
School, if >16	-.32	-.06	-.06	-.04	-.11
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.30	-.12	-.14	-.04	.03
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.20	.39*	.33	.33	.45*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

We observed slightly better outcomes for the female Treaty On sample, with five items

on the scale producing a significant correlation with some of the outcome variables.

These items were: Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Financial Management,

Emotional Stability, and Academic/Vocational skills. Once again, we found that the

remaining items, while failing to produce statistically significant correlations, produced

correlation scores of comparable strength to that observed for other groups.

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 20	Re-convicted Year 1 N 20	Re-convicted Year 2 N 20	Re-convicted Year 3 N 19	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 19
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.49*	-.08	.07	-.01	-.03
Attitude to Probation	.00	.00	-.23	-.27	-.27
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.22	.25	.03	-.02	-.09
Type of Prior Conviction	.13	-.26	-.08	-.17	.01
Family/ Marital Relations	-.19	.33	-.07	-.19	-.28
Financial Management	-.07	-.20	-.41	-.37	-.37
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.38	.29	-.06	-.15	-.04
Emotional Stability	-.38	-.29	-.29	-.39	-.54*
Peer and Companions	.17	.10	-.09	-.14	.08
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.17	.03	-.04	-.18	-.40
School, if >16	.00	-.19	.23	.35	.21
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.29	-.06	.29	.19	.05
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.06	.06	.05	-.03	.13

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty Off sample, we found only two items on the scale produced

significant correlations for the Treaty Off female offender group. These items were:

Address Changes, and Emotional Stability. Nearly all of the remaining items, with the

exception of variable: Academic/Vocational skills, while failing to produce statistical

significance, produced correlation scores of sufficient magnitude to be comparable to

other offender samples.

TABLE 102– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 241	Re-convicted Year 1 N 240	Re-convicted Year 2 N 240	Re-convicted Year 3 N 222	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 221
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.27**	.02	.09	.07	.04
Attitude to Probation	-.14*	.12	.12	.08	.06
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.12	.15*	.18**	.15*	.14*
Type of Prior Conviction	-.23**	.05	.11	.07	.03
Family/ Marital Relations	-.13*	.11	.17**	.06	.01
Financial Management	-.17**	.06	.12	-.00	-.02
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.04	.02	.10	.05	.08
Emotional Stability	-.10	.05	.09	-.02	-.03
Peer and Companions	-.16*	.16*	.24**	.16*	.10
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.16*	.14*	.12	.09	.06
School, if >16	-.14*	.03	.06	.01	.02
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.23**	.11	.14*	.11	.11
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.04	.07	.10	.03	.07

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Non-Aboriginal population, only three items failed to produce significant correlations with some of the outcome variables. These items were: Alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, and Academic/vocational skills.

TABLE 103– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 99	Re-convicted Year 3 N 96	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 96
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.07	-.04	.06	.08	.23*
Attitude to Probation	-.20*	-.10	.14	.02	.06
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.07	.02	.21*	.10	.08
Type of Prior Conviction	-.33**	.01	-.01	.01	.05
Family/ Marital Relations	-.09	.03	.15	.02	.15
Financial Management	.02	.13	.06	.10	.08
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.10	.08	-.09	-.15	-.14
Emotional Stability	-.15	-.05	.04	.11	.11
Peer and Companions	-.12	.11	.19	.09	.18
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.03	.12	.23*	.24*	.19
School, if >16	-.22*	.07	.08	.10	.13
Employment >15 and School not an issue	.03	-.08	.05	.07	.03
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.10	.00	-.08	-.11	-.05

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Metis offender population, only half of the items produced a significant correlation with any of the outcome variables. The items that did produce significant correlations were: Address Changes, Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior Conviction, Drugs/Alcohol use, and School.

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 116	Re-convicted Year 1 N 116	Re-convicted Year 2 N 116	Re-convicted Year 3 N 110	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 110
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.15	.20*	.18	.09	.08
Attitude to Probation	-.31**	.18*	.20*	.21*	.13
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.20*	.31**	.21*	.24*	.25**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.19*	.19*	.12	.08	.13
Family/ Marital Relations	-.23*	.12	.18*	.11	.18
Financial Management	-.10	-.05	.00	-.04	-.03
Alcohol Use in the Family	.02	.11	.14	.17	.17
Emotional Stability	-.06	.20*	.15	.05	.02
Peer and Companions	-.26**	.18	.12	.17	.13
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.09	.20*	.15	.12	.16
School, if >16	-.11	-.02	.02	-.07	-.04
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.12	.05	.06	-.04	-.05
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.10	.01	.07	.03	.04

TABLE 104– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE TREATY ON OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty On sample population, we found five items on the scale failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Financial Management, Alcohol use in the family, School, and Employment, and Academic/Vocational skills.

TABLE 105– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 40	Re-convicted Year 1 N 40	Re-convicted Year 2 N 40	Re-convicted Year 3 N 37	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 37
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.02	.28	.35*	.33*	.41*
Attitude to Probation	-.22	.21	.14	.13	.06
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.42**	.23	.09	.05	.04
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16	-.10	-.09	-.10	.01
Family/ Marital Relations	-.06	.27	.17	.03	-.19
Financial Management	-.13	.05	-.16	-.35*	-.28
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.06	.35*	.17	.10	-.11
Emotional Stability	-.18	-.03	-.03	-.04	-.23
Peer and Companions	-.18	.08	-.01	-.02	-.02
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.24	.13	.12	.01	-.11
School, if >16	-.37*	-.12	.05	-.01	.06
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.30	.24	.09	-.02	-.16
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.01	-.07	.13	.10	.10

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

When examining the male Treaty Off sample, we found only four of the items on the scale produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Prior Convictions, Financial; Management, and Alcohol use in the family. Some of the items such as Employment, Drug/Alcohol use of Probationer, Peers & Companions, Emotional Stability, Family/Marital Relations and Attitude to Probation did however produce correlation scores of sufficient strength for some of the outcome variables. Once again we acknowledge that the sample size here is very small (40) and therefore we must look for more than statistical significance.

207

TABLE 106– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 274	Re-convicted Year 1 N 273	Re-convicted Year 2 N 273	Re-convicted Year 3 N 250	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 247
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.26**	-.01	.05	.03	.01
Attitude to Probation	-.09	.11	.12	.08	.08
Sex	-.08	.15*	.14*	.15*	.15*
Prior Convictions	-.13*	.19**	.21**	.19**	.18**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.08	.16**	.11	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.14*	.09	.15*	.04	.02
Financial Management	-.19**	.09	.12*	.02	.02
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.06	.01	.10	.05	.07
Emotional Stability	-.09	.04	.07	-.04	-.05
Peer and Companions	-.13*	.13*	.21**	.13*	.09
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.12*	.15*	.13*	.11	.09
School, if >16	-.11	.01	.05	-.01	.04
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.23**	.12*	.15*	.12	.13*
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.03	.07	.11	.05	.07

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Non-Aboriginal offender population five of the items on the scale failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were; Attitude to Probation, Alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, School, and Academic/Vocational skill.

TABLE 107– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 114	Re-convicted Year 1 N 114	Re-convicted Year 2 N 114	Re-convicted Year 3 N 107	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 107
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.07	-.06	.03	.03	.14
Attitude to Probation	-.22*	-.02	.08	.02	.12
Sex	-.01	.25**	.19*	.04	.03
Prior Convictions	-.03	.04	.21*	.09	.07
Type of Prior Conviction	-.03**	.07	.07	.04	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.13	.00	.14	.04	.17
Financial Management	-.04	.14	.03	.06	.08
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.13	.01	-.10	-.13	-.09
Emotional Stability	-.13	-.06	-.03	.15	.13
Peer and Companions	-.15	.09	.15	.07	.18
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.02	.14	.24*	.27**	.21*
School, if >16	-.24*	.10	.08	.10	.16
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.03	-.05	.03	.01	.05
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.15	.02	-.05	-.09	-.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

When examining the Metis offender sample, we found only five items on the scale produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior Conviction, Drugs/Alcohol use in the family, and School.

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 147	Re-convicted Year 1 N 147	Re-convicted Year 2 N 147	Re-convicted Year 3 N 138	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 137
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.17*	.18*	.15	.05	.07
Attitude to Probation	-.40**	.15	.14	.12	.07
Sex	.04	.20*	.24**	.28**	.33**
Prior Convictions	-.22**	.27**	.17*	.24**	.23**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.17*	.21**	.15	.08	.09
Family/ Marital Relations	-.21*	.09	.18*	.12	.17
Financial Management	-.20*	-.03	.01	-.02	-.01
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.04	.09	.11	.13	.12
Emotional Stability	-.11	.23*	.19*	.12	.14
Peer and Companions	-.27**	.18*	.08	.10	.04
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.14	.18*	.09	.06	.04
School, if >16	-.15	-.02	.02	-.04	-.04
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.03	.02	.03	-.05	-.04
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.15	.10	.15	.13	.17*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty On sample, we found that only three items on the scale failed to produce

significant correlation with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Alcohol use

in the family, school, and employment.

TABLE 109– ADMISSION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE TREATY OFF OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 60	Re-convicted Year 1 N 60	Re-convicted Year 2 N 60	Re-convicted Year 3 N 56	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 56
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.17	.16	.25	.20	.22
Attitude to Probation	-.20	.17	.06	.04	-.01
Sex	-.27*	.13	.17	.20	.23
Prior Convictions	-.37**	.27*	.14	.11	.10
Type of Prior Conviction	-.12	-.15	-.04	-.07	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.05	.27*	.07	-.06	-.23
Financial Management	-.12	-.02	-.23	-.34*	-.30*
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.17	.34**	.12	.04	-.05
Emotional Stability	-.22	-.11	-.12	-.16	-.34*
Peer and Companions	-.09	.09	-.03	-.04	.05
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.06	.07	.04	-.10	-.26
School, if >16	-.26*	-.13	.12	.14	.14
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.24	.12	.13	.04	-.10
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.02	-.02	.12	.07	.12

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty Off sample, we found that only half of the items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Sex, Prior Convictions, Family/Marital Relations, Financial Management, Alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, and School. Some items that failure to produce statistical significance did however produce correlation scores of sufficient magnitude to be compared to other groups. Specifically we are referring to items Address Changes in previous 12 moths, Attitude to Probation, Drug/Alcohol Use of Probationer, and Employment.

211

From the above tables, we have demonstrated that the association between individual items on the PRA and the outcome criterion vary with both gender and ethnicity. We now assess the correlations of termination items by Youth Outcome on Probation and reconviction variables. Given this information was collected at the completion of a community supervision period, we would expect that these items show stronger correlations with the outcome variables than we saw for the admissions items.

TABLE 110– TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 595	Re-convicted Year 1 N 594	Re-convicted Year 2 N 594	Re-convicted Year 3 N 551	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 547
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.25**	.13**	.16**	.15**	.12**
Response to Supervision	-.50**	.15**	.19**	.21**	.21**
Sex	-.06	.17**	.15**	.15**	.16**
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.18*	.19**	.17**	.17**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.09*	.13**	.08	.09*
Family/ Marital Relations	-.26**	.10*	.11**	.08	.12**
Financial Management	-.18**	.11**	.11*	.07	.09*
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.10	.10*	.12**	.13**	.12**
Emotional Stability	-.21**	.05	.04	.01	.01
Peer and Companions	-.36**	.23**	.27**	.23**	.25**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.30**	.19**	.23**	.24**	.22**
School, if >16	-.19**	.11*	.15**	.17*	.15**
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.24**	.08	.11**	.07	.06
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.13**	.06	.09*	.07	.11*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the overall sample, we found that all items were significantly correlation with the outcome variables. Correlation scores overall were stronger than those observed for the admission items.

TABLE 111– TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE FEMALE OFFENER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 99	Re-convicted Year 3 N 86	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 83
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.29*	.08	.02	-.01	.02
Response to Supervision	-.57**	.07	.04	.19	.26*
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.10	.12	.06	.16	.17
Type of Prior Conviction	-.04	.05	.18	.04	.03
Family/ Marital Relations	-.23*	.10	.05	.07	.17
Financial Management	-.21*	.12	-.05	-.07	.13
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.09	.04	-.01	.07	.06
Emotional Stability	-.14	-.06	-.09	-.06	-.06
Peer and Companions	-.20*	.15	.15	.18	.31**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.18	.20*	.11	.18	.18
School, if >16	-.19	.09	.17	.17	.10
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.17	-.10	.03	-.05	.01
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.06	.03	.12	.06	.11

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Examining the female offender sample, we found that only six items on the scale produced any significant correlation with any outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Response to Supervision, Family/Marital Relations, Financial Management, Peers & Companions, and Drugs/Alcohol use.

213

TABLE 112– TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 496	Re-convicted Year 1 N 495	Re-convicted Year 2 N 495	Re-convicted Year 3 N 465	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 464
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.25**	.15**	.20**	.19**	.16**
Response to Supervision	-.49**	.18**	.23**	.22**	.21**
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.17**	.16**	.18**	.15**	.15**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.24**	.07	.09*	.06	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.27**	.12**	.14**	.10*	.13*
Financial Management	-.17**	.11*	.13**	.09	.08
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.10*	.12**	.15**	.15**	.14**
Emotional Stability	-.22*	.06	.07	.02	.03
Peer and Companions	-.39**	.25**	.30**	.25**	.24**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.32**	.19**	.25**	.24**	.23**
School, if >16	-.20**	.12*	.16**	.17**	.17**
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.25**	.10*	.13**	.09	.07
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.13**	.05	.07	.06	.09*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For male young offenders, we found all items on the termination scale produced

significant correlations with most of the outcome variables. We again found that

correlation scores were overall stronger than those observed for the admission items.

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 33	Re-convicted Year 1 N 33	Re-convicted Year 2 N 33	Re-convicted Year 3 N 28	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 26
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.48**	.09	.03	-.04	-.09
Response to Supervision	-.41*	.03	.08	.17	.20
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.08	.45**	.40*	.32	.42*
Type of Prior Conviction	-.06	.29	.47**	.35	.30
Family/ Marital Relations	-.11	.04	-.04	-.02	.08
Financial Management	-.04	.28	.18	.13	.33
Alcohol Use in the Family	.12	-.15	-.05	.06	.02
Emotional Stability	-.13	-.04	-.12	-.07	-.10
Peer and Companions	-.10	-.20	-.11	-.10	.21
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.06	.07	.05	.18	.13
School, if >16	-.26	.08	.17	.11	-.04
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.17	.04	-.15	-.27	-.12
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.04	-.12	.03	-.03	-.12

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that only four items on the scale produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Response to Supervision, Prior Convictions, and Type of Prior Conviction. Additionally, variables: Financial Management, Drug/Alcohol use of Probationer, School, and Employment produced correlation score that were of sufficient magnitude with some of the outcome variables, implying sample size may a sufficient explanation for the lack of statistical significance.

