

PRESERVATION

A Limited Study
Comparing Maoris and
Non-Maoris Appearing
in The Children's
Court in 1960

1963

DSW
364
.36
JOI



A00360996B

AGENCY CANCEL

ING BY
RICEBRN 8134
8192PRESERVATIONJOINT COMMITTEE ON YOUNG OFFENDERSR E S E A R C H R E P O R T

A LIMITED STUDY COMPARING MAORIS
AND NON-MAORIS
APPEARING IN THE CHILDREN'S COURT
IN
1960

SLATER, S.W.
+
PERCE, W.L.

WELLINGTON
17 JUNE 1963

CONTENTS.

	Page
Purpose	1
Source of Data	1
Sample	1
Method of Achieving Sample	1
Method	2
Results	2
Profiles	2
Maori Boy Offender	3
Non-Maori Boy Offender	4
Maori Girl Offender	5
Non-Maori Girl Offender	6
Discussion	7
 <u>Appendix 1.</u>	
1. Age	10
2. Legitimacy	11
3. Mother Working	12
4. Siblings	13
5. With Whom Living at Time of Offence	14
6. Family Broken	15
7. Religious Denomination and Religious Adherence	16
8. Circumstances at Time of Offence	16
9. School Attendance	17
10. School Progress	18
11. Intelligence	18
12. School Class	19
13. Previous Court Appearances	20
14. The Actual Offence	21
Breakdown of Broad Offence Classification	27
Summary Concerning Offences	29
15. The Number of Charges	30
16. Multiple Charges	31
17. Companions in Offence	31
18. Time of Offence	32
19. Decision	32
20. Locality	34
 <u>Appendix 11.</u>	
Operational Definition of Sample	36
References	37

17 June 1963

JOINT COMMITTEE ON YOUNG OFFENDERS

A LIMITED STUDY COMPARING MAORIS AND NON-MAORIS

APPEARING IN THE CHILDREN'S COURT IN 1960.

PURPOSE: To prepare summary profiles of four groups, Maori boys, Maori girls, Non-Maori boys and Non-Maori girls, appearing in the Children's Court from April 1959 to March 1960.

SOURCE OF DATA: The information was taken from Child Welfare Punch Cards which are themselves derived from Case Reports prepared by Child Welfare Officers for every young person appearing in the Children's Court. By statute a Child Welfare Officer must have had the opportunity to investigate the circumstances of a case before the Children's Court and to present a report to the Magistrate. These reports are almost invariably written, and consist of a "structured" facing sheet and a narrative under prescribed headings as follows: Present Incident; Previous Incidents; Home and Family; Physical Development; Behaviour Symptoms; Temperament and Attitude; School; Employment; Friendships and Recreation; Religion; Summary and Impressions.

SAMPLE: All children, aged 10 - 17 inclusive, involved in Children's Court cases from April 1959 to March 1960 for named offences excluding technical and minor traffic offences. All cards for second and subsequent offences were deleted from the sample so that only one card for each child was included.

METHOD OF ACHIEVING SAMPLE:

1. The total set of cards for offenders appearing in the Children's Court during 1960 was machine sorted into four groups: "Maori" females, "Maori" males, "Non-Maori" females, "Non-Maori" males. "Maori" here includes these categories of the Child Welfare Code:

- (i) Maori.
- (ii) Half or more Maori (balance European).
- (iii) Maori/Asian, other Maori blends.

"Non-Maori" includes:

- (i) European.
- (ii) Other e.g. Polynesian, Asian, etc.
- (iii) Less than half Maori.
- (iv) Other racial blends

Four females and 205 males had to be rejected because their race was not coded at all.

2. From the cards in each of the four groups further cards were deleted from the sample if they came under the following categories:

- (i) The main offence was technical, or a minor traffic offence.
- (ii) Age of child was under 10 or over 17.
- (iii) There had been a previous appearance by the same child in the current year.

All children under 10 were excluded from the sample because (a) the age of criminal responsibility has lately been raised from 7 to 10 and (b) for convenience in tabulating and considering the results. Those omitted were 40 Non-Maori boys, 11 Maori boys, 4 Non-Maori girls, and 2 Maori girls.

3. By these steps we arrived at the final sample of 2573 distinct children. A step-by-step operational definition of the sample, (for the benefit of research workers who have occasion to make use of the Child Welfare punch card code) is given below in Appendix II.

METHOD:

Each racial group was stratified by age and for every age-group the cards were sorted on each variable of the code, and the number falling in each category tabulated. Profiles were derived from the tables obtained and sum up the essential findings. For the sake of brevity, these summarizing profiles make up the bulk of the section Results, and the tables, with statistical analysis and comment, are presented for reference in Appendix I.

RESULTS:

Before considering the profiles, it should be noted that careful checks were made to determine whether differing distributions in the various age-groups might obscure or exaggerate any other difference between Maori and Non-Maori offenders. These necessary checks were made both with the sample of offenders, and with the relevant child populations. It was found that age could not be an important underlying variable. The reference is to Table I et seq. in Appendix I.

PROFILES:

Keeping the sexes distinct, the summary data for Maoris are set out alongside those for Non-Maoris to allow ready comparison.

The proportions stated in the profiles often differ slightly from those stated in Appendix 1. In the Appendix, a "not known" or "information not available" category is included, and totals are nearly always the full number of Maori boys, Non-Maori boys, Maori girls or Non-Maori girls in the entire sample. In the profiles, however, proportions are of the total relevant number of children for whom information was available. The profiles thus show what we believe to be the general picture, while the tables of the Appendix are more cautious and exact.

PROFILES

MAORI BOY OFFENDERS

AGE

They are of average age $14\frac{1}{2}$ years, 81% being between 13-16 years inclusive.

SCHOOLING

In three cases out of five, they are school-boys, mostly in Forms II-IV: 48% of the boys have had schooling not beyond Form II, 77% not beyond Form III, 95% not beyond Form IV. The mean class attained is Form II. Ratings both of "intelligence" and of "school progress" when available evenly split between "average" and "Below average"; about 40% are characterized "irregular" attenders, truancy being specifically mentioned for one case in four.