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 15	Re-convicted Year 1 N 15	Re-convicted Year 2 N 15	Re-convicted Year 3 N 11	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 11
Address Changes in last 12 months	-30	.a	-.17	.15	.09
Response to Supervision	-.65**	.a	-.27	-.09	.24
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.22	.a	.12	.07	.04
Type of Prior Conviction	-.07	.a	.26	.21	.13
Family/ Marital Relations	-.47	.a	.30	-.24	-.15
Financial Management	-.49	.a	-.43	-.57	-.36
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.06	.a	.12	.07	.04
Emotional Stability	.09	.a	-.11	.18	-.13
Peer and Companions	-.29	.a	.06	.00	.00
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.30	.a	.17	.24	-.03
School, if >16	-.14	.a	-.18	.13	-.10
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.34	.a	.32	.04	.29
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.54*	.a	.08	-.13	.22

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Metis offender sample, we found only two items on the scale produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Response to Probation, and Academic/Vocational skills. The remaining items, while failing to produce statistically significant correlations, produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be comparable to other offender groups.

TABLE 115 - TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE FEMALE TREATY ON OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION					
Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 31	Re-convicted Year 1 N 31	Re-convicted Year 2 N 31	Re-convicted Year 3 N 28	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 27
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.38	.03	-.02	-.03	.13
Response to Supervision	-.74**	.13	.05	.34	.41*
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.36*	-.03	-.18	.08	.02
Type of Prior Conviction	-.13	.16	.03	-.17	-.27
Family/ Marital Relations	-.53**	.16	.03	.27	.33
Financial Management	-.44*	.34	.27	.25	.35
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.18	.19	.08	.19	.26
Emotional Stability	-.33	.24	.12	.04	.29
Peer and Companions	-.44*	.43*	.28	.39*	.39*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.68**	.40*	.13	.30	.33
School, if >16	-.19	.18	.25	.24	.17
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.16	-.12	.02	.11	.18
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.05	.23	.41*	.35	.30

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty On sample, we found seven items on the scale produced a significant correlation with some of the outcome variables. These items were: Response to Supervision, Prior Convictions, Family/marital Relations, Financial Management, Peers & Companions, Drugs/alcohol use, and Academic/Vocational skills. The remaining items, while failing to produce statistically significant correlations, produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be comparable to other offender groups.

217

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 20	Re-convicted Year 1 N 20	Re-convicted Year 2 N 20	Re-convicted Year 3 N 19	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 19
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.12	.25	.11	-.09	-.19
Response to Supervision	-.53*	-.07	.01	-.08	-.10
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	.22	.25	.03	-.02	-.09
Type of Prior Conviction	.13	-.36	-.08	-.17	.01
Family/ Marital Relations	.22	.25	-.05	-.23	-.13
Financial Management	.09	-.15	-.53**	-.69**	-.45
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.22	.06	-.20	-.29	-.41
Emotional Stability	-.34	-.21	-.10	-.17	-.27
Peer and Companions	.04	.12	.19	.13	.28
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	.04	-.03	.01	-.11	.01
School, if >16	-.10	-.03	.28	.24	.39
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.05	-.33	.07	-.04	-.19
Academic/ Vocational Skills	.15	-.12	-.21	-.25	.18

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty Off offender sample, we found that only two items on the scale produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Response to Supervision, and Financial Management. Many of the remaining items, while failing to produce statistically significant correlations, produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be comparable to other offender groups.

TABLE 117- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 241	Re-convicted Year 1 N 240	Re-convicted Year 2 N 240	Re-convicted Year 3 N 222	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 221
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.32**	.13*	.18**	.15*	.11
Response to Supervision	-.57**	.25**	.26**	.21**	.21**
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.12	.15*	.18*	.15*	.14*
Type of Prior Conviction	-.23**	.05	.11	.07	.03
Family/ Marital Relations	-.32**	.11	.09	.05	.11
Financial Management	-.19**	.10	.10	.09	.05
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.07	.01	.06	.04	.07
Emotional Stability	-.21**	.12	.09	.04	.09
Peer and Companions	-.46**	.29**	.33**	.24**	.27**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.40**	.20**	.28**	.24**	.29**
School, if >16	-.17**	.21**	.19**	.15*	.12
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.27**	.15*	.11	.09	.04
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.13*	.07	.08	.02	.04

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For male Non- Aboriginal young offenders, only one items failed to produce a significant correlation with any of the outcome variables. This item was Alcohol use in the family.

TABLE 118- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 99	Re-convicted Year 1 N 99	Re-convicted Year 2 N 99	Re-convicted Year 3 N 96	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 96
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.11	.04	.07	.19	.23*
Response to Supervision	-.36**	.09	.18	.21*	.18
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.70	.02	.21*	.10	.08
Type of Prior Conviction	-.33**	.01	-.01	.01	.05
Family/ Marital Relations	-.22*	-.01	.05	.02	.12
Financial Management	-.21*	.08	.19	.17	.19
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.16	.07	.06	.07	.01
Emotional Stability	-.28**	.06	.12	.10	.09
Peer and Companions	-.30**	.24*	.33**	.28**	.21*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.30**	.11	.21*	.37**	.16
School, if >16	-.18	.10	.09	.16	.28**
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.14	-.05	.11	.14	.11
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.18	.05	.10	.09	.14

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Metis young offender sample, we found only 3 items on the scale failed to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Alcohol use in the family, Employment, and Academic/vocational skills. The items that failed to produce significant results however did produce correlations of sufficient magnitude for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation, however not for the reconviction variables.

TABLE 119- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE MALE TREATY ON OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 116	Re-convicted Year 1 N 116	Re-convicted Year 2 N 116	Re-convicted Year 3 N 110	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 110
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.13	.33**	.35**	.34**	.25**
Response to Supervision	-.46**	.23*	.20*	.28**	.25**
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.20*	.31**	.21*	.24*	.25**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.19*	.19*	.12	.08	.13
Family/ Marital Relations	-.25**	.30**	.31**	.29**	.27
Financial Management	.03	.26**	.21*	.13	.12
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.18	.24*	.27**	.27**	.25**
Emotional Stability	-.17	.03	.09	.04	-.06
Peer and Companions	-.39**	.22*	.21*	.19*	.09
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.24**	.27**	.22*	.26**	.18
School, if >16	-.23*	.01	.11	.09	-.01
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.26**	-.00	.12	-.02	.00
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.06	.03	.01	.04	.05

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty On young offender sample, we found only two items on the scale failed to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Emotional Stability and Academic/vocational skills.

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 40	Re-convicted Year 1 N 40	Re-convicted Year 2 N 40	Re-convicted Year 3 N 37	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 37
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.21	.12	.25	.22	.16
Response to Supervision	-.41**	-.19	.06	.00	-.18
Sex	.a	.a	.a	.a	.a
Prior Convictions	-.42**	.23	.09	.05	.04
Type of Prior Conviction	-.16	-.10	-.09	-.10	.01
Family/ Marital Relations	-.11	-.02	.13	.08	-.09
Financial Management	-.21	-.12	-.17	-.32	-.17
Alcohol Use in the Family	.01	.09	-.01	-.06	-.14
Emotional Stability	-.21	-.07	-.10	-.14	-.20
Peer and Companions	-.38*	.09	.11	.10	.15
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.23	-.04	.12	.01	-.10
School, if >16	-.38*	-.07	-.01	.04	.03
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.47**	.46**	.21	.10	.10
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.35*	-.12	-.20	-.27	-.13

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty Off young offender sample, we found that seven of the items on the

scale failed to produce a significant relationship with the any of the outcome variables.

These items were: Address Changes, Type of Prior Conviction, Family/marital Relations,

Financial Management, Alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, and

Drugs/Alcohol use. The remaining items while failing to produce statistical significance

generally produced correlation scores of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 274	Re-convicted Year 1 N 273	Re-convicted Year 2 N 273	Re-convicted Year 3 N 250	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 247
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.33**	.11	.14*	.11	.06
Response to Supervision	-.56**	.23**	.24**	.21**	.22**
Sex	-.08	.15*	.14*	.15*	.15*
Prior Convictions	-.13*	.19**	.21**	.19**	.18**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.21**	.08	.16**	.11	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.29**	.09	.07	.03	.09
Financial Management	-.18**	.12*	.12	.10	.08
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.04	-.01	.04	.03	.05
Emotional Stability	-.19**	.08	.05	.01	.04
Peer and Companions	-.41**	.25**	.28**	.20**	.26**
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.36**	.20**	.27**	.24**	.28**
School, if >16	-.17**	.17**	.16**	.12	.08
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.26**	.14*	.09	.05	.02
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.11	.05	.08	.02	.02

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Examining the Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that only two items on the scale failed

to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables. These items

were: Alcohol use in the family and Academic/vocational skills.

TABLE 122- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 114	Re-convicted Year 1 N 114	Re-convicted Year 2 N 114	Re-convicted Year 3 N 107	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 107
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.14	.04	.04	.19	.21*
Response to Supervision	-.40**	.08	.12	.17	.18
Sex	-.01	.25*	.19*	.04	.03
Prior Convictions	-.03	.04	.21*	.09	.07
Type of Prior Conviction	-.28**	.07	.07	.04	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	-.25**	-.04	.05	-.00	.09
Financial Management	-.24*	.05	.11	.09	.13
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.15	.06	.06	.07	.01
Emotional Stability	-.23*	.03	.07	.11	.06
Peer and Companions	-.29**	.20*	.29**	.25**	.19
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.23*	.14	.23*	.26**	.14
School, if >16	-.18	.12	.08	.16	.25**
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.16	-.02	.15	.14	.13
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.22*	.06	.11	.07	.15

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Metis young offender population, we again found only two items on the scale that failed to produce a significant correlation with the any of the outcome variables. These items are Alcohol use in the family and Employment.

TABLE 123- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 147	Re-convicted Year 1 N 147	Re-convicted Year 2 N 147	Re-convicted Year 3 N 138	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 137
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.17*	.30**	.30**	.29**	.25**
Response to Supervision	-.53**	.19*	.14	.28**	.26**
Sex	.04	.20*	.24**	.28**	.33**
Prior Convictions	-.22**	.27**	.17*	.24**	.23**
Type of Prior Conviction	-.17	.22**	.15	.08	.09
Family/ Marital Relations	-.31**	.28**	.26**	.28**	.28**
Financial Management	-.07	.27**	.22**	.15	.17
Alcohol Use in the Family	.18*	.22**	.23**	.24**	.23**
Emotional Stability	-.19*	.08	.12	.07	.04
Peer and Companions	-.39**	.27**	.24**	.24**	.17*
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.34**	.28**	.19*	.26**	.20*
School, if >16	-.22**	.05	.15	.12	.04
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.24**	-.01	.11	.02	.05
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.03	.08	.10	.13	.14

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Nearly all items on the scale produced a significant correlation with the outcome variables for the Treaty On offender sample. The only item that failed to produce a significant correlation was Academic/vocational skills.

TABLE 124- TERMINATION ITEM ANALAYSIS FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

Termination Item	Youth Outcome on Probation N 60	Re-convicted Year 1 N 60	Re-convicted Year 2 N 60	Re-convicted Year 3 N 56	Re-convicted Year 4 + N 56
Address Changes in last 12 months	-.16	.15	.19	.09	-.00
Response to Supervision	-.41**	-.17	.04	-.03	-.15
Sex	-.27*	.13	.17	.20	.23
Prior Convictions	-.37**	.27*	.14	.11	.10
Type of Prior Conviction	-.12	-.15	-.04	-.07	.07
Family/ Marital Relations	.04	.02	.03	-.06	-.15
Financial Management	-.18	-.10	-.25	-.39**	-.22
Alcohol Use in the Family	-.08	.10	-.05	-.10	-.19
Emotional Stability	-.26*	-.09	-.07	-.11	-.17
Peer and Companions	-.22	.09	.12	.10	.18
Drug/ Alcohol Use of Probationer	-.13	-.04	.07	-.04	-.06
School, if >16	-.28*	-.06	.09	.12	.18
Employment >15 and School not an issue	-.32*	.21	.15	.04	-.03
Academic/ Vocational Skills	-.31*	-.08	-.15	-.20	.01

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty Off sample, we found that six items on the scale failed to produce a significant relationship with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Type of Prior Conviction, Family/marital Relations, Alcohol use in the family, Peers & Companions, and Drugs/alcohol use.

226

We can see from the above results that many of the items on both the admission and termination scales failed to produce statistical significance with all of the outcome variables. This in some cases appears to be the result of small sample sizes, however we have found that other items consistently demonstrate very poor correlation scores for specific groups, implying that they are not contributing much to the outcome criterion. In the next section, we report on how each sub sample scored on both the admission and termination risk scores.

HOW THE GROUPS SCORE

We ran frequencies of how each categorical group scores on both the Admission and Termination scores. The table below illustrates the breakdown for each categorical group.