EMPLOYMENT

26% of the boys are not at school but are employed, 10% are neither at school nor in employment.

FAMILY

One in seven is said to be "illegitimate", or adopted either legally or by custom. The median number of children in the family is between 6 and 7; the average would be about 9. Families are normal (i.e. not broken by death, separation ...) in only one case in two, and a parent is dead in a quarter of cases. Slightly under half are living with both parents at the time of offence.

CHURCH

A little under one-third of the boys are characterized as regular church attenders.

LOCALITY

45% come from towns with more than 5,000 inhabitants, the description of the locality being semi-rural, rural, or isolated-rural in 37% of all cases.

PREVIOUS NOTICE

41% have previously been "under notice" for some reason; just under one third have made at least one previous court appearance.

PRESENT OFFENCE

The present offence is one of dishonesty in 84% of cases (90% of all cases concerned offences against property). Companions are involved 66% of the time.

OUTCOME

The outcome of proceedings is:

Admonish etc. - 19%; Child Welfare Supervision - 48%; Committal to care of the Superintendent* - 18%; Probation 10%; Borstal 3%.

* "Committal" in these profiles includes "Return to the care of the Superintendent" etc.

PROFILES

NON-MAORI BOY OFFENDERS

<u>AGE</u>	The average age is 14½ years, 76% being between 13-16 years inclusive.
<u>SCHOOLING</u>	In three cases out of five, they are schoolboys, mostly in Forms III or IV: 20% of the boys have had schooling not beyond Form I, 37% not beyond Form II, 63% not beyond Form III, 90% not beyond form IV and 98% not beyond Form V. The "mean" class attained is Form III. Ratings of intelligence fall - above average 9%, average 46%, below average 24%, not known 22%. Ratings of "school progress" split evenly between "average" and "below average". Attendance is irregular in one third of cases, truancy mentioned for one case in five.
<u>EMPLOYMENT</u>	32% of the boys are not at school but are employed, 4% are neither at school nor in employment.
<u>FAMILY</u>	About 6% are said to be illegitimate or adopted. The median number of children in the family is 4, the average probably a little more. Families are "broken" for one reason or another in one third of the cases. In all, 8% of families are broken by death of a parent. 65% of offenders live with both parents at the time of offence.
<u>CHURCH</u>	A little under one third of the boys are characterized as regular church attenders.
<u>LOCALITY</u>	85% come from towns with more than 5,000 inhabitants, the description of the locality being town residential (including state housing) in 81% of cases; rural etc. in 11%. 37% are from the South Island.
<u>PREVIOUS NOTICE</u>	Nearly 40% have previously been under notice for some reason; just under one third have made at least one previous court appearance.
<u>PRESENT OFFENCE</u>	The present offence is one of <u>dishonesty</u> in 70% of cases (85% of all cases concerned offences against property). Companions are involved in 77% of cases.
<u>OUTCOME</u>	The outcome of proceedings is: Admonish etc. - 40%; Child Welfare Supervision - 42%; Committal to care of Superintendent - 10%, Probation - 5%, Borstal - 1%.

PROFILES

MAORI GIRL OFFENDERS

- AGE: They are of average age 15, 71% being between 14-16 inclusive.
- SCHOOLING: One in every two is at school: counting those whose schooling continues as well as those who have left school, 40% have not gone beyond Form II, 75% not beyond Form III, 95% not beyond Form IV. The mean class attained is Form II, "School progress" is 31% average, 66% below average. Attendance is stated to be irregular in 60% and truancy is explicitly mentioned in 33% of cases.
- EMPLOYMENT: Of the 45% who are known to have left school, half are employed, half are unemployed.
- FAMILY: 19% are said to be "illegitimate" or adopted either legally or by custom. The median number of children in a family is 7, the average somewhat more. One family in two is broken (by death, separation, divorce) and in 19% of cases there is a parent dead. Only 38% are living with both parents at the time of offence.
- CHURCH: 22% of the girls are said to be regular in attendance at church.
- LOCALITY: 58% come from towns of over 5,000 inhabitants, the description of the locality being 52% town residential (including State housing), 25% rural etc.
- PREVIOUS NOTICE: 47% have been under notice for some reason, and 28% have previously made a court appearance.
- PRESENT OFFENCE: The present offence is one against property in 61 % of cases, is a sex offence in 12% of cases, and is general misconduct (such as going missing from home) serious enough to bring about legal complaint, in 21% of cases. Companions (not including a partner in a sexual offence) are involved in 48% of offences.
- OUTCOME: The outcome is:
Admonish etc. - 10%, Child Welfare Supervision - 45%; Committal to care of Superintendent - 33%; Probation - 6%; Borstal - 4%.

PROFILES

NON-MAORI GIRL OFFENDERS

AGE: They are of average age 15, 75% being between 14-16 inclusive.

SCHOOLING: 42% are at school: counting continuing as well as completed schooling, 24% have not gone beyond Form II, 59% not beyond Form III, 92% not beyond Form IV. The mean class attained is Form III. "School progress" is 46% average, 51% below average. Attendance is stated to be irregular in 45%, truancy being explicitly mentioned in 30% of cases.

EMPLOYMENT: 41% are known to have left school, and to be employed, 13% have left school and are unemployed.

FAMILY: 13% are said to be "illegitimate" or adopted. The median number of children in the family is between 3 and 4. One family in two is "broken", 15% of families have a parent dead. 45% of the girls are living with both parents at the time of the offence.

CHURCH: 26%, or one girl in four, is said to be regular in attending church.

LOCALITY: 96% come from towns of over 5,000 inhabitants, the description of the locality being 85% town residential (including State housing).

PREVIOUS NOTICE: 52% have been under notice for some reason, and 15% have previously made a court appearance.

PRESENT OFFENCE: The present offence is against property in 51% of cases, is a sex offence in 16% of cases, and is general misconduct, serious enough to bring about a legal complaint, in 24% of cases. Companions (not including a partner in a sexual offence) are involved in 60% of offences.

OUTCOME: The outcome is:
Admonish etc. - 16%; Child Welfare Supervision - 48%; Committal to care of the Superintendent - 31%; Probation - 2%; Borstal - 2%.

DISCUSSION:

When similar profiles were presented and considered in the Report on Recent Research into Crime Amongst Maoris (1) comment was made as follows:

"The picture emerging is one of highly disturbed upbringing; a disrupted, crowded home; hardly any education and so no prospects in employment....."

The above profiles are consistent with this picture, though even so simple a summary is based not only on the facts but also on inferences about them. For example the statement concerning a crowded home (for Maoris) is based on the fact that the average number of siblings is about eight, and the assumption that the houses concerned are of mostly average size or less. Similarly, the statement about education is based on the fact that many children in the sample have clearly made limited progress, and on the assumption that few of those continuing their schooling will improve this record. Nevertheless both all the facts and all plausible assumptions are consistent with the conclusion, even though they do not inescapably imply it, that the young people of the sample are in general children suffering handicaps (sometimes severe ones) in their families; in consequence in their educational experiences, their employment opportunities and indeed in their life experiences and opportunities generally. Since the sample is representative, and since other recent representative samples have provided the same picture, this conclusion is likely to apply to the population of delinquent children in New Zealand, at least over the last five years or so. The conclusion is, of course, one that experienced social workers would reach from spontaneous evidence available to them. This research evidence supports, documents, quantifies and elaborates on such a conclusion.

The evidence supports a corollary which again social workers with the relevant experience would probably have predicted. It is that, in areas where Non-Maori delinquent children turn out to be handicapped, the Maori children are handicapped too - more frequently and probably more severely. Comparison of the profiles (a crude proceeding - but it is supplemented in the appendix by more exact comparisons whose status is assessed by means of statistical checks) shows that, for example, while schooling* is unsatisfactory for the typical Non-Maori delinquents it is worse still for the typical Maori delinquent; that while Non-Maori delinquents show a high incidence of "broken" homes, the corresponding Maoris show a higher incidence; and similarly for other variables. A hypothesis asserting that these results would be obtained was stated by the researchers before beginning work. The study has not contradicted this hypothesis, but has tended to support it. The differences found - trends which we must presume are characteristic of the population of delinquents as well as our sample - are summarized as follows:

*as summed up by the four indices of attendance, progress, class attained, and teacher perceptions of so-called "intelligence"

Maori Offenders Compared with Non-Maori Offenders

<u>Expected Result</u>	<u>Confirmed or Not</u>	<u>Reference</u>
1. Age distributions much the same. (The range of ages being small)	Confirmed.	p. 10
2. Same proportion of Maori and Non-Maori mothers working. (Null hypothesis)	Confirmed.	p. 12
3. If mother working, supervision of Maoris more often* unsatisfactory.	Not confirmed - no difference found.	p. 12
4. Maoris come from considerably larger families.	Confirmed.	p. 13
5. Fewer* Maoris living with natural parents.	Confirmed.	p. 14
6. More *Maoris from "broken" homes.	Confirmed.	p. 15
7. More *Maoris have one or both parents dead.	Confirmed.	p. 15
8. The same proportions have left school (since the legal school leaving age, and age distributions are the same for both races).	Confirmed.	p. 16-17
9. Maoris are more retarded academically.	Confirmed.	p. 17,18,19
10. Of those who have left school more Maoris* are unemployed.	Confirmed.	p. 16
11. More Maoris* commit offences of dishonesty.	Confirmed.	p. 21 et seq.
12. Fewer Maoris* offend alone.	Not confirmed - contrary found.	p. 31
13. Maoris receive more severe sentences.	Confirmed.	p. 32

* i.e. proportionately.

The question now arises whether the differences between Maori and Non-Maori offenders reflect differences present between the Maori and Non-Maori child populations in general. It is probable that they do, and unlikely that only such Maori children as appear in court are more handicapped in their backgrounds compared with similar Non-Maori children. There is conclusive evidence for this presumption at least as regards educational progress, so-called "illegitimacy", and rural - urban

distribution of population.*

The presumption that such variables as incidence of disturbed homes, or of death amongst parents likewise are influenced by trends in the population must be accepted unless evidence is forthcoming to the contrary.

The present investigation thus supports the hypothesis of a socio-economic origin for the higher crime rate displayed by Maoris. The projected study of the Joint Committee on Young Offenders (to be based on the interviewing of Maori offenders and members of their families with comparisons if possible with data to be obtained similarly about Maori non-offenders) will refine the general picture and will add detail and greater certainty to it. It is not likely to do a great deal more and it is unlikely to suggest any remedies that we do not know already should be taken - remedies such as those implied in the work of the Maori Education Foundation. At present I think we know just as much about the "causes of delinquency" amongst Maoris as amongst Non-Maoris. What we take to be the obvious major cause - a faulty background which leads to a lowered efficiency and readiness to face life - seems to be the same for both groups; but Maori children are more often and more severely subject to such drawbacks than Non-Maori children. No calculation can be made to show conclusively that this accounts for the $3\frac{1}{2}$ times greater crime rate amongst Maoris: the presumption that it does so account must be strong in the present state of our knowledge or ignorance.

S. W. Slater

Research Officer

W. L. Pearce

Secretary and Research Assistant

- * (i) See for example Ausubel D. Maori Youth; and the Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand⁽²⁾ p. 404 (esp. Table I) and p. 408 (esp. Table 4(a)).
- (ii) The most recent rate for "ex-nuptial" births amongst Maoris is 21% of live births. As a result of an innovation in the Government Statistician's procedures this is a figure now comparable with the Non-Maori rate of 5%.
- (iii) The 1956 census showed only 24% of the Maori people lived in cities, towns and boroughs.