TABLE 125 – HOW GROUPS WERE CLASSIFIED BY ADMISSION/TERMINATION RISK SCORES			
CATEGORICAL GROUP	**LEVEL**	**ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE**	**TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE**
OVERALL POPULATION N 595	**LOW**	22.2%	29.4%
	MED	52.8%	42.0%
	HIGH	25.0%	28.6%
FEMALES N 99	**LOW**	32.3%	34.3%
	MED	50.5%	43.4%
	HIGH	17.2%	22.2%

TABLE 125 - HOW GROUPS WERE CLASSIFIED BY ADMISSION/TERMINATION RISK SCORES			
MALES **N 496**	**LOW**	20.2%	28.4%
	MED	53.2%	41.7%
	HIGH	26.6%	29.8%
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL N 33	**LOW**	36.4%	36.4%
	MED	54.5%	42.4%
	HIGH	9.1%	21.2%
FEMALE Metis N 15	**LOW**	20.0%	26.7%
	MED	60.0%	46.7%
	HIGH	20.0%	26.7%
FEMALE TREATY ON N 31	**LOW**	35.5%	48.4%
	MED	38.7%	32.3%
	HIGH	25.8%	19.4%
FEMALE TREATY OFF N 20	**LOW**	30.0%	15.0%
	MED	55.0%	60.0%
	HIGH	15.0%	25.0%
MALES NON-ABORIGINAL N 241	**LOW**	22.8%	37.8%
	MED	53.9%	37.3%
	HIGH	23.2%	24.9%
MALES Metis N 99	**LOW**	11.1%	11.1%
	MED	50.5%	47.5%
	HIGH	38.4%	41.4%

TABLE 125 - HOW GROUPS WERE CLASSIFIED BY ADMISSION/TERMINATION RISK SCORES			
MALES TREATY ON N 116	LOW	24.1%	29.3%
	MED	52.6%	44.0%
	HIGH	23.3%	26.7%
MALES TREATY OFF N 40	LOW	15.0%	12.5%
	MED	57.5%	47.5%
	HIGH	27.5%	40.0%
NON-ABORIGINAL POPULATION N 274	LOW	24.5%	37.6%
	MED	54.0%	38.0%
	HIGH	21.5%	24.5%
METIS POPULATION N 114	LOW	12.3%	13.2%
	MED	51.8%	47.4%
	HIGH	36.0%	39.5%
TREATY ON POPULATION N 147	LOW	26.5%	33.3%
	MED	49.7%	41.5%
	HIGH	23.8%	25.2%
TREATY OFF POPULATION N 60	LOW	20.0%	13.3%
	MED	56.7%	51.7%
	HIGH	23.3%	35.0%

229

From the above table, we can see how each group was classified both at admission and termination of Probation. For the majority of our sample groups, the largest segment of the each sample was assessed to be medium risk for re-involvement. This is what we would expect. This, however, was not the case for Female Treaty On offenders, where the majority had been classified as low risk and Male Non-Aboriginals where the low and medium risk groups have similar representation for the termination Risk/Need score. Another factor we can discern from the results, is that female offenders are more likely to be classified as low risk than male offenders. Additionally, the Metis population was least likely to be classified as low risk. In the next section, we present data on how the sample groups actually performed.

HOW THE GROUPS ACTUALLY PERFORM

Given one of the primary objectives of this study was to assess the validity of the Primary Risk Assessment both during the period of supervision and beyond., we now present these results for each categorical group separately.

As the tables below illustrate the majority of young offenders successfully completed their Probation period. This is true for all categorical groups under study. Female offenders continue to perform better than males generally. For male offenders, the male Treaty On group appears to be most successful on probation. For female offenders, the female Non- Aboriginal and female Treaty Off offender groups perform best on

Probation. Assessing ethnicity alone, we find the most successful results for the Treaty

On and Non- Aboriginal offenders.

TABLE 126 – YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION

GROUP	% SUCCEEDED
OVERALL POPULATION N 595	59.5%
MALE OFFENDERS OVERALL N 496	58.3%
FEMALE OFFENDERS OVERALL N 99	65.7%
MALE NON-ABORIGINAL N 241	58.5%
MALE METIS N 99	53.5%
MALE TREATY ON N 116	67.2%
MALE TREATY OFF N 40	42.5%
FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL N 33	72.7%
FEMALE METIS N 15	59.3%
FEMALE TREATY ON N 31	61.3%
FEMALE TREATY OFF N 20	70.0%
NON ABORIGINAL POPULATION N 274	60.0%
METIS POPULATION N 114	53.5%
TREATY ON POPULATION N 147	66.0%
TREATY OFF POPULATION N 60	51.7%

When we take a more longitudinal approach, however, we find that the longer the follow-

up period, the more young offenders become reconvicted for a new offence. Our results

for the overall population are presented below.

TABLE 127 – POST PROBATION OUTCOME FOR THE OVERALL POPULATION

	Reconvicted Year 1 N 594	Reconvicted Year 2 N 594	Reconvicted Year 3 N 551	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 547
Yes	29.1%	46.5%	59.9%	70.6%

When separating the data by gender, we found that male young offenders were reconvicted at a greater rate than female offenders. Furthermore, both male and female young offenders were reconvicted at an increasing rate as the follow up period increased.

TABLE 128– POST PROBATION OUTCOME SEPARATED BY GENDER

Males	Reconvicted Year 1 N 495	Reconvicted Year 2 N 495	Reconvicted Year 3 N 465	Reconvicted Year 4+ N 464
Yes	32.5%	49.9%	63.0%	73.7%
Female	N 99	N 99	N 86	N 83
Yes	12.1%	29.3%	49.0%	53.0%

The table below presents our findings when the sample was separated by gender and ethnicity.

TABLE 129– POST PROBATION OUTCOME SEPARATED BY GENDER AND ETHNICITY

	Reconvicted Year 1	Reconvicted Year 2	Reconvicted Year 3	Reconvicted Year 4+
Males Non-Aboriginal	28.8% N 240	41.7% N 240	52.3% N 222	62.0% N 221
Males Metis	34.3% N 99	54.5% N 99	69.8% N 96	85.4% N 96
Males Treaty On	38.8% N 116	58.6% N 116	75.5% N 110	83.6% N 110
Males Treaty Off	32.5% N 40	62.5% N 40	73.0% N 37	83.8% N 37
Female Non-Aboriginal	9.1% N 33	21.2% N 33	28.6% N 28	38.5% N 26
Female Metis	Ø% N 15	26.7% N 15	63.6% N 11	81.8% N 11
Female Treaty On	16.1% N 31	29.0% N 31	42.9% N 28	48.1% N 27
Female Treaty Off	20.0% N 20	45.0% N 20	52.6% N 19	63.2% N 19
Non –Aboriginal Overall	26.4% N 273	39.2% N 273	49.6% N 250	59.5% N 247
Metis Overall	29.8% N 114	50.9% N 114	69.2% N 107	85.0% N 107
Treaty On Overall	34.0% N 147	52.4% N 147	68.8% N 138	76.6% N 137
Treaty Off Overall	28.3% N 60	56.7% N 60	66.1% N 56	76.8% N 56

We conclude from the above information, that Non-Aboriginal offenders were reconvicted at a lower rate than their Aboriginal counterparts in any category. This was true for both male and female offenders.

Furthermore, we can see that the number of youth sentenced to secure custody also increased as the follow up period is extended. For the overall population, we found the following tend:

TABLE 130 -PERCENTAGE OF YOUTH SENTENCED TO SECURE CUSTODY FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 1 N 594	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year2 N 594	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 3 N 551	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 4+ N 547
9.4%	13.8%	17.2%	18.5%

When separating the data to reflect the groups under study, we found similar trends.

These are presented below:

TABLE 131 -PERCENTAGE OF YOUTH SENTENCED TO SECURE CUSTODY SEPARATED BY GENDER AND ETHNICITY

Study Group	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 1	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 2	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 3	% Secure Custody when reconvicted Year 4+
Female Overall	1.0% N 99	2.0% N 99	4.7% N 86	6.0% N 83
Female Non-Aboriginal	3.0% N 33	3.0% N 33	3.6% N 28	3.8% N 26
Female Metis	Ø% N 15	Ø% N 15	9.1% N 11	18.2% N 11
Female Treaty On	Ø% N 31	3.2% N 31	7.1% N 28	7.4% N 27
Female Treaty Off	Ø% N 20	Ø% N 20	Ø% N 19	Ø% N 19
Male Overall	11.1% N 495	16.2% N 495	19.6% N 465	20.7% N 464
Male Non-Aboriginal	9.2% N 240	14.2% N 240	17.1% N 222	17.6% N 221
Male Metis	12.1% N 99	19.2% N 99	22.9% N 96	25.0% N 96
Male Treaty On	13.8% N 116	18.1% N 116	20.9% N 110	22.7% N 110
Male Treaty Off	12.5% N 40	15.0% N 40	21.6% N 37	21.6% N 37

As the table above demonstrates, female young offenders are less likely to be re-incarcerated than male offenders. For the female offender population, we found that in years one and four, female Non-Aboriginal offenders are most likely to be sentenced to secure custody. In years two and three the female Treaty On offenders are most likely to be sentence to secure custody. Surprisingly no member of the female Treaty Off sample was sentenced to secure custody for the entire follow up period. For Male young offenders, we found that the Non-Aboriginal groups was least likely to be sentenced to a period of secure custody as compared to their Aboriginal counterparts in any category.

Given we are examining youth offenders it is useful to determine if reconviction occurred in youth or adult court. When we ran the frequencies, we found that 54.4% of the young offender sample was convicted in adult court. Separating the data, we found that a greater number of males are convicted as adults than females (58.6% versus 33.3%). Additionally, the Metis group overall had the highest conviction rates as adults at 71.1%. This was then followed by the Treaty Off (61.7%), Treaty On (54.4%), and the Non Aboriginal group (45.8%). The table below highlights trends in the data when the sample is separated by gender and ethnicity.

TABLE 132 – EVER CONVICTED IN ADULT COURT

Female Non Aboriginal N 33	21.2%		Male Non Aboriginal N 240	49.2%
Female Metis N 15	46.7%		Male Metis N 99	74.7%
Female Treaty On N 31	29.0%		Male Treaty On N 116	61.2%
Female Treaty Off N 40	50.0%		Male Treaty Off N 40	67.5%

Clearly male offenders are incarcerated at a higher level than female offenders.

Furthermore, Aboriginal offenders are incarcerated at a higher rate than Non Aboriginal

offenders.

Another way of presenting the above data is to crosstabulate the Admission and

Termination Risk/Need Scores with Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in

years 1-4. Beginning with the overall sample, we can see all results seem to suggest the

validity of the Manitoba Risk Needs instrument. That is to say that, as the corresponding

risk level increases so does the reconviction rate. Should this relationship exist for all

groups when separated then we could conclude that the instrument is a valid tool for

prediction of recidivism for all groups it is used for. This, as we will present, is not the

case. As we saw with the adult instrument, there is no consistent relationship evident

between the designated risk levels and reconviction for all groups. We begin our

discussion first for the Admission Risk/Need scores and follow it with the Termination

Risk/Need Score.

TABLE 133 – THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 595	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 594	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 594	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 551	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 547
LOW	81.8%**	22.1%**	34.4%**	54.1%**	62.0%**
MEDIUM	62.1%**	25.2%**	42.7%**	55.4%**	68.5%**
HIGH	34.2%**	43.6%**	65.1%**	73.0%**	81.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

From the above results, we can conclude that for at least the general sample population, the Admission Risk is a valid predictor of post probation behaviour. As the classified risk level increased, so does the actual rate of failure on probation, and for the post probation follow up period.

TABLE 134 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 86	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 83
LOW	84.4%**	15.6%	31.3%	45.8%	47.8%
MEDIUM	66.0%**	8.0%	28.0%	42.2%	52.3%
HIGH	29.4%**	17.6%	29.4%	41.2%	62.5%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

Unlike the trend we observed for the general sample population, we only observed expected patterns of re-involvement for Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in year four following the completion of Probation. Reconviction in years 1-3, followed no consistent pattern.

TABLE 135 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 496	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 495	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 495	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 465	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 464
LOW	81.0%**	24.2%**	35.4%**	56.5%**	65.9%**
MEDIUM	61.4%**	28.4%**	45.5%**	57.8%**	71.4%**
HIGH	34.8%**	47.0%**	69.7%**	77.1%**	83.2%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male young offender population, the Admission risk designations did a good job

of predicting both outcome on probation, and reconviction for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 136 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 33	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 33	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 33	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 28	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 26
LOW	75.0%	16.7%	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%
MEDIUM	72.2%	5.6%	16.7%	23.5%	31.3%
HIGH	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	100%

For the female Non-Aboriginal population, the Admission risk designation was only

useful for predicting outcome on probation. The risk designation was unrelated to

reconviction in the post probation follow up period.

TABLE 137 –THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 15	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 15	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 15	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 11	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 11
LOW	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MEDIUM	44.4%	0.0%	44.4%	71.4%	85.7%
HIGH	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	100%

For the female Metis population, predictions were only accurate for youth outcome on Probation and for reconviction in year four following the completion of Probation.

TABLE 138 – THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE TRAETY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 28	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 27
LOW	90.9%**	9.1%	18.2%	22.2%	25.0%
MEDIUM	66.7%**	8.3%	33.3%	63.6%	63.6%
HIGH	12.5%**	37.5%	37.5%	37.5%	50.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty On population, the Admission Risk designation was only accurate in predicting youth outcome on probation and reconviction in year two of the follow up period.

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 19	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 19
LOW	83.3%	33.3%	83.3%	100%*	100%
MEDIUM	72.7%	18.2%	27.3%	30.0%*	50.0%
HIGH	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%*	33.3%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Treaty Off population, the Admission risk designation was only useful for the prediction of youth outcome on Probation. The Admission risk designation was unrelated to reconviction patterns in the post probation follow up period.

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 241	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 240	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 240	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 222	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 221
LOW	80.0%**	22.2%	27.8%**	47.8%*	58.7%
MEDIUM	62.3%**	26.2%	37.7%**	46.3%*	59.2%
HIGH	28.6%**	41.1%	64.3%**	69.1%*	70.9%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Non-Aboriginal population, the admission risk designation was a powerful predictor for nearly all outcome variables. Only reconviction in year three of the follow up period failed to result in an expected pattern of re-involvement.

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 96	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 96
LOW	72.7%	27.3%	45.5%	66.7%	77.8%
MEDIUM	58.0%	26.0%	46.0%	61.2%	77.6%
HIGH	42.1%	47.4%	68.4%	81.6%	95.4%

TABLE 141- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

For the male Metis offender population, the admission risk designation was only useful for the prediction of youth outcome on probation and reconviction in year two of the follow up period.

TABLE 142 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 110	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 110
LOW	89.3%**	28.6%*	42.9%**	68.0%	72.0%
MEDIUM	67.2%**	34.4%*	55.7%**	72.4%	84.5%
HIGH	44.4%**	59.3%*	81.5%**	88.9%	92.6%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The Admission risk designation was a powerful predictor for the male Treaty On population. The admission score successfully predicted the rate of re-involvement both during the period of supervision and for the entire follow up period.