APPENDIX I.

Source Tables with Analysis and Comment on Each.

1. AGE:

Table I. Age at Time of Offence

Age	<u>Males</u>				<u>Females</u>			
	<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>		<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>	
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent
10 years	18	3	43	3	3	2	4	2
11 "	36	6	99	6	4	3	6	2
12 "	45	7	175	11	7	5	12	5
13 "	88	14	203	13	20	14	31	12
14 "	129	21	290	19	34	24	42	17
15 "	129	21	302	19	33	23	74	29
16 "	157	25	396	25	34	24	73	29
17 "	19	3	49	3	7	5	11	4
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

The major question, important in its own right and because of the possible effect of age differences on subsequent tables, is whether the age distributions are significantly different.

Analysis: Maori vs Non-Maori

Males: $\chi^2 = 9.45$ for 7 d.f. $.30 > p > .20$

Females: (the 10 and 11 year categories needed to be pooled)
 $\chi^2 = 5.33$ for 6 d.f. $.70 > p > .50$

Thus it would appear that there is no significant difference for either the males or the females, between Maori and Non-Maori, in the proportion of offenders in each age group. The mean ages and variances are given in Table II.

Table II

	<u>Mean (years)</u>	<u>Variance</u>
Maori males	14.73	2.82
Non-Maori males	14.64	3.09
Maori females	14.95	2.38
Non-Maori females	15.15	2.15

Although the difference between age distributions in this offender sample is not significant, age cannot be considered a controlled factor in the results that follow unless it is shown that for Maoris and Non-Maoris the general populations at risk also have similar distributions. (For example, if it

is found that there is a comparatively greater number of Maoris in the lower age groups in the general population, a bias in the opposite direction is present in the offender sample).

We tested the distributions given by the Mean Population Estimates* for 1959.

Analysis: For ages 10 to 17 inclusive:

Males: $\chi^2 = 16.20$ for 7 d.f. $.05 > p > .02$

Females: $\chi^2 = 27.79$ for 7 d.f. $p < .001$

It is our opinion that the differences are not large enough to matter but this assertion is, as a safeguard, made subject of a check. It will be assumed that the distributions of Maoris and Non-Maoris in these age groups are the same when considering most of the tables that follow. But in the "actual offence" variable it is clear that age and maturity are extremely important, and so a sensitive test assessing any influence due to the age differences was made and is recorded with the results of the offence variable. The negligible effect found is further evidence that variation in physical age is not important as an underlying variable.

2. LEGITIMACY

Table III Legitimacy of Offenders

	<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>		<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>	
	<u>males</u>		<u>males</u>		<u>females</u>		<u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Apparently legitimate	521	84	1456	94	111	78	220	87
Known to be illegitimate	64	10	47	3	16	11	17	7
Legally adopted	21	3	53	3	10	7	16	6
Adopted Maori fashion	8	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Not coded***	7	1	0	0	4	3	0	0
Totals	621	100**	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Males: $\chi^2 = 51.44$ for 2 d.f. and 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 2.60$ for 2 d.f. $.30 > p > .20$

(The category "Adopted Maori Fashion" was omitted from the test as the numbers involved were too small to warrant a test of them).

* Provided by the Government Statistician.

** Not all the percentages as given add exactly to 100 as small rounding-off approximations are involved.

*** Some cards have not been punched on certain variables because information was not given in the case reports.

Comment:

These results show that a greater proportion of Maori than of Non-Maori male offenders are known to be illegitimate, but the trend is not so clear for females. There is no difference between the races in the proportion of males or females adopted and it is interesting that proportionately twice as many females as males are legally adopted.

It should be noted that there will probably be a sizeable error in the recording* of legitimacy by Child Welfare Officers. As will be shown later, fewer Maoris live with their natural parents and this may give rise more often to a presumption of illegitimacy.

3. MOTHER WORKING:

Table IV

	<u>Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mother not working	251	40	725	47	49	35	74	29
Working - Children Supervised	37	6	148	10	5	4	21	8
Working - Children Unsupervised	32	5	85	5	14	10	25	10
N/A. - Child at work	262	42	542	35	65	46	129	51
Not stated	27	4	24	2	5	4	3	1
Not coded	12	2	33	2	4	3	1	0
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis: Categories: "mother working" and "mother not working"

Males: $\chi^2 = 1.01$ for 1 d.f. .50 > p > .30

Females: $\chi^2 = 2.07$ for 1 d.f. .20 > p > .10

Categories: "Children supervised" and "Children not supervised" (mother working)

Males: $\chi^2 = 2.197$ for 1 d.f. .20 > p > .10

Females: $\chi^2 = 2.09$ for 1 d.f. .20 > p > .10

Comment:

There is no evidence that the Maori children are more frequently left unsupervised, nor is there a greater proportion of working mothers than among the Non-Maori offenders.

* Recent figures from the Government Statistician's Office are that 21% of Maori live births are "ex-nuptial", whereas the corresponding figure for Non-Maoris is 5%.

4. SIBLINGS

Table V

Number of Sib- lings.	<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>		<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>	
	<u>males</u> No.	%	<u>males</u> No.	%	<u>females</u> No.	%	<u>females</u> No.	%
0	26	4	79	5	1	1	20	8
1	34	5	202	13	8	6	30	12
2	42	7	263	17	12	8	46	18
3	51	8	292	19	9	6	46	18
4	49	8	196	13	15	11	34	13
5	64	10	177	11	14	10	24	9
6	55	9	131	8	11	8	12	5
7	76	12	82	5	13	9	14	6
8	55	9	41	3	13	9	9	4
9	63	10	32	2	13	9	6	2
10	34	5	25	2	8	6	6	2
11	33	5	14	1	11	8	2	1
12	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	1
13+	0	0	5	0	7	5	0	0
Not coded	37	6	18	1	5	4	2	1
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100
Median	<u>5.5</u>		<u>2.8</u>		<u>6.0</u>		<u>2.6</u>	

The tables show that Maori offenders tend to come from larger families than Non-Maoris. This is borne out also by the following 2x2 tables in which a cut was made at 5 siblings:

<u>Males</u>				<u>Females</u>			
	<u>Maori</u>	<u>Non-Maori</u>			<u>Maori</u>	<u>Non-Maori</u>	
5 and below	266	1209	1475	5 and below	59	200	259
6 and above	318	330	648	6 and above	78	51	129
	584	1539	2123		137	251	388

$$\chi^2 = 218.42$$

for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

$$\chi^2 = 53.54$$

for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

These results may simply reflect the situation in the general population, but we do have evidence to show that the young Maori offender tends to come from a family of about 6 to 7 children, whereas the Non-Maori offender has only 2 or 3 brothers and sisters.