241

TABLE 143- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION					
ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 37	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 37
LOW	66.7%	16.7%	50.0%	60.0%	80.0%
MEDIUM	47.8%	30.4%	60.9%	76.2%	90.5%
HIGH	18.2%	45.5%	72.7%	72.7%	72.7%

For the male Treaty Off sample, the admission risk designation successfully predicted patterns of re-involvement for youth outcome on probation and reconviction in years 1 and 2 following the completion of probation. For variables: reconviction in years three and four, we found the medium risk groups were reconvicted at a greater rate than the high risk groups.

TABLE 144- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION					
ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 274	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 273	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 273	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 250	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 247
LOW	79.1%**	21.2%*	27.3%**	46.3%**	55.6%
MEDIUM	63.5%**	23.6%*	35.1%**	43.5%**	55.9%
HIGH	30.5%**	39.0%*	62.7%**	67.2%**	71.9%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Non-Aboriginal offender sample we found the admission risk designation was an accurate predictor of re-involvement patterns on probation and for reconviction in years 1 and 2 following the completion of probation.

TABLE 145- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION					
ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 107	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 107
LOW	78.6%	21.4%*	35.7%	60.0%	70.0%**
MEDIUM	55.9%	22.0%*	45.8%	62.5%	78.6%**
HIGH	41.5%	43.9%*	63.4%	80.5%	97.6%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The admission risk designation was a powerful predictor of reconviction patterns for the Metis youth sample population both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 146- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION					
ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 138	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 137
LOW	89.7%**	23.1%**	35.9%**	55.9%	60.6%*
MEDIUM	67.1%**	30.1%**	52.1%**	71.0%	81.2%*
HIGH	37.1%**	54.3%**	71.4%**	77.1%	82.9%*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The Admission risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the Treaty On youth, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

243

ADMISSION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 56	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 56
TABLE 147- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION					
LOW	75.0%	25.0%	66.7%	81.8%	90.9%
MEDIUM	55.9%	26.5%	50.0%	61.3%	77.4%
HIGH	21.4%	35.7%	64.3%	64.3%	64.3%

The Admission risk designation was a valid predictor only of youth outcome on probation and reconviction in year 1 of the follow up period.

While the variable Youth Outcome on Probation continues to produce acceptable results when separated by gender, we cannot extend this to reconviction variables. As we can see when we separately observe male and female offender results, the patterns become discontinuous. While for male offenders overall and for the Metis and Treaty On samples, the PRA appears to be valid, when separating out both gender and ethnicity, we could only find consistently reliable predictions for outcome on Probation.

We now look at the results from correlation of the same variables with termination risk score. Again, we see that variable Youth Outcome on Probation produced acceptable results for both male and female populations and surprisingly we also see expected patterns of reconviction for both genders for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 148 - THE TERMINATION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 595	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 594	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 594	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 551	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 547
LOW	89.1%**	21.3%**	35.1%**	49.0%**	58.3%**
MEDIUM	60.8%**	22.4%**	38.8%**	53.7%**	67.0%**
HIGH	27.1%**	47.1%**	69.4%**	78.4%**	86.7%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 149 -THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 86	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 83
LOW	94.1%**	8.8%	23.5%	35.7%	42.3%
MEDIUM	58.1%**	11.6%	30.2%	45.9%	51.4%
HIGH	36.4%**	18.2%	36.4%	47.6%	70.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 150 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 496	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 495	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 495	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 465	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 464
LOW	87.9%**	24.3%**	37.9%**	52.0%**	61.6%**
MEDIUM	61.4%**	24.6%**	40.6%**	55.2%**	69.9%**
HIGH	25.7%**	51.4%**	74.3%**	82.9%**	89.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 151 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE NON -ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATIO N RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 33	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 33	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 33	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 28	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 26
LOW	97.7%*	8.3%	16.7%	20.0%	33.3%
MEDIUM	71.4%*	7.1%	21.4%	36.4%	36.4%
HIGH	42.9%*	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%	50.0%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the female Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that the termination risk designation was only successful in predicting youth outcome on Probation and reconviction for years two and four.

TABLE 152 - THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 15	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 15	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 15	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 11	RE- CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 11
LOW	100%	0.0%	25.0%	100%	100%
MEDIUM	42.9%	0.0%	28.6%	50.0%	66.7%
HIGH	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	66.7%	100%

For the female Metis sample, we found that the termination risk designation was only successful in predicting youth outcome on probation.

246

TABLE 153- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 31	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 28	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 27
LOW	93.3%**	6.7%*	20.0%	23.1%	25.0%
MEDIUM	50.0%**	10.0%*	30.0%	55.6%	55.6%
HIGH	0.0%**	50.0%*	50.0%	66.7%	83.3%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The termination risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the female Treaty On youth, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 154- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 20	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 19	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 19
LOW	100%	33.3%	66.7%	100%	100%
MEDIUM	58.3%	25.0%	41.7%	45.5%	54.5%
HIGH	80.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	60.0%

For the female Treaty Off sample, we found that the termination risk designation was an accurate predictor only of youth outcome on Probation. The risk designation was unrelated to patterns of reconviction in the post probation follow up period.

247

TABLE 155- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 241	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 240	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 240	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 222	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 221
LOW	85.7%**	23.3%**	36.7%**	50.0%**	56.3%**
MEDIUM	57.8%**	18.9%**	27.8%**	37.8%**	54.3%**
HIGH	18.3%**	51.7%**	70.0%**	75.0%**	80.0%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that the termination risk designation was an accurate predictor only of youth outcome on Probation. The risk designation was unrelated to patterns of reconviction in the post probation follow up period.

TABLE 156- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 99	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 96	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 96
LOW	90.9%**	18.2%	27.3%**	30.0%**	60.0%**
MEDIUM	61.7%**	29.8%	46.8%**	63.0%**	80.4%**
HIGH	34.1%**	43.9%	70.7%**	87.5%**	97.5%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The termination risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the male Metis population, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

248

TABLE 157- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 116	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 110	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 110
LOW	91.2%**	26.5%**	41.2%**	63.3%**	76.7%*
MEDIUM	72.5%**	29.4%**	52.9%**	70.0%**	78.0%*
HIGH	32.3%**	67.7%**	87.1%**	96.7%**	100%*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The termination risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the male Treaty On offender population, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 158- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION					
TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 40	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 37	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 37
LOW	100%*	40.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
MEDIUM	47.4%*	26.3%	52.6%	75.0%	93.8%
HIGH	18.8%*	37.5%	75.0%	75.0%	81.3%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the male Treaty Off sample, we found that the termination risk designation was an accurate predictor of re-involvement on Probation and reconviction in year three of the follow up period.

TABLE 159- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 274	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 273	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 273	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 250	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 247
LOW	86.4%**	21.6%**	34.3%**	46.7%**	53.9%**
MEDIUM	59.6%**	17.3%**	26.9%**	37.6%**	52.2%**
HIGH	20.9%**	47.8%**	65.7%**	70.1%**	77.3%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Non-Aboriginal sample, we found that the termination risk designation was an accurate predictor for youth outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period.

TABLE 160- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 114	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 107	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 107
LOW	93.3%**	13.3%	26.7%**	41.7%**	66.7%**
MEDIUM	59.3%**	25.9%	44.4%**	61.5%**	78.8%**
HIGH	33.3%**	40.0%	66.7%**	86.0%**	97.7%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The termination risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the Metis offender sample, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 161- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 147	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 138	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 137
LOW	91.8%**	20.4%**	34.7%**	51.2%**	61.9%**
MEDIUM	68.9%**	26.2%**	49.2%**	67.8%**	74.6%**
HIGH	27.0%**	64.9%**	81.1%**	91.7%**	97.2%**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

The termination risk designation was successful in predicting the rate of re-involvement for the Treaty On offender population, both during Probation and for the entire follow up period.

TABLE 162- THE ADMISSION RISK SCORE BY OUTCOME CRITERION FOR THE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

TERMINATION RISK/NEED SCORE	YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION (SUCCEEDED) N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 1 N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 2 N 60	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 3 N 56	RE-CONVICTED YEAR 4 N 56
LOW	100%*	37.5%	62.5%	75.0%	75.0%
MEDIUM	51.6%*	25.8%	48.4%	63.0%	77.8%
HIGH	33.3%*	28.6%	66.7%	66.7%	76.2%

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

For the Treaty Off sample, we found that the termination risk designation was only accurate for predicting youth outcome on Probation. We found that the termination score designation was unrelated to outcome for the entire post probation follow up period.

In summary, we found similar patterns for the termination risk designation as observed at admission. While we found the risk classification to be a powerful predictor of reconviction for all groups while on probation, we could not establish the same consistency of findings for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, we female offenders continue to deviate from the expected patterns with the exception of the female Treaty On sample, where the PRA termination designation was successful in predicting both outcome on probation and for the entire follow up period. For the remainder of the female offender samples, the score was only useful for predicting youth outcome on Probation. Additionally, male Non -Aboriginal and Treaty Off offenders also fail to result in expected patterns of re-involvement for the post probation follow up period. When we look at ethnicity alone, we find that the scores for the Non- Aboriginal and Treaty Off groups are not accurate predictors of patterns of re-involvement for reconviction in the follow up period. The termination score was reliable in predicting patterns of re-involvement both during probation and for the entire follow up period for the Metis and Treaty On sample groups.

SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

The majority of our young offender sample was composed of male offenders (83.4%). Of the male offenders, the single largest group was Non-Aboriginal (48.6%). The average age for the sample ranged from 15 – 17 years of age, with female offenders averaging slightly older than male offenders (16.1 versus 15.9). Metis and Treaty Off

offenders were slightly younger than the other sample groups under study. Most offenders in the sample had reached a grade 8 education, however, the Treaty On sample had achieved the lowest average grade of 7.5.

Correlations of total Admission and Termination scores with outcome variables all produced significant relationships for the overall sample. When we separated the sample first by gender, we found that while male offenders continued to produce significant correlations with all outcome variables, female offenders were only significantly correlated with Youth Outcome on Probation. As we discussed however, failure to produce a statistically significant relationship may well be the result of small sample sizes for some of the sample groups rather than a lack of relevance.

When separating the data to examine the combined influence of gender and ethnicity, we found correlations scores of acceptable range for most of the female offender samples. We could not however establish statistically significant results for any group other than the female Treaty On sample. Reconviction scores generally did not produce impressive correlation scores. Correlation scores were greatest for the female Treaty On sample.

We found significant correlations between admission/termination risk scores and Youth Outcome on Probation for all male offender samples. Finally, the correlations were best correlated with the male Non- Aboriginal and Treaty On offender populations.

Item analysis of admission and termination items revealed that termination items overall were more strongly correlated than admission items. Male offenders produced more significant correlations than female offenders, and Non-Aboriginal and Treaty On groups produced correlations of greater magnitude than Metis and Treaty Off groups.

Offenders were generally most commonly classified as medium risk for re-involvement. Exception to this was the female Treaty On and male Non-Aboriginal (by termination risk score) groups who were most commonly classified as low risk for re-involvement.

As with adult offenders, the majority of the young offenders, successfully completed their Probation period. When making gender comparisons, we found that female offenders performed better overall than their male counterparts. Female Non -Aboriginal and Treaty Off groups performed better than the female Metis and Treaty On groups. The male Treaty On group performed better than all other male offender groups. Finally, assessing ethnicity alone, we found the Treaty On and Non-Aboriginal groups performed best.

Similar to what we observed for the adult offender sample, we again found that as the follow up period increase, so did the corresponding number of reconviction and re-incarcerations. The Aboriginal groups were reconvicted and re-incarcerated at greater rates than their Non-Aboriginal counterparts, and male offenders were incarcerated at a higher rate than female offender.

When observing the results from our crosstabulations of risk scores and outcome variables, we found that the admission PRA score was a powerful predictor of outcome for the overall sample population. When we separated the sample into the categorical groups under study, we found the admission PRA score was valid as a predictors of male re-involvement both during Probation and for the post Probation follow up period, however, this was not reproduced for the female offender sample. For female offenders the Admission PRA score was only successful in predicting Youth Outcome on Probation and reconviction in year 4 of the follow up period.

The Admission PRA score was not an accurate predictor of outcome in the follow up period for all groups. Specifically, the PRA score was only successful in consistently and accurately predicting the post probation behaviour of male Treaty On offenders. Though the admission designation was able to accurately predict re-involvement in the post probation period for some years for other sample groups.

When assessing ethnicity alone, the PRA score successfully predicted the post probation behaviour for only the Metis and Treaty On samples. The PRA was able to successfully predict Youth Outcome on Probation for all sample groups.

The Termination PRA score was a successful predictor not only for the overall population, but also for both male and female offender populations. The Termination risk classification was successful in predicting both outcome on probation, as well as the

post probation outcome for the entire follow up period. When the sample was separated by gender and ethnicity, we found the score to be successful in predicting only outcome on probation. The reconviction outcome varied from group to group. While the termination score was unable to reliably predict re-involvement patterns for the entire follow up period for female Non- Aboriginal, Metis, and Treaty Off groups, it was a successful predictor for the female Treaty On group. The termination score was unable to reliably predict re-involvement patterns for male Non-Aboriginal and Treaty Off groups, however, successful for predicting post probation outcomes for the male Metis and Treaty On groups.

FUTURE DIRECTION

Clearly from the results we have presented, we can conclude that the Primary Risk Assessment is only valid for the prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation however, cannot be extended to post probation follow up.

In a final look at the young offender data set, we examined information routinely collected by corrections to determine which items may be useful for future inclusions of the scale. We assessed this by running correlations of these items by Youth Outcome on Probation and Reconviction in year one for each of the categorical groups under study. The items that produced significant results are presented below.

As we observe the tables below, we can clearly see that while the items selected demonstrate strong correlations with some groups, they may fail to demonstrate any correlation for others. All we can say with regard to this, is that more research is necessary to adequately assess the benefits of adding items to the Primary Risk Assessment. There is a strong need for collaborative efforts with other jurisdictions to develop an instrument that is truly gender and ethnicity inclusive.