5. WITH WHOM LIVING AT THE TIME OF OFFENCE:

Table VI

	<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>		<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>	
	<u>males</u>		<u>males</u>		<u>females</u>		<u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Natural parents	291	47	1005	65	52	37	115	45
Adoptive parents	14	2	34	2	5	4	11	4
Foster parents	34	5	19	1	2	1	8	3
Grandparents	26	4	18	1	7	5	6	2
Mother, step-father	36	6	102	7	10	7	24	9
Father, step-mother	6	1	20	1	2	1	5	2
Aunt, sister, cousin, etc.	68	11	17	1	20	14	10	4
Mother alone	41	7	175	11	8	6	24	9
Father alone	27	4	50	3	9	6	18	7
Employer	26	4	22	1	5	4	0	0
Boarding School, Hostel	20	3	33	2	4	3	14	6
C.W. Receiving Home etc.	0	0	23	1	7	5	9	4
Others	2	0	36	2	7	5	9	4
Not coded	30	5	3	0	4	3	0	0
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Categories: Relatives (not parents) v Foster or Adoptive parents.

Males: $\chi^2 = 15.40$ for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 8.34$ for 1 d.f. $.01 > p > .001$

Categories: Natural parents v all other categories (save "not coded")

Males: $\chi^2 = 42.56$ for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 2.21$ for 1 d.f. $.20 > p > .10$

Comment:

The proportion of males living with their natural parents is much lower among the Maoris than Non-Maoris; the effect is not significant for females though the trend is clear. Significantly fewer females than males live with natural parents (ignoring race) -

$$\chi^2 = 43.15 \text{ for 1 d.f. } p < .001$$

Among those not living with natural parents, the Maori offender is more likely to be living with relatives than the Non-Maori offender.

6. FAMILY BROKEN:

Table VII

	<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>		<u>Maori</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u>	
	<u>males</u>		<u>males</u>		<u>females</u>		<u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Death	148	24	119	8	25	18	38	15
Separation/Divorce	48	8	232	15	20	14	54	21
Desertion	10	2	30	2	3	2	5	2
Parents never married	30	5	20	1	7	5	4	2
Work (husbands)	9	1	14	1	4	3	5	2
Accommodation difficulties	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
Health	12	2	20	1	0	0	2	1
Parent in prison	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	1
Child temp. from home	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
Home intermittently broken in past	19	3	34	2	0	0	13	5
Combination of any	0	0	9	1	0	0	1	0
No break	313	50	1015	65	70	49	127	50
Not coded	30	5	55	4	11	8	1	0
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Categories: Death v Separation, Divorce and Desertion.

Males: $\chi^2 = 88.93$ for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 2.18$ for 1 d.f. $.20 > p > .10$

Categories: Break v No Break in Original Family.

Males: $\chi^2 = 39.09$ for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 0.32$ for 1 d.f. $.70 > p > .50$

Comment:

Among the male offenders, a much greater proportion of Maori homes have been broken by the death of a parent (24% to 8%) and a smaller proportion by "separation" or divorce (8% to 15%). We can be confident that this difference in our sample is not due to chance, but reflects a trend in the population of offenders. With the females, however, we cannot be confident that a difference exists in the offender population, although the same trend is found in our sample.

Similar remarks apply when considering whether or not there has been a "break" in the family unit. There is a greater proportion (50:35%) of "broken" homes amongst the Maori males, but only an insignificant difference for the females.

While as usual control data for non-offenders or for the general population are lacking, common experience in this case provides some control. In neither the Maori nor the Pakeha population is it true that about one home in two is "broken" in the sense of the above table; nor is it true that for Maoris between 10 years and 17 years inclusive, one in four has at least one parent dead. For all that the sample is based on a single year of cases only, the table is fairly convincing evidence that the "broken home" (in our sense) and delinquency show some association. That this sample is typical is borne out to some extent by the fact that the sample of 1958-1959 cases considered by the Interdepartmental Committee on Maori Crime (1) gave similar results.

7. RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION AND RELIGIOUS ADHERENCE:

Because these variables are probably inadequately and inaccurately reported, and because it is easy for the tables to be misunderstood, we decided not to present results obtained for these categories.

Families who never attend church frequently identify themselves with one particular denomination, although they have had little contact with it. Others probably state a denomination simply because they are asked to report their religion. Some denominations, especially the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, will include more of these cases than will the smaller denominations. The preferences of Maoris may differ from those of Non-Maoris in such cases, and calculation of rates of offending amongst the various religious groups misleading.

Religious adherence can vary considerably and some people, when reporting this, may feel it "looks better" if they say they attend church regularly. It is doubtful whether the part that religion plays in the lives of these young people can be adequately gauged from the present source.

The complex questions involved have been ably discussed by O'Neill (4) in a study Catholics and Delinquency, (1952) - work that O'Neill is at present repeating with another sample.