TABLE 163 – POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – OVERALL SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 595	-.13**	.02
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 595	-.07	.19**
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 595	-.08*	.11*
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 595	-.16**	.09*
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 587	.13**	-.19**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 585	-.20**	.22**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 20	-.46*	-.06
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 595	-.10*	.06
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 583	-.11*	.06
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 591	-.07	.15**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 581	.05	-.09*
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 585	-.16**	.18**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 595	-.20**	.17**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 583	-.14**	.07
PREVIOUS BREACH N 591	-.07	.14**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 164– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – FEMALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 99	-.28**	.11
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 9	.03	.17
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 99	-.01	.00
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 99	-.09	.06
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 97	-.07	-.03
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 96	-.01	.08
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 1	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 99	.07	.01
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 95	-.11	.05
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 99	.10	.17
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 97	.00	-.08
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 96	-.09	.12
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 99	-.09	.15
PREVIOUS JAIL N 95	-.11	.05
PREVIOUS BREACH N 99	.10	.17

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 165– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – MALE OFFENDER SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR 496	-.10*	-.00
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 496	-.10*	.20**
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 496	-.09*	.11*
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 496	-.17**	.08
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 490	.16**	-.19**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 489	-.22**	.21**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 19	-.49*	-.03
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 496	-.13**	.06
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 488	-.10*	.05
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 492	-.08	.14**
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 484	.06	-.10*
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 489	-.17**	.16*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 496	-.21**	.16**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 488	-.14**	.07
PREVIOUS BREACH N 492	-.09*	.13**

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 166– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 33	-.14	-.12
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 33	.32	.01
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 33	-.10	-.08
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 33	-.05	-.10
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 32	-.21	-.13
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 32	.04	.18
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 0	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 33	.08	.05
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 33	.10	-.06
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 33	.18	.27
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 33	-.06	-.06
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 32	-.07	.45**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 33	-.03	.40*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 33	.10	-.06
PREVIOUS BREACH N 33	.18	.27

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 167– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – FEMALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR 15	-.20	.a
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 15	-.04	.a
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 15	.a	.a
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 15	-.17	.a
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 14	-.06	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 15	.37	.a
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 0	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 15	-.42	.a
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 15	.a	.a
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 15	-.29	.a
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 15	.28	.a
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 15	.22	.a
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 15	-.42	.a
PREVIOUS JAIL N 15	.a	.a
PREVIOUS BREACH N 15	-.29	.a

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 168– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 31	-.44*	-.06
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 31	-.30	.30
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 31	.11	-.17
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 31	-.21	.16
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 31	.03	-.21
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 29	-.17	-.05
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 1	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 31	-.15	.07
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 30	-.28	.09
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 31	.15	-.08
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 29	-.03	-.23
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 29	-.34	-.04
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 31	-.28	.01
PREVIOUS JAIL N 30	-.28	.09
PREVIOUS BREACH N 31	.15	-.08

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
TABLE 169– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION		
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 20	-.29	.19*
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 20	.19	.02
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 20	-.15	.25
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 20	.09	-.08
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 20	-.06	.34
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 20	.21	.33
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 0	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 20	.22	-.10
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 17	.a	.a
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 20	.15	.46*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 20	-.13	.18
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 20	.22	.25
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 20	.33	.06
PREVIOUS JAIL N 17	.a	.a
PREVIOUS BREACH N 20	.15	.46*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 170– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 241	-.19**	.01
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 241	-.16*	.15*
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 241	-.05	.12
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 241	-.14*	.01
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 239	.05	-.19**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 239	-.15*	.14*
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 10	-.37	-.17
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 241	-.05	.07
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 238	-.12	.01
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 240	-.11	.13*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 239	.07	-.14*
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 239	-.12	.14*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 241	-.17**	.15*
PREVIOUS JAIL N 238	-.14*	.05
PREVIOUS BREACH N 240	-.11	.12

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

	TABLE 171– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION	

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 99	.01	-.04
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 99	.03	.19
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 99	-.11	.03
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 99	-.22*	.20*
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 98	.25*	-.07
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 9	-.09	.13
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 4	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 99	-.03	-.14
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 98	-.03	.05
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 98	-.11	.22*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 98	.07	.05
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 99	-.07	.02
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 99	-.06	-.02
PREVIOUS JAIL N 98	-.02	-.01
PREVIOUS BREACH N 98	-.11	.22*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 116	.00	-.01
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 116	.01	.25**
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 116	-.17	.19*
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 116	-.17	.21*
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 115	.24*	-.27**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 112	-.29**	.37**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 5	-.80	.25
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 116	-.22*	.12
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 115	-.24*	.29**
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 115	.04	.16
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 109	.22*	-.13
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 112	-.23*	.32**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 116	-.26**	.32**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 115	-.24*	.29**
PREVIOUS BREACH N 115	.00	.21*

TABLE 172– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 173– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 40	-.19	.21
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 40	-.27	.34*
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 40	.00	.05
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 40	-.13	-.03
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 38	.11	-.22
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 39	-.46**	.43**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 0	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 40	-.39*	.36*
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 37	-.05	-.11
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 39	-.07	-.02
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 38	-.16	.18
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 39	-.41**	.25
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 40	-.50	.23
PREVIOUS JAIL N 37	-.14	-.08
PREVIOUS BREACH N 39	-.04	-.13

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 174– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 274	-.19**	.02
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 274	-.12	.15*
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 274	-.06	.11
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 274	-.14*	.03
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 271	.03	-.20**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 271	-.15*	.16**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 10	-.37	-.17
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 274	-.03	.06
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 271	-.11	.02
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 273	-.08	.14*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 272	.05	-.12
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 271	-.12*	.19**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 274	-.16**	.17**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 271	-.12*	.06
PREVIOUS BREACH N 273	-.07	.13*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 175– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 114	-.02	-.02
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 114	.02	.21*
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 114	-.10	.07
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 114	-.22*	.23*
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 112	.21*	-.09
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 114	-.07	.16
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 4	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 114	-.04	-.10
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 113	-.03	.08
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 113	-.13	.22*
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 113	.10	.05
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 114	-.03	.04
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 114	-.09	.02
PREVIOUS JAIL N 113	-.02	.02
PREVIOUS BREACH N 113	-.13	.22*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

TABLE 176– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – TREATY ON SAMPLE POPULATION

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 147	-.10	-.03
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 147	-.06	.23**
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 147	-.11	.12
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 147	-.18*	.18*
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 146	.20*	-.26**
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 141	-.26**	.32**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 6	-.76	.20
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 147	-.21*	.12
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 145	-.25**	.20*
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 146	.06	.14
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 138	.16	-.16
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 141	-.24**	.27**
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 147	-.26**	.28**
PREVIOUS JAIL N 145	-.25**	.20*
PREVIOUS BREACH N 146	.03	.18*

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

ITEM	CORRELATES WITH YOUTH OUTCOME ON PROBATION	CORRELATION WITH RECONVICTION IN YEAR ONE
ADMISSION RISK-% OF TIME EMPLOYED PREVIOUS YEAR N 60	-.11	.25
ADMISSION – TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED N 60	-.10	.22
INCARCERATION PRECEEDING ORDER N 60	-.07	.12
CALCULATED LENGTH OF ORDER N 60	-.10	-.03
ACTUAL AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION N 58	.17	-.11
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS N 59	-.44**	.41**
ORDER RELATED TO CHILD/SPOUSE ABUSE N 0	.a	.a
ACTUAL # PREVIOUS PROBATION ORDERS N 60	-.19	.20
# PREVIOUS TERMS INCARCERATION N 54	-.09	-.08
# PREVIOUS BREACHES N 59	-.07	.08
GRADE IN OR ACHIEVED AT ADMISSION N 58	-.12	.16
PREVIOUS CONVICTION N 59	-.36**	.28*
PREVIOUS PROBATION N 60	-.35**	.21
PREVIOUS JAIL N 54	-.17	-.06
PREVIOUS BREACH N 59	-.04	.01

TABLE 177– POSSIBLE FUTURE INCLUSIONS – TREATY OFF SAMPLE POPULATION

(Significant level - .01 represent by **, .05 represented by *)

To conclude this section of the report, we feel it helpful to summarize the findings for each sample group separately.

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL – YOUTH SAMPLE

The male Non-Aboriginal group of offenders accounted for 48.6% of our male offender sample and 40.5% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 16.1, placing them as the oldest male offender sample. Their mean grade level was 9.0, placing them at the highest grade level achieved by all male offender samples. This is not too surprising given they are slightly older than the other male offender groups.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found both scores significantly correlated to all outcome variables, however, this relationship was stronger for the termination score as compared to the admission score. We found the correlation to be stronger for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation than it was for the post probation follow up period. Correlations ranged from .11- .34 for the admission risk score and between .24-.54 for the termination risk score.

Admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. In fact only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, and Academic/Vocational skills. Similar to the same items

that failed to produce significance for the adult male non-aboriginal sample. Correlation strength was relatively weak for the items that failed to reach significance.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only one item failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. This item was alcohol use in the family.

The male Non-Aboriginal group was most commonly classified as medium risk by both the admission and termination risk/need scores. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (58.5%), however, as the follow up period increased so did their rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of youth outcome on probation, however not as useful for predicting post probation outcomes. We found that the male non-aboriginal offender was reconvicted least compared to all other male offender groups in the post probation period. We found that the admission risk score was useful in predicting reconviction in year 2, however not as useful for predicting reconviction in other years. Specifically, we found that it was difficult to distinguish performance between the low and medium risk groups for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4. Additionally, for variable reconviction in year 3, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at a slightly higher rate than the medium risk group.

The termination risk score was not any more useful for predicting post probation recidivism rates. For variables reconviction in years 1-4, we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at the lowest level followed by the low and high risk groups. Clearly this warrants some concern.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however not for post probation predictions. Additional variables found to be significantly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; actual number of previous convictions, and previous probation.

MALE METIS – YOUTH SAMPLE

The male Metis group of offenders accounted for 20.0% of our male offender sample and 16.6% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.9. Their mean grade level was 8.2, placing them at the second highest grade level achieved by all male offender samples.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found the Admission risk score only significantly correlated with variables Youth Outcome on Probation, and reconviction in year 4. Termination risk score however significantly correlated with all but variable Reconviction in year 1. Correlations were overall stronger for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation than for the post probation period, and we found that the Termination risk score was more strongly

related to outcome than the admission risk score. Correlations ranged from .07- .22 for the admission risk score and between .14-.42 for the termination risk score.

Admission item analysis revealed that half of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. While some of the items which failed to produce significant correlations, had a correlation strength comparable to other groups, many did not, implying that it may not be simply an issue of sample size.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. The items that failed to produce significant results however did produce correlations of sufficient strength for variable Youth Outcome on Probation, however not for the reconviction variables. This may indicate that the scale may be more useful as a prediction tool for Probation, but not for the post Probation period.

The male Metis group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the admission and termination risk scores. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (53.5%), however, as the follow up period increased so did their rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of youth outcome on probation, however not as useful for predicting post probation outcomes. We found that the Admission risk score was not particular helpful for predicting reconviction in any of the years. Specifically, we found that it was difficult

to distinguish performance between the low and medium risk groups for all reconviction variables, and for reconviction in years 1, 3, and 4 we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at a lower rate than the low risk group. The termination risk score was however valid in predicting both youth outcome on probation and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however we are caution about its ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. While the termination risk score was valid, the admission risk score was not.

MALE TREATY ON – YOUTH SAMPLE

The male Treaty On group of offenders accounted for 23.4% of our male offender sample and 19.5% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.7. Their mean grade level was 7.4, placing them at the lowest grade level achieved by all male offender samples.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found the Admission risk score to be significantly correlated with nearly all outcome variables. The exception to this was variables reconviction in years 3 and 4. Termination risk score was significantly correlated with all outcome variables. Correlations were overall stronger for variable Youth Outcome on Probation than for the post probation period, and we found that the Termination risk score was more strongly

related to outcome than the admission risk score. Correlations ranged from .18- .31 for the admission risk score and between .26-.40 for the termination risk score.

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items failed to produce a significant correlation with any of the outcome variables. Theses items were: Financial Management, Alcohol use in the family, School, Employment, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only 2 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were Emotional Stability and Academic/Vocational skills.

The male Treaty On group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the admission and Termination risk scores. This sample was most successful on probation compared with all male offender samples. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (67.2%), however they surpassed all other group for reconviction in the post probation period. We found that both the Admission and Termination risk/need score served as valid predictors of youth outcome on probation, and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism both during the period of probation, and for the post probation follow up period.

MALE TREATY OFF – YOUTH SAMPLE

The male Treaty Off group of offenders accounted for 8.1% of our male offender sample and 6.7% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.3, placing them as the youngest male offender sample. Their mean grade level was 7.8.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found both scores to be significantly correlated with Youth Outcome on Probation, but not with any of the reconviction variables.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Prior Convictions, Financial Management, and Alcohol use in the Family. For many of the remainder variables the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger, however only 5 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

The male Treaty Off group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores, however we found that the Termination risk score classified offender in the medium and high risk groups of equal proportion. The male Treaty Off group was least successful on probation as compared with all other male

offender samples. In fact, only 42.5% of the sample successfully completed their probation terms. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of both Youth Outcome on Probation, and for the entire follow up period. The Termination risk/need score however was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation. The score failed to reliably predict recidivism for any of the post probation years.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. While the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of both outcome on probation and beyond, the Termination risk score, derived from essentially the same measures and at a later period, failed to reliably predict recidivism for any of the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL – YOUTH SAMPLES

The female Non-Aboriginal group of offenders accounted for 33.3% of our female offender sample and 5.5% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.8. Their mean grade level was 8.6, placing them at the highest grade level achieved by all female offender samples.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found that the Admission risk score was only correlated with variable reconviction in year 4. The Termination risk score failed to produce any significant correlations with the outcome variables. We did however see stronger

correlation strength for the Termination risk score than that observed for the Admission score, indicating that small sample sizes may be of issue here.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. Theses items were: Prior Convictions, and Type of Prior. For many of the remainder variables the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger, however, only 4 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

The female Non-Aboriginal group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The female Non-Aboriginal group was most successful on probation as compared with all other female or male offender samples. In fact, 72.7% of the sample successfully completed their probation terms. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. In fact even for Youth Outcome o Probation, we found relatively little distinction from the performance of the low and medium risk groups. For the post probation period, we found the Admission risk score unrelated to outcome. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation and for Reconviction in years 2-4. For

variable Reconviction in year 1, we found the lowest recidivism rates for the medium rather than the low risk group.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was found to be unrelated to outcome in the post probation period and the Termination risk score was not able to reliably predict for all years in the follow up period.

FEMALE METIS – YOUTH SAMPLE

The female Metis group of offenders accounted for 15.2% of our female offender sample and 2.5% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.3, placing them as the youngest female offender sample. Their mean grade level was 8.3.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found no significant correlations for either the Admission or Termination risk score. We did however observe correlations of sufficient strength to be considered for variable Youth Outcome on Probation. Additionally, the Admission risk score also produced a strong correlation with variable reconviction in year 4, however this was not reproduced for the Termination score.

Admission item analysis revealed that while very few items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables, all produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger however we only found 2 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

The female Metis group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their probation terms (59.3%). We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4, we found the medium risk group was reconvicted at a higher rate than the low risk group. We found that no offenders from this sample were reconvicted in the first year following the completion of probation, and finally for variable reconviction in year 3 we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the low and high risk groups. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation. We found the score to be unrelated to reconviction in the post probation period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however not for the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE TREATY ON – YOUTH SAMPLE

The female Treaty On group of offenders accounted for 31.3% of our female offender sample and 5.2% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 17.1, placing them as the oldest female offender sample. In spite of their older age, they achieved the lowest mean grade level of 7.9.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found the Admission risk score was only significantly correlated for Youth Outcome on Probation. We did, however, observe correlation scores of sufficient magnitude for reconviction variables. We found significant correlations between the Termination risk score and nearly all outcome variables. Only variable: Reconviction in year 2 failed to produce a significant correlation. Again, however, the correlation appeared to be of sufficient strength to be considered.

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items on the scale were significantly correlated with outcome variables. All remaining items however produced correlations of sufficient strength to be comparable to other sample groups.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found 7 items produced significant correlations with outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

The Admission risk score classified the majority of the Treaty On female offenders as being either low or medium risk. The Termination risk score placed most offenders in this sample as being low risk for re-involvement. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their Probation Terms (61.3%), though not to the degree that we would expect given their classifications. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, the Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2. The score was unrelated to performance for the remainder of the years. The Termination risk/need score was valid for prediction of both Youth Outcome on Probation, and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2 in the post probation period. The termination risk score was found to reliably predict both Youth Outcome on Probation and in the entire follow up period.

FEMALE TREATY OFF – YOUTH SAMPLE

The female Treaty Off group of offenders accounted for 20.2% of our female offender sample and 3.4% of our total young offender sample. Their mean age was 15.5. Mean educational grade was 8.1.

When we ran correlations of the total Admission and Termination risk scores by the outcome variables, we found no significant correlation for either the Admission or Termination risk scores. Additionally, the correlation scores were weaker than those observed for other female offender groups.

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items on the scale were significantly correlated with outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes and Emotional Stability. Remaining items however did produce correlation scores comparable to that observed for other groups.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger, however, we still found only 2 items produced significant correlations with outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlation scores comparable to that observed for other groups.

The female Treaty Off group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their probation terms (70.0%). We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rates in all years. The Termination risk/need score was an invalid measure for all outcome variables.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument was a valid for predicting Youth Outcome on Probation but not for the post probation follow up period.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

When beginning this thesis, we outlined our objectives in the form of the following questions;

> Is the Primary Risk Assessment used by Manitoba Justice to classify offenders valid and reliable for female offenders;

> Are all items on the scale relevant predictors for all groups under study (i.e. male, female, aboriginal and non-aboriginal groups of offenders);

> Does the combination of gender and race variables change the validity of the instrument;

> Are the same predictor variables equally important to male and female offenders, and to aboriginal non aboriginal offenders, and

> Is the Primary Risk Assessment a reliable tool for prediction of recidivism both during a period of supervision and beyond.

Below we present the summary of our finds and discuss them in relation to the above

objectives.

1) **Is the Primary Risk Assessment used by Manitoba Justice to classify offenders valid and reliable for female offenders;**

ADULT OFFENDER INSTRUMENT

Taking the most accurate risk score (the termination risk/need score) we found, that for

the female Non-Aboriginal sample, the risk/need score served as a valid predictor of both

Adult Outcome on Probation, and for the entire follow up period. This was more difficult

to assess for the female Metis offender sample. We found that the risk/need score served

as a valid predictor of both, Adult Outcome on Probation and beyond, however only if we

assess the low and medium risk groups. No member of this sample group was classified as high risk for re-involvement.

For the female Treaty On sample, we found that the risk/need score served as a valid predictor of Adult Outcome on Probation, though we found little discrimination between the low and medium risk groups. The risk/need score was found to be unrelated to outcome in the post probation follow up period, where we found the high risk group was reconvicted at the lowest rate followed by the low and medium risk groups.

Finally for the female Treaty Off sample group, we found similar results as t/hose observed for the female Treaty On group. Specifically while the risk/need score was a valid predictor of Adult Outcome on Probation, it was unrelated to outcome in the post probation follow up period.

We therefore conclude that while the PRA may be useful for predicting outcome on probation and beyond for the female Non-Aboriginal and Metis groups, it is less valuable for the female Treaty On and Treaty Off groups. The instrument was valid for predicting Adult Outcome on Probation for all female offender sample groups.

YOUNG OFFENDER INSTRUMENT

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

For the female Non-Aboriginal sample group, we found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. In fact even for Youth Outcome on Probation, we found relatively little distinction from the performance of the low and medium risk groups. For the post probation period, we found the Admission risk score unrelated to outcome. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation and for Reconviction in years 2-4. For variable Reconviction in year 1, we found the lowest recidivism rates for the medium rather than the low risk group.

For the female Non-Aboriginal sample group, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however, are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was found to be unrelated to outcome in the post probation period and the Termination risk score was not able to reliably predict for all years in the follow up period.

FEMALE METIS SAMPLE

For the female Metis offender sample, we found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4, we found the medium

risk group was reconvicted at a higher rate than the low risk group. We found that no offenders from this sample were reconvicted in the first year following the completion of probation. Finally, for variable reconviction in year 3 we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the low and high risk groups. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation. We found the score to be unrelated to reconviction in the post probation period.

For the female Metis offender sample, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however not for the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

For the female Treaty On sample group, we found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, the Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2, the score was unrelated to performance for the remainder of the years. The Termination risk/need score was valid for prediction of both Youth Outcome on Probation, and beyond

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2 of the post probation follow up period. The termination risk score was however found to reliably predict both, Youth Outcome on Probation and beyond.

FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

For the female Treaty Off sample group, we found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post Probation follow up period. Specifically, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rates in all years. The Termination risk/need score was an invalid measure for all outcome variables.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument was a valid for predicting Youth Outcome on Probation but not for the post probation follow up period.

2.)   Are all items on the scale relevant predictors for all groups under study (i.e. male, female, aboriginal and non-aboriginal groups of offenders).

ADULT OFFENDER INSTRUMENT

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

For the male Non-Aboriginal sample, admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. In fact only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Family/Marital Relations, Emotional Stability, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis revealed that all of the items produced significant results for at least some of the outcome variables. This demonstrates that all of the items on the scale contribute something important to the prediction model.

MALE METIS SAMPLE POPULATION

Admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. We found that significant correlations were sporadic, in that an item may be significantly correlation with one of the outcome variables, however rarely more than that. We further found that 4 items were not significant with any of the outcome variables. These items were; Attitude to Probation, Mental Ability, Drugs/Alcohol use, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Significant correlations were far more consistent for all outcome variables, and we found only two items that failed to produce a significant relationship with any outcome variables. These item were; Financial Management and Mental Ability.

MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were Address Changes, Age, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Employment. Here we may be beginning to see the drawbacks of our smaller sample size. We did find an acceptable range of correlations for variables: attitude to probation, prior convictions, and drug and alcohol use, though they did not reach statistically significant levels.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while some items still failed to meet significant levels, 9 items were significantly correlated with at least some of the outcome variables. While variable prior convictions failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables, the correlation scores are within an acceptable range, implying that sample size may be of issue. We do, however also observe that some items do not appear to produce sufficiently high correlation scores with any of the outcome variables. These item were; Employment and Academic/Vocational skills.

MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that only 5 items were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address Changes, Age, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior, Peers & Companions, and Academic/Vocational skills. While our significantly smaller sample size may explain some of the loss in significance, we found that the strength of the correlations were not as high as those observed for the other male offender samples. While variables such as Financial Management and Employment appear to maintain some reasonable correlations, many others do not.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while some items still failed to meet significant levels, 11 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. Items; percentage of time employed in previous year, and Academic/Vocational skills failed to produce acceptable correlations with any of the outcome variables.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that 8 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were Address Changes, Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Type of Prior, Family/Marital Relations, Financial Management, Emotional Stability, and Peers & Companions. Additionally, we found that items Age, Drugs and Alcohol use, and Employment produced correlations of sufficient strength to

be considered. Specifically, small sample sizes may be the reason we cannot establish a significant relationship between these items and the outcome variables.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and nearly all items reached significance with at least one outcome variable. Items that continued to lack significance were generally within an acceptable range to be considered.

FEMALE METIS SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items were significantly correlated with at least one of the outcome variables. These items were; Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Financial Management, Mental Ability, and Employment. Additionally, we found that almost all of the other items produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered. Specifically, small sample sizes may be the reason we cannot establish a significant relationship between these items and the outcome variables.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 6 items reached significance with at least one outcome variable, many of the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. These items were; Type of Prior Conviction and Family/Marital Relations. While the remainder of the admission items failed to produce statistically significant correlations, the strength of the correlation scores were comparable to those observed in other female offender samples.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 2 items reached statistical significance with any of the outcome variables, many of the correlation scores were of sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE TREATY OFF

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items were significantly correlation with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Attitude to Probation, Prior Convictions, Family/Marital Relations, and Drugs/Alcohol use. Many of the remaining items, while failing to produce statistically significant relationships, produced correlation scores of sufficient magnitude to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and while only 4 items reached significance with ant of the outcome variable, many of the correlations were of sufficient

297

strength to be considered.

YOUNG OFFENDER INSTRUMENT

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL

Admission item analysis revealed that the vast majority of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. In fact only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: alcohol use in the family, Emotional Stability, and Academic/ Vocational skills. These are the same items that failed to produce significance for the adult male Non-Aboriginal sample. Correlation strength was relatively weak for the items that failed to reach statistical significance.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only one item failed to produce statistically significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. This item was alcohol use in the family.

MALE METIS SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that half of items were significantly correlated with the outcome variables. While some of the items which failed to produce significance produced correlation strength comparable to other groups, many did not, implying that it may not be simply an issue of sample size.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only 3 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. The items that failed to produce significant results, however, did produce correlation scores of sufficient strength for variable: Youth Outcome on Probation, however not for the reconviction variables. This may indicate that the scale may be more useful as a prediction tool for Probation, but not for the post probation period.

MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items failed to produce a significant correlation with any of the outcome variables. Theses items were: Financial Management, Alcohol use in the family, School, Employment, and Academic/Vocational skills.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than that observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found only 2 items failed to produce significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Emotional Stability and Academic/Vocational skills.

MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that only 4 items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. These items were: Address changes, Prior Convictions, Financial Management, and Alcohol use in the Family. For many of the

remainder variables, the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger, however, we only found 5 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remaining items produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables. Theses items were: Prior Convictions, and Type of Prior. For many of the remaining variables, the correlations were of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger however we only found 4 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remaining items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE METIS SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that while very few items on the scale were significantly correlated with any of the outcome variables, all produced correlations of sufficient strength to be considered.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger however we only found 2 items produced significant correlations with any of the outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remaining items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that 5 items on the scale were significantly correlated with outcome variables. All remaining items however produced correlations of sufficient strength to be comparable to other sample groups.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger and we found 7 items produced significant correlations with outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remaining items produced correlations with sufficient strength to be considered.

FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

Admission item analysis revealed that only 2 items on the scale were significantly correlated with outcome variables. These items were; Address Changes and Emotional Stability. Remaining items however did produce correlation scores comparable to those observed for other groups.

Termination item analysis demonstrated more favorable results than those observed at admission. Correlations overall were stronger however we still found only 2 items produced significant correlations with outcome variables. Again however, we found that the remainder items produced correlation scores comparable to those observed for other groups.

3) **Does the combination of gender and race variables change the validity of the instrument;**

We found from our result that the combination of race and gender does make a difference. We found that the scale worked reasonably well for female and male offenders overall, however, when we combined race and gender we found diminished correlation scores and reduced level of accuracy in prediction. This was true for both the Adult and Young offender instruments.

4).   Are the same predictor variables equally important to male and female offenders, and to aboriginal non aboriginal offenders.

We found that our ability to produce significant relationship between individual items on the scale and outcome on probation and beyond varied with both the risk scores assessed for the same group and changed from group to group. We found that in order to increase accuracy of our assessments it is necessary to add group specific items. We must remain ever conscious of the heterogeneity of our offenders, not only in terms of race and gender (the primary controls of this project) but also of life experiences, which may cluster groups of offenders more appropriately than either race or gender alone.

5)   Is the Primary Risk Assessment a reliable tool for prediction of recidivism both during a period of supervision and beyond.

ADULT OFFENDERS

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism. Both the total risk score and item analysis demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with our outcome variables.

303

MALE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE

The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism, however not to the same degree as that observed for the male non-aboriginal group.

MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

The male Treaty On sample was most commonly classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. When we compare the percentage of offenders classified at each risk level, we found that a greater proportion of male offender from the Treaty On group were classified as low risk than any other male offender group. We found that the male Treaty On group was most successful of all male offender sub samples during the Probation period. (69.7%) successfully completed their probation. This is what we would expect given they were most commonly assessed as low risk for re-involvement. Surprisingly, however, they surpassed all other male offender groups in the post probation follow up period. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, as well as the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. That is, those offenders classified as low risk were reconvicted and re-incarcerated at a lower rate than those classified as medium or high risk.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument may not be as useful as it was for the male non-aboriginal and Metis offender groups, especially for prediction in the post probation follow up period. The PRA did however reliably distinguish within the group, which offenders were of greater risk for re-involvement. Additional variables found to be strongly correlated with outcome on probation and reconviction in year one included; incarceration preceding order, actual age at first conviction, actual number of previous convictions, actual number of terms of incarceration, actual number of previous breaches, and previous jail.