8. CIRCUMSTANCES AT TIME OF OFFENCE:

Table VIII

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attending State School	362	58	868	56	68	48	99	39
Private school	16	3	107	7	3	2	7	3
Employed	157	25	487	31	31	22	104	41
Special School	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Private Boarding School	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
State Boarding School	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Unemployed	63	10	65	4	31	22	33	13
Unemployable	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
C.W. Institution	4	1	7	0	5	4	7	3
Borstal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coded	12	2	15	1	4	3	2	1
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Categories: At school v Left school

Males: $\chi^2 = 0.04$ for 1 d.f. $.90 > p > .80$

Females: $\chi^2 = 3.42$ for 1 d.f. $.10 > p > .05$

Categories: Employed v Unemployed of those left school

Males: $\chi^2 = 3.23$ for 1 d.f. $.10 > p > .05$

Females: $\chi^2 = 13.14$ for 1 d.f. $p < .001$

Comment:

As age is controlled, it cannot influence the results obtained for the proportion of Maori and Non-Maori offenders who have left school. In neither sex is there any significant difference between the races in the proportions still at school and left school - for boys, the proportions are very closely similar.

It seems however, that Maori offenders who have left school (and the evidence suggests that they do not tend to leave at an earlier age than Non-Maori offenders) are more likely to be unemployed at the time of their offence than Non-Maoris in the same category. The difference is significant for girls, and not for boys, though the latter show the same trend.

9. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE. (Under 15 years only)

Table IX

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Regular	180	57	518	64	26	38	42	44
Irregular (truancy)	81	26	150	19	19	28	30	32
Very Irregular "	16	5	32	4	10	15	5	5
Irregular (not stated)	20	6	51	6	8	12	8	8
Very Irregular "	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3
Irregular (Health)	6	2	17	2	3	4	1	1
Not coded	13	4	41	5	2	3	6	6
Total	316	100	810	100	68	100	95	100

The Percentages are based on the total number of children, in our sample, who are aged 10 to 14 inclusive, in each racial and sex group.

Analysis:

Categories: Regular v Irregular Attendance (for any reason)

Males: $\chi^2 = 6.05$ for 1 d.f. $.02 > p > .01$

Females: $\chi^2 = 0.936$ for 1 d.f. $.50 > p > .30$

Comment: The apparent trend for Maoris to be more irregular in their school attendance is present, but the result is statistically significant only for boys.

10. SCHOOL PROGRESS (Under 15 years only)

Table X

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Above average	17	5	35	4	1	1	4	4
Average	134	42	376	46	21	31	40	42
Below average, poor	147	47	364	45	41	60	44	46
Not coded	18	6	35	4	5	7	7	7
Total	316	100	810	100	68	100	95	100

Analysis:

Males: (All three categories)

$$\chi^2 = 1.75 \quad \text{for 2 d.f.} \quad .50 > p > .30$$

Females: (Above average and average combined)

$$\chi^2 = 3.39 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad .10 > p > .05$$

Comment:

There is no significant difference but, as the basis for judgement is not necessarily the same for Maoris as for Non-Maoris, no reliance could be placed on any result in this area. It may be that either because a boy is "good for a Maori" he is given "above average", whereas the same standard for a Non-Maori is judged "average"; or that Maoris should be and perhaps are judged according to present educational norms for Pakehas. Hence this variable adds little that is reliable to the profiles of these four groups.

11. INTELLIGENCE

Table XI

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Well above average	0	0	11	1	0	0	1	0
Above average	18	3	120	8	3	2	14	6
Average, normal	199	32	712	46	29	20	87	34
Below average	212	34	328	21	37	26	51	20
Well below average	30	5	50	3	5	3	5	2
Not coded	162	26	336	22	68	49	95	38
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Males: Categories: Above average, Average, Below Average, Well Below Average

$$\chi^2 = 73.75 \quad \text{for 3 d.f.} \quad p < .001$$

Females: Categories: Average and Above, Below Average and Well Below Average.

$$\chi^2 = 9.38 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad .01 > p > .001$$

Comment:

Maoris receive lower ratings of "intelligence". The ratings and the difference found are of interest only in showing how the Maoris appear to the teachers making the rating. The hypothesis of an educationally depressed group is strengthened, but we really learn nothing about the intelligence, however defined, of the young offenders.

These are the reasons:

(a) Ratings are not objective, but are particularly subject to the well-known "halo" effect which results from any conscious or unconscious stereotype the raters may have. In this case the stereotype would be unfavourable to the Maori children.

(b) Even if an objective test of intelligence had been used, it could not (in the present stage of development of such tests) separate intrinsic intelligence from socio-cultural traits dependent on language skills, early perceptual experiences and so on. Ratings are probably even more subject to error from this source.

12. SCHOOL CLASS:

School class refers to the class the child was in at the time of offence or, if he has left school, to the highest class attained.

Table XII.

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below Std.2	2	0	1	0	3	2	1	0
Std. 2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Std. 3	20	3	34	2	8	6	1	0
Std. 4	37	6	86	6	7	5	5	2
Form 1	86	14	162	10	11	8	12	5
Form 2	131	21	251	16	23	16	35	14
Form 3	168	27	379	24	46	32	77	30
Form 4	104	17	410	26	27	19	74	29
Form 5	28	5	117	8	3	2	16	6
Form 6	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0
Special class	1	0	11	1	3	2	2	1
Not coded	41	7	88	6	11	8	30	12
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Categories: Below Form 1, Form 1, Form 2, Form 3, Form 4, Forms 5 and 6.

Males: $\chi^2 = 40.37$ for 5 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 24.01$ for 5 d.f. $p < .001$

Comment:

The phrase "class attained" really muddles two distinct concepts - completed schooling and continued schooling. A crude separation was made by considering ages 15, and above, separately from those below 15 (the "school leaving age")-i.e. the mean class for children 15 and over was calculated for the males. The difference between Maori and Non-Maori offenders was only slightly greater here than for the combined scores. The "mean" classes, derived from the previous table, are:

Maori males - Form 2 Maori females - Form 2
Maori males - Form 3 Non-Maori females - Form 3

The actual retardation shown by the Maoris as calculated exactly from the previous table is not a full year but half a year.

The statistical test results show that a difference does exist in the educational achievement of the Maori and Non-Maori offender groups and that a similar difference probably does exist in the offender population from which our sample came.

13. PREVIOUS COURT APPEARANCES

Table XIII.

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	133	21	265	17	30	21	34	13
Two	50	8	104	7	6	4	3	1
Three or more	0	0	72	5	4	3	1	0
Previously under C.W. notice only	48	8	151	10	26	18	84	33
Previously under J.C.P.S. notice only	24	4	12	1	1	1	10	4
No previous notice	366	59	953	61	75	53	121	48
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Categories: Previous Court v No Previous Court Appearance

Males: $\chi^2 = 0.26$ for 1 d.f. $.70 > p > .50$

Females: $\chi^2 = 9.92$ for 1 d.f. $.01 > p > .001$

Categories: Previously Under Notice (including court appearances) v Not previously under notice

Males: $\chi^2 = 0.97$ for 1 d.f. $.50 > p > .30$

Females: $\chi^2 = 0.91$ for 1 d.f. $.50 > p > .30$

Comment:

There may be a tendency for offenders in rural areas to come under notice only if a court appearance is warranted. As more Maoris, proportionally, come from rural areas, this could

affect the results obtained.

In general, it would appear that more Maori than Non-Maori females have had previous court appearances, but the difference between the races is not statistically significant in the case of the male samples.

14. THE ACTUAL OFFENCE

Table XIX.

	Maori males		Non-Maori males		Maori females		Non-Maori females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Offences of dishonesty	522	84	1086	70	82	58	124	49
Other offences against property	35	6	239	15	4	3	5	2
Offences against the person	8	1	43	3	3	2	8	3
Sexual Offences	26	4	96	6	17	12	41	16
Offences against good order	10	2	48	3	6	4	13	5
Misconduct*	16	3	31	2	30	21	61	24
Miscellaneous**	4	1	14	1	0	0	1	0
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

*Misconduct includes offences which do not come under any of the other categories, but which were the basis of a complaint.

**Miscellaneous includes a variety of offences such as being unlawfully on board a ship, escaping from Borstal, and attempting suicide (still an offence in 1960)

A calculation can be performed to find whether the disproportions in the above table can largely be explained as owing to differing age patterns. In the other variables considered it has been assumed that the patterns are similar enough not to influence the results. This calculation provides a check on this assumption. Other studies have shown that the type of offence committed does depend on the age of the offender.

If the male Non-Maori population in 1959 is taken and the rates of offending for Maoris applied to it, percentages corresponding to those above can be derived. In this way we obtain the proportions of the various offence types that would be observed if the Maori population had the same age structure as the Non-Maori, and all other factors remained constant.

(1) Rates of Offending.

Table XX (a)

Rates per 10,000 of Population of Relevant
Age (Maori Boys)

Age:	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Over- all
Offences of dishonesty	69	147	194	416	638	647	752	102	352
Other offences against property	14	14	20	16	29	48	55	-	24
Offences against the person	-	-	-	-	6	12	30	-	5
Sexual offences	-	-	5	22	29	30	67	-	18
Offences against good order	-	-	-	-	11	12	24	12	7
Misconduct	-	9	5	16	29	18	12	-	11
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	5	-	6	12	-	3
Total	83	170	224	475	742	773	952	114	418

Table XX (b)

Rates per 10,000 of Population of Relevant
Age (Non-Maori Boys)

Age:	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Over- all
Offences of dishonesty	13	30	58	76	128	123	141	16	69
Other offences against property	5	10	17	10	14	26	41	5	15
Offences against the person	-	1	2	3	2	2	15	1	3
Sexual offences	-	2	2	7	8	15	17	6	6
Offences against good order	-	2	-	2	2	4	20	2	3
Misconduct	2	1	2	2	4	3	4	-	2
Miscellaneous	-	-	2	2	1	2	4	-	1
Total	18	42	79	98	159	175	242	28	99

That a marked "maturity" factor is present is obvious from inspection of the physical appearance of the tables.

(ii) Male Non-Maori Population (Ages 10 - 17) (Mean Population Estimates, 1959)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Population</u>
10	22,700	14	18,300
11	22,700	15	17,200
12	22,200	16	16,400
13	20,300	17	16,800

- (iii) No. of Hypothetical Offences (correct to nearest 10) -
from the Maori rates applied to the Non-Maori Population
(Males)

Table XXI.

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Total
Offences of dishonesty	160	330	430	840	1300	1110	1230	170	5570
Other offences against property	30	30	40	30	60	80	90	-	360
Offences against the person	-	-	-	-	10	20	50	-	80
Sexual offences	-	-	10	40	60	50	110	-	270
Offences against good order	-	-	-	-	20	20	40	20	100
Misconduct	-	20	10	30	60	30	20	-	170
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	10	-	10	20	-	40
Total	190	380	490	950	1510	1320	1560	190	6590

(Where the columns and rows do not add correctly, this is due to rounding-off errors)

- (iv) Hypothetical Percentages i.e. the offence distribution Maoris would have if they had the same age distribution as the Non-Maoris in the general population. (Males)

Table XXII.

	<u>Actual Percentage</u>	<u>Hypothetical Percentage</u>
Offences of dishonesty	84	84½
Other offences against property	6	5½
Offences against the person	1	1
Sexual offences	4	4
Offences against good order	2	2
Misconduct	3	2½
Miscellaneous	1	½
Total	100	100

These results show without doubt that the different age distributions do not affect the results obtained.

- (v) Analysis of the Male Samples:

$$\chi^2 = 58.84 \text{ for 6 d.f. } p < .001$$

- (vi) Expected Rates - Males:

Expected rates of offending among Maoris and Non-Maoris were calculated from "the Rate per 10,000 of Population of Relevant Ages" (as in Table XX) in the same way that expected

or theoretical values are calculated from raw scores.* These expected rates are given in Table XXIII: the hypothesis on which they are expected is that race shows no association with type of offence, when the general crime pattern and the numbers at risk are allowed for.

Table XXIII

Expected Rates per 10,000 of Population (males)

<u>Offence Category</u>	<u>Maoris</u>		<u>Non-Maoris</u>	
	<u>Rates</u> <u>Obtain-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Expect-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Obtain-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Expect-</u> <u>ed</u>
Offences of dishonesty	352	340	69	81
Other offences against property	24	31	15	8
Offences against person	5	7	3	2
Sexual offences	18	19	6	5
Offences against good order	7	8	3	2
Misconduct	11	10	2	3
Miscellaneous	3	3	1	1
Total	418	418	100	100

If the type of offence were independent of race then the rate per 10,000 of population of Maoris convicted of theft would be 12 cases per 10,000 of population less than was obtained: namely, 352 cases per 10,000. This is a 3½% difference between the rates obtained and those expected taking account of the general crime pattern and on an hypothesis of independence between type of offence and racial classification. For the offence group called "other offences against property", the actual Maori rate is lower than the expected Maori rate.

The findings here bear out those of the report Recent Research on Crime Amongst Maoris. For males, there is a definite tendency for offences of dishonesty to be, proportionately to other offences, more frequent in detected crime amongst Maoris than amongst Pakehas; but the difference does not seem particularly marked when all relevant factors are considered.

*See Wilkins L.T. (1960) Delinquent Generations (5) (Home Office Research Unit) for an account of this method.

(vii) Rate of Offending - Females

Table XXIV (a)

Rates per 10,000 of Population of Relevant Age
(Maori Girls)

Age:	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Overall
Offences of dishonesty	14	20	31	50	89	122	124	31	57.1
Other offences against property	-	-	-	6	-	-	19	-	2.8
Offences against the person	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	-	2.1
Sexual offences	-	-	-	17	41	43	-	-	11.8
Offences against good order	-	-	-	-	-	6	19	13	4.2
Misconduct	-	-	5	39	71	30	31	-	20.9
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	14	20	36	112	201	201	212	44	99

Table XXIV (b)

Rates per 10,000 of Population of Relevant Age
(Non-Maori Girls)

Age:	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Overall
Offences of dishonesty	1	1	4	9	11	18	22	6	8.3
Other offences against property	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	0.3
Offences against the person	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	0.5
Sexual offences	-	-	-	2	3	9	9	1	2.7
Offences against Good Order	-	-	-	1	1	3	3	-	0.9
Misconduct	-	1	1	5	9	13	7	-	4.1
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	2	3	6	16	24	45	45	7	17

(Since the rates are small both random fluctuation and rounding off errors are considerable)

(viii) Female Non-Maori Population (Ages 10-17) 1959

<u>Age</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Population</u>
10	21,700	14	17,400
11	21,900	15	16,200
12	21,300	16	15,600
13	19,400	17	16,100

(ix) No. of Hypothetical Offences - derived from Maori rates applied to the Non-Maori population. (Females)

Table XXV.

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Total
Offences of dishonesty	3	44	66	97	155	198	193	50	806
Other offences against property	-	-	-	12	-	-	30	-	42
Offences against the person	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	n 30
Sexual Offences	-	-	-	33	71	70	-	-	174
Offences against good order	-	-	-	-	-	10	30	21	61
Misconduct	-	-	11	76	124	49	48	-	308
Total	3	44	77	217	350	327	331	71	1421

(x) Hypothetical Percentages i.e. The distribution of offences the Maoris would show if they had the same age distribution as the Non-Maoris in the general population. (Females)

Table XXVI.

	<u>Actual Percentage</u>	<u>Hypothetical Percentage</u>
Offences of dishonesty	58	57
Other offences against property	3	3
Offences against the person	2	2
Sexual Offences	12	12
Offences against good order	4	4
Misconduct	21	22
Miscellaneous	0	0
Total	100	100

Again the different age distributions amongst Maoris and Non-Maoris do not influence the distributions of offences.

(xi) Analysis of the Results for Females

$$\chi^2 = 3.83 \quad \text{for 3 d.f.} \quad .3 > p > .2$$

(Categories: All offences against property; Offences against the person or good order; Sexual Offences; and Misconduct and Miscellaneous).

(xii) Expected Rates

Table XXVII

Expected Rates per 10,000 of Population (females)

<u>Offence Category</u>	<u>Maoris</u>		<u>Non-Maoris</u>	
	<u>Rates</u> <u>Obtain-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Expect-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Obtain-</u> <u>ed</u>	<u>Rates</u> <u>Expect-</u> <u>ed</u>
Offences of dishonesty	57	56	8.0	9.5
Other offences against property	3	3	0.3	0.5
Offences against the person	2	2	0.5	0.4
Sexual Offences	12	12	2.7	2.1
Offences against good order	4	4	0.9	0.7
Misconduct	21	21	4.1	3.6
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-

There is quite clearly very little tendency for Maori girls to be detected in crimes of dishonesty proportionately more often, having regard to the general crime pattern, than Non-Maori girls. This is an interesting result which must affect any theorising on the explanation for the difference which does seem to exist for boys.

BREAKDOWN OF BROAD OFFENCE CLASSIFICATION.

A breakdown of offences of dishonesty was made (for males only) to supplement the foregoing. The following tables give the results:

Table XXVIII

Subdivision of offences of dishonesty by age (males)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Conversion</u>		<u>Attempted Conversion</u>		<u>Forgery etc.</u>		<u>Other Theft</u>	
	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>
10	2	3	-	-	-	-	13	27
11	3	1	-	-	-	1	28	67
12	6	13	-	-	-	1	33	114
13	5	13	-	1	-	-	72	140
14	15	38	-	-	3	2	93	195
15	28	36	1	3	2	1	77	171
16	39	40	4	3	3	4	78	185
17	6	6	-	-	1	-	10	21
Total	104	150	5	7	9	9	404	920

Analysis:

1. Categories: theft, conversion, forgeries.

	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>	<u>Total