For the male Treaty On sample, we found that the PRA score was reliably able to predict which offenders within the sample were most likely to become reconvicted/re-incarcerated. We could not however, account for why more members of this groups were reconvicted in the post probation period than any other group. The male Treaty On offenders were most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement and most successful while on probation, yet they surpassed all other sample group in the post probation follow up period. We are therefore caution about the utility of the PRA for the male Treaty On population.

MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

When we compare the percentage of offenders classified at each risk level, we found that a greater proportion of male offenders from the Treaty Off group were classified as high risk than any other male offender group. We found that the male Treaty Off group was least successful of all male offender sub samples during the probation period, however the majority (57.6%) still successfully completed their probation. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however, not the reconviction/re-incarceration rates. While the risk score successfully predicted the re-involvement patterns for reconviction in years 1 and 3, and re-incarceration in years 1-4, we found that offenders in this sample were more likely to be reconvicted in year 2, if classified as medium risk rather than low risk. Furthermore, for variable reconviction in year 4, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the high and medium risk groups. Finally, for variable re-incarceration in year 4, we see very little differentiation between the performance of low and medium risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument has limited utility, and is clearly not as valid for this group of offenders as for male Non-Aboriginal and male Metis groups. While the instrument was useful in predicting outcome on probation, it is only able to predict recidivism behaviour for some years in the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL

The female Non-Aboriginal sample was most commonly classified as low risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. The majority of offenders in this sample (74.0%) successfully completed their Probation period. Next to the female Metis offenders, the female Non-Aboriginal offenders were the second most successful group in our female offender sample. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation and in the entire post probation follow up period. For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reasonably good instrument for the prediction of recidivism.

FEMALE METIS OFFENDER SAMAPLE

The female Metis sample was most likely to be classified as medium risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk/need score. Of note however, offenders in this sample were classified as either low or medium risk. No member form this sample group was classified as high risk for re-involvement. The majority of offenders in this sample (77.40%) successfully completed their probation period, placing them as the most successful female offender sample measured on probation. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation and for the post probation follow up period, however only if we assess the low and medium risk classifications. As no member of this group was assigned to a high risk category, we found we could only compare the low and medium risk groups.

307

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reasonably good instrument for the prediction of recidivism. We do, however, have some concern with regard to the high risk classification for this group. Given we had no members to compare, it is difficult to see if a larger sample size would have made these results different.

FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

The female Treaty On sample was most likely to be classified as low risk for re-involvement as measured by the risk need/score. The majority of offenders in this sample (64.3%) successfully completed their probation period, however not as high a percentage as we might expect given their risk classification. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however we found that there was virtually no discrimination between the low and medium risk groups performance. There was a one percent difference between the two groups. The risk/need score was not found to be reliable in predicting any of the post probation performance. We found that the high risk groups were reconvicted at the lowest level followed by the low and medium risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is not overly useful for predicting recidivism in the post probation period. The tool did demonstrate some utility in predicting adult outcome on probation.

FEMALE TREATY OFF

The majority of offenders in this sample (61.1%) successfully completed their probation period. Comparing all of the female offender samples, the Treaty Off group was least successful in the probation period. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of outcome on probation, however not for the post probation follow up period. We found that the risk need score was unrelated to outcome in all but variables reconviction in years 2 and 3. We found that for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4, the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate. For variables re-incarceration in years 1-4, we found that the low risk group was actually re-incarcerated at the highest rate, followed by the medium and finally high risk groups.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is not overly useful for predicting recidivism in the post probation period. The tool did demonstrate ability to predict adult outcome on probation.

YOUNG OFFENDER SAMPLE

MALE NON-ABORIGINAL

The male Non-Aboriginal group was most commonly classified as medium risk by both the admission and termination risk scores. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (58.5%), however as the follow up period increased so did their rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of youth outcome on probation, however not as useful for predicting post

probation outcomes. We found that the male Non-Aboriginal offender was reconvicted least compared to all other male offender groups in the post probation period. We found that the Admission risk score was useful in predicting reconviction in year 2, however not as useful for predicting reconviction in other years. Specifically, we found that it was difficult to distinguish performance between the low and medium risk groups for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4. Additionally, for variable reconviction in year 3, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at a slightly higher rate than the medium risk group.

We found that the Termination risk score was not any more useful for predicting post probation recidivism rates. For variables reconviction in years 1-4, we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at the lowest level followed by the low and high risk groups. Clearly this warrants some concern.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however not very useful for post probation predictions.

MALE METIS SAMPLE

The male Metis group was most commonly classified as medium risk by both the admission and termination risk scores. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (53.5%), however as the follow up period increased so did their rate of reconviction and re-incarceration. The risk/need score served as a valid predictor of youth outcome on probation, however not as useful for predicting post probation outcomes. We found that the admission risk score was not particular helpful for predicting reconviction for any of the post probation follow up years. Specifically, we found that it was difficult to distinguish performance between the low and medium risk groups for all reconviction variables, and for reconviction in years 1, 3, and 4 we find that the medium risk group is reconvicted at a lower rate than the low risk group. The termination risk score was valid in predicting both youth outcome on probation and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however we are caution about its ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. While the termination risk score was valid, the admission risk score was not.

311

MALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

The male Treaty On group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the admission and termination risk scores. This sample was most successful on probation compared with all male offender samples. The majority of the sample successfully completed their probation term (67.2%), however they surpassed all other group for reconviction in the post probation period. We found that both the Admission and Termination risk/need score served as valid predictors of youth outcome on probation, and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism both during the period of probation, and for the post probation follow up period.

MALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

The male Treaty Off group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores, however ,we found that the termination risk score classified offender in the medium and high risk groups of equal proportion. The male Treaty Off group was least successful on probation as compared with all other male offender samples. In fact, only 42.5% of the sample successfully completed their probation terms. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of both Youth Outcome on Probation and for the entire follow up period. The Termination risk/need score, however, was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation.

The score failed to reliably predict recidivism for any of the post probation years.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. While the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of both outcome on probation and beyond, the Termination risk score, derived from essentially the same measures and at a later period, failed to reliably predict recidivism for any of the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE NON-ABORIGINAL SAMPLE

The female Non-Aboriginal group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The female non-aboriginal group was most successful on probation as compared with all other female or male offender samples. In fact, 72.7% of the sample successfully completed their probation terms. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. In fact, even for Youth Outcome o Probation, we found relatively little distinction from the performance of the low and medium risk groups. For the post probation period, we found the Admission risk score unrelated to outcome. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation and for reconviction in years 2-4. For variable Reconviction in year 1, we found the lowest recidivism rates for the medium rather than the low risk group.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was found to be unrelated to outcome in the post probation period and the Termination risk score was not able to reliably predict for all years in the follow up period.

FEMALE METIS OFFENDER SAMPLE

The female Metis group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their probation terms (59.3%). We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, for variables reconviction in years 1 and 4, we found the medium risk group was reconvicted at a higher rate than the low risk group. We found that no offenders from this sample were reconvicted in the first year following the completion of probation. Finally, for variable reconviction in year 3, we found that the medium risk group was reconvicted at the highest rate followed by the low and high risk groups. The Termination risk/need score was only valid for prediction of Youth Outcome on Probation. We found the score to be unrelated to reconviction in the post probation period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however not for the post probation follow up period.

FEMALE TREATY ON SAMPLE

The Admission risk score classified the majority of the Treaty On female offenders as being either low or medium risk. The Termination risk score placed most offenders in this sample as being low risk for re-involvement. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their probation terms (61.3%), though not to the degree that we would expect given their classifications. We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, the Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2, the score was unrelated to performance for the remainder of the years. The Termination risk/need score was valid for prediction of both Youth Outcome on Probation, and for the entire follow up period.

For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is a reliable and valid tool for the prediction of recidivism during the period of probation, however are cautious about the instruments ability to predict post probation recidivism rates. The Admission risk score was only able to successfully predict reconviction in year 2 in the post probation period. The termination risk score was however found to reliably predict both Youth Outcome on Probation and in the entire follow up period.

FEMALE TREATY OFF SAMPLE

The female Treaty Off group was most likely to be classified as medium risk by both the Admission and Termination risk scores. The majority of offenders in this sample successfully completed their probation terms (70.0%). We found that the Admission risk score was a valid predictor of Youth Outcome on Probation, but not for the post probation follow up period. Specifically, we found that the low risk group was reconvicted at the highest rates in all years. The Termination risk/need score was an invalid measure for all outcome variables. For this sub sample of the population, we concluded that the PRA instrument is invalid, both for predicting Youth Outcome on Probation and beyond.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the body of this thesis we have presented a great deal of information. We have acknowledged that as a society, we have become increasingly intolerant of crime and violence, and as a response have demanded a more appropriate response to the growing number of youth and adults who have become involved in the criminal justice system. At a time when the general public is running low on patience, we are more strenuously pushed to invest the time, energy, and financial resources into investigating better correctional practices, that more appropriate and successfully meet the needs of offenders, victims and the larger community. We must also manage this task in a cost efficient manner. This cost/ benefit analysis of justice is what we have accepted as the new penology'.

We have established the importance of studying risk and how it relates to offender management. We have acknowledged that the prediction of human behaviour can never become an exact science. Corrections will continue to encounter false positives and false negatives. We hope that with more research, however, we will have a lower number of these cases. In addition to our growing reliance on risk assessment tools to inform us of which offenders will go on to commit more crimes, we have also relied on risk assessment tools to guide our approach to offender management. We have reported on research that has demonstrated that when we identify offenders' criminogenic needs and work with offenders to establish pro-social avenues of achieving those needs, we see a significant decrease in criminal re-involvement. We have also reported on studies that

317

have stressed the importance of providing appropriate intensity of treatment to offenders. Specifically, when we apply intensive treatment to low risk offenders, we actually increase their risk of reconviction, rather than decrease it. It is for these reasons that we feel this inquiry holds merit. While the Manitoba Primary Risk Assessment is a tool that has demonstrated some success in predicting reconviction for general probation population, we found that given these populations are composed primarily of male non aboriginal offenders, the results of this study do not provide evidence of the instruments ability to reliably and validity predict the behaviors all other groups of offenders, specifically, female and Aboriginal offenders.

We have discussed throughout the body of this thesis, how the traditional response to female offenders from the criminal justice system, has been a mixture of neglect and inappropriate responses, focused primarily around a presumed biological etiology of female criminality. Women have consistently been described as more difficult to manage within correctional setting and less responsive to correctional interventions. All research evidence presented, however, speaks in direct contradiction to this. We have reported that women in prison are disciplined more harshly then men, and are isolated for minor infractions that would normally be overlooked in male institutions. We have also presented data that supports that women are reconvicted at lower rates than male offenders and generally have less developed criminal careers. This was true for both the adult and young female offender.

While the decades long struggle for federally sentenced women, has resulted in the building of new federal prisons for women, in order to facilitate greater access to programming and family contact, provincially sentenced women are still at a great disadvantage in comparison to provincially sentenced men. What we have demonstrated with the issue of risk assessments, is that traditional attitudes and policies have guided contemporary practices. Specifically, we have discussed that prior to this inquiry, there has been no report on the validity of the Primary Risk Assessment for female offenders. While researchers had previously examined the validity of applying a generic risk tool to adult aboriginal offenders, there was no interest in researching the validity of this tool for adult female offenders. Furthermore, there has been no examination of the influence of either gender or ethnicity for young offenders. Given the risk assessment tool is intended not only to measure an offenders risk for re-involvement, but also serve as a guide for programming, female offenders are doubly disadvantaged. First, they are inappropriately assessed and therefore managed, and second, when provided programming, those programs available, are those developed and tested for male offenders. While the conditions for federally sentenced women have improved significantly in recent years, more work is needed to correct the imbalance for provincially sentenced women and girls.

Aboriginal offenders have received a great deal of recent attention from the criminal justice system. While the system has acknowledged the over representation of Aboriginal peoples within corrections, there is a greater need to acknowledge that this

319

over-representation is greatest for Aboriginal women. We have presented data that indicates Aboriginal people are reconvicted at a greater rate than their non-aboriginal counterparts. Contemporary criminal justice practices are in direct conflict with the Aboriginal sense of justice, which places the victim and offender together rather than separate. Aboriginal justice focuses of healing rather than punishment, and involves the entire community, not just the victim and offender. These factors of healing, reparation, and community involvement need to be better incorporated into the overall system of justice, if it is to be effective for Aboriginal communities. From our research we found that the Metis offender samples performed most closely to the Non-Aboriginal samples than to the Treaty Offender samples.

Young offenders as a group have been vulnerable to many abuses under the criminal justice system. Viewed under the JDA as in need of re-socialization and guidance, they were often incarcerated for lengthy periods of time for behaviors that would not have been defined as criminal for adults. This was particularly common for female youth who failed to conform to social and cultural expectations of the time. While we have entered the era of the YOA (1982), and eliminated the category of 'status offences', we continue to see high rates of incarceration for youth offenders. The programming made available in youth institutions is nothing short of appalling, and with no provincial standards in place for what constitutes program for either youth or adults, we are unlikely to see changes soon.

320

We have discussed that the largest gap in knowledge available is in the area of female young offenders. Little is known about what factors lead them to become involved in the criminal justice system, why their rates of re-involvement remain less than male delinquents, and what programs are required to make the difference. Female delinquency has always been perceived as less violent and therefore less important than that of their male counterparts. Female young offenders, like adult women, have been reduced to being a correctional afterthought. While traditional theories of youth crime described male delinquency as having many causes, stemming from blocked occupational opportunities or peer group influence, female delinquency was explained via reference to a dysfunctional familial setting. Even with the increase in the number of girls entering the correctional system, there has been no corresponding increase in the number of research endeavors aimed at understanding their unique position. The availability of information is most scarce for the Aboriginal female youth.

This thesis has presented results to suggest that the Primary Risk Assessment has limited utility in predicting female offender post probation reconviction rates. In fact we have observed that when combining the race and gender variables the tool demonstrated unimpressive ability to predict beyond probation. For the adult offender instrument, we saw invalid results not only for the female offender sample, but also for some of the male offenders. For the Young offender instrument, we conclude that while it is valid and useful for the prediction of Youth outcome on Probation, it provides us with no predictive validity for a post probation follow up period. We feel that this is the area in which future research should be directed. While we accept that there exist many similarities in

criminogenic needs among heterogeneous offender populations, we feel that there also exist sufficient differences. In order to improve current assessment of these groups, we need to examine what these differences are, and how they can be incorporated into existing assessments. Young Offender assessment instruments are most likely to encounter the greatest difficulty with post probation prediction rates simply based on the rapid changes of this group. Specifically, the natural process of maturation may itself have a tremendous influence on post probation recidivism rates. As young offenders mature and become more invested in society, and as the consequences of criminal activity begin to outweigh the benefits, we are likely to see greater decreases in criminal involvement. From our sample populations, we found that the Aboriginal offenders were younger than the Non-aboriginal sample overall, which may partly account for the increased rate of recidivism among Aboriginal versus Non-Aboriginal young offenders. These are environmental factors that cannot easily be assessed on risk assessment tools.

Additional factors that may assist our prediction of post probation recidivism rates is the combination of Primary Risk Assessments (which are designed to measure general risk for recidivism), with Secondary Risk Assessments (which are designed to measure specific offence styles). Currently there are Secondary Risk Assessments for violent and sexual offenders. While we have seen no validation studies on the SRA used in Manitoba, we feel that in order to improve assessment of recidivism overall, future studies need to examine the combined ability of both the PRA and SRA scores to predict performance for specific offender types.

Not all offenders present the same degree of risk to society. The determination of which offenders will go on to inflict further harm on society is imperative so that correctional services can focus most intensely on those most dangerous to re-offend. Risk/Needs assessment instruments are important tools used to assess offenders risk for re-involvement and to identify offenders criminogenic needs. While the Primary Risk Assessment in Manitoba has been repeatedly validated on male offenders and general offender populations, this inquiry was the first attempt to validate the instrument for a female offender population. We have concluded that the instrument at present fails to adequately assess adult female offenders and some groups of male offenders, at least with regard to post probation recidivism. For the youth PRA, we found the instrument to be a valid and reliable for the prediction of youth outcome on probation, however, the instrument failed to demonstrate predictive validity for all groups in the follow up period. We remain hopeful that with more research and alterations, tools can be valid for all groups of offenders, however caution that assessment tools should not uniformly be applied to populations they have not been validated on. Research literature reminds us that items such as a history of self-injurious behaviour has been found to be related to recidivism for female offenders. We need to invest in more research that explore factors specific to women and aboriginal offenders. If the scale is to be improved for these groups of offenders, we need to begin to understand how the realities of these groups are different from other groups, and how this impacts on reconviction rates. Bonta et al, (1996) theorized that rate of reconviction for the Treaty On population is related to the isolation experienced by these groups living on remote reserves. Diminishing these

trends, however, requires greater knowledge of what specific factors are involved and how appropriate responses and programming can limit the negative influence of these factors. We must further be cautious of offering the identical programs to male and females to attack similar need dimensions. There is currently a dramatic need for expansion of programming that is women centred. Programming that confronts issues of physical and sexual violence in the lives of women and girls as well as programming around pregnancy and motherhood are severely limited.

While we are not prepared to conclude that different racial and gender groups require group specific assessment instruments, we feel that closer investigation of the groups is necessary in order to improve the quality of a generic instrument.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelberg, E. & Currie, C. (1987) *Too Few to Count: Canadian Women In Conflict with the law.* Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.

Adler, F. (1975) *Sisters in Crime.* New York : McGraw-Hill.

Andrews, D.A. (1989) *Recidivism Is Predictable and can be influenced: Using Risk Assessments to Reduce Recidivism.* Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (1994) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct.* Cincinnati.OH: Anderson.

Angenent, H. & De Man, A. (1996) *Background Factors of Juvenile Delinquency.* New York: Peter Press.

Belcourt, R., Nouwens, T., & Lefevre, L. (1993). *Examining the Unexamined: Recidivism Among Female Offenders.* Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada. Ottawa.

Bartol, C. R. (1995) *Criminal Behavior: A Psychological Approach.* 4th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Blanchette, K. (1997). *Comparing violent and non-violent female offenders on risk and need.* Forum on Correctional Research, vol. 9.

Blanchette, K. (1997). *Classifying female offenders for correctional intervention.* Forum on Correctional Research. Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa.

Boe, R. (1995). *In the shadow of the Young Offenders Act: Youths admitted into federal custody since 1978-1979.* Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa.

Boe, R. and Dell, C. (1998). *Female Young Offenders in Canada: Revised Edition.* Forum on Correctional Research, December, 1998.

Boe, R. and Dell, C. (1998). *Adult Female Offenders in Canada: Recent Trends.* Research Branch: Correctional Service of Canada, May 1998.

Bonta, James., Pang, Bessie. , and Wallace-Capretta, Suzanne, (1995) *Predictors of Recidivism Among Incarcerated Female Offenders.* The Prison Journal, 75, 3, 277-294.

Bonta, James., Hann, R.G., Harmen, W.G., & Cormier, R.B. (1994) *Revising The Wisconsin Classification System.* Paper Presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Miami.

Bonta, J. (1996) . *Risk-needs assessment and treatment.* In A.T. Harland (ed.). Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the supply. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

Bonta, J. LaPrarie, C., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1997). *Risk prediction and re-offending: Aboriginal and non-aboriginal offenders.* Canadian Journal of Criminology, 127-144.

Bonta, James. (1997) *Offender Rehabilitation: From Research to Practice*
(User Report no. 1997-01) Ottawa: Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General
Canada.

Bonta, J. (1997). *Do we need theory for offender risk assessment?.* Forum on Correctional Research, Solicitor General Canada, Ottawa.

Bonta, J. Parkinson, R., Pang, B, Barkwell, L. & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1994). *The Revised Manitoba Classification System for Probationers.*

Bonta, J. (1994). *Gauging the Risk for Violence: Measurement, Impact and Strategies for Change.* Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.

Boritch, Helen. (1997) *Fallen Women: Female Crime and Criminal Justice in Canada.* Toronto: ITP Nelson: An International Thomson Publishing Company.

Broadhurst, R.G., Maller, R.A., Maller, M.G., & Duffecy, J. (1988). *Aboriginal and Non-aboriginal Recidivism in Western Australia: A failure rate analysis.* Journal of research in Crime and Youth crime, 25,1, 83-108.

Brown, Mark & Pratt, John. (2000) *Dangerous Offenders: Punishment & Social Order.* London: Routledge.

Byrne, James M., Lurigio, Arthur J., & Petersilia, Joan. (1992) *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions.* London: Sage Publications.

Cain, M. (1990) *"Towards Transgression: New Directions in Feminist Criminology".* International Journal of Sociology of Law 1990, 18, 1-18.

Carlen, Pat. (1988) *Women, Crime and Poverty.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Chesney-Lind, M., (1989) *Girls' Crime and Women's Place: Toward a feminist model of female youth crime.* Crime and Youth crime, 35,5-29.

Comack, Elizabeth (1992). *"Women and Crime"* in Rick Linden (ed.) (1992). Criminology. Ontario: Harcourt Bruce Jaovanovich Canada Inc. pp.127-162.

Coumier, R.B. (1997). *Yes, SIR! A stable risk prediction tool* Forum January 1997, vol. 9, no.1. Solicitor General Canada, Ottawa.

Correctional Service of Canada (1990). *Creating Choices: Report of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women.* Ottawa: Author.

Correctional Service of Canada (1997). *Basic Facts about corrections in Canada.* Ottawa: Author.

Cowie, J., Cowie, V., & Slater, E. (1968) *Youth crime in Girls.* London. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Crites, L. (1976) *The Female Offender.* Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1999) *Women, Crime, and the Canadian Criminal Justice System.* Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

Dell, C. A. & Boe, Roger. (1998) " Adult Female Offenders in Canada: Recent Trends" Research Branch. Correctional Service of Canada.

Dell, C. A. & Boe, Roger. (1998) " Female Young Offenders in Canada" Research Branch. Correctional Service of Canada.

Ditton, Jason, & Ford, Roslyn. (1994) *The Reality of Probation.* Sydney: Avebury.

Emler, Nicholas and Reicher, Stephen (1995) *Adolescence and Delinquency.* Great Britian. Blackwell Publishers

Feeley, M. and Simon, J. (1992). *"The New Penology: notes on the emerging strategy of corrections".* Criminology, 30, 4, 449-475.

Flowers, R. B. (1995). *Female Crime, Criminals, and Cellmates*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc.

Gendreau, P., Goggin,C. & Little, T. (1996). *Predicting Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works!*. (User Report no. 1996-07). University of New Brunswick.

Gelsthorpe, Loraine & Morris, Allison (1990) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Gottfredson, D. and Tonry, M. (1987). *Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hann, R. G. & Harman, W. G. (1992). *Predicting General Release Risk for Canadian Penitentiary Inmates* (User Report no. 1992-07). Ottawa: Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada.

Hann, R. G. & Harman, W. G (1993) *Predicting Release Risk for Aboriginal Penitentiary Inmates*. User Report 1993-12. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Hannah-Moffat, Kelly & Shaw, Margaret (2000) edited *An Ideal Prison? Critical Essays on Women's Imprisonment in Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing

Harland, Alan T (1996) Editor *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. London: Sage Publications.

Heidensohn, F. (1995) *Women and Crime*. 2nd Edition. Washington: New York University Press.

Hippchen, L. (1975). *Correctional Classification and Treatment*. Washington, D.C.: The American Correctional Association.

Hoge, Robert D. & Andrews, D.A. (1996) *Assessing the Youthful Offender: Issues and Techniques*. New York, Plenum Press.

Hogeveen, Brian. (2000) "Winning Deviant Youth Over By Friendly Helpfullness: Transformations in the Legal Governance of Deviant Children in Canada. 1857-1908. in Smandych, R. (2000) Youth Justice: History, Legislation, and Reform. Toronto, Harcourt Canada.

Julia, Maria. (2000) *Constructing Gender: Multicultural Perspectives in Working with Women*. Australia: Brooks/Cole.

Jung, S. Rawana, E.P., & Lod, B. (1997). *Risk Classification for young offenders*. Forum on Correctional Research, vol. 7.

Kemshall, H. and Pritchard, J. (1997). *Good Practice in Risk Assessment and Risk Management 2: Protection, Rights, and Responsibilities.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Kirvan, M. (1995). *Canada's youth justice system-under review.* Forum on Correctional Research, vol.7.

Leschied, A.W. (1995). *The Young Offenders Act in review: A more than modest proposal for change.* Forum on Correctional Research, Vol. 7.

Long, G.T., Sultan, F.E., Kiefer, S.A., & Schrum, D.A. (1984) *The Psychological Profile of the Female First Offender and the Recidivist: A Comparison.* Gender Issues, Sex Offences and Criminal Justice, Haworth Press.

Loucks, A. & Zamble, E. (1994). *Some comparison of female and male serious offenders.* Forum on Correctional Research, Vol. 6.

Luciani, F. (1997). *Tried and True: Proof that the Custody Rating Scale is still reliable and valid.* Forum January 1997, Vol 9. no.1: Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Mann, C. R. (1984) *Female Crime and Delinquency.* The University of Alabama Press.

Meda Chesney-Lind (1997) *The female Offender: Girls, Women, and Crime.* London, Sage Publications.

Morash, M. (1986). *Gender, peer group experiences, and seriousness of youth crime.* Journal of Research in Crime and Youth crime, 23, 43-67.

Motiuk, L.L. (1993). *Where are we in our ability to assess risk?.* Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa.

Motiuk, L. (1997). *The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: An effective supervision tool.* Forum on Correctional Research, 9. Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa.

Moyer, Imogene L. (1992). *The Changing Roles of Women in the Criminal Justice System: Offender, Victims, and Professionals.* 2nd Edition. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.

Nuffield, J. (1989). *The 'SIR Scale': Some Reflections on its Apllications.* Correctional Branch, Ministry Secretariat Solicitor General Canada, Ottawa.

Petersilia, Joan. (1998) *Community Corrections: Probation, Parole and Intermediate Sanctions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Joycelyn M. (1998) *Counselling Women in Prison*.London: Sage Publications.

Ritzer, George. (1992) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Schmidt, Peter & Witte, Ann Dryden. (1988) *Predicting Recidivism Using Survival Models*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Serin, R.C. & Barbaree, H. (1993) *Decision Issues in Risk Assessment*. Correctional Service of Canada, Ontario.

Shaw, M. (1991) *The Federal Female Offender: Report on a Preliminary Study* (User report no. 1991 - 3). Ottawa: Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada.

Shaw, M. (1992) *Paying The Price: Federally Sentenced Women in Context* (User report no. 1992-3) Ottawa: Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada.

Shaw, M. (1991) *Survey of Federally Sentenced Women: Report to the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women on the Prison Survey*. (User Report no. 1991-4) Ottawa: Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada.

Simons, R.L., Miller, M.G., & Aigner, S.M. (1980). *Contemporary theories of deviance and female youth crime: An empirical test*. Journal of Research in Crime and Youth crime, 17, 42-53.

Simourd, L. & Andrews, D.A. (1995). *Correlates of youth crime: A look at gender differences*. Carleton University, Ottawa.

Smandych, Russell C. (2000). *Youth Justice: History, Legislation, and Reform*. Toronto: Harcourt Canada.

Smart, C. (1976) *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Statistics Canada (1996) *Census*. Author.

Taylor, G. (1997). *Implementing Risk and Needs Classification in the Correctional Service of Canada*. Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa.

Voorhis, P.V. (1997). *Correctional Classification and the "Responsivity Principle"*. University of Cincinnati. Forum January 1997, Vol 9, No.1.

Wormith, J.S. (1997). *Research to Practice : Applying risk/needs assessment to offender classification.* Forum January 1997, Vol 9, no. 1: Ontario Solicitor General and Correctional Services.

Wormith, J.S. (1997). *The Youth management Assessment: Assessment of young offenders at risk of serious re-offending.* Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, North Bay, Ontario.

Worrall, Anne. (1990) *Offending Women.*London: Routledge.

Zamble, E. (1993). *Expanding the Recidivism Inquiry: A Look at Dynamic Factors.* Department of Psychology, Queen's University.

Zamble, E. & Quinsey, V. L. (1997) *The Criminal Recidivism Process.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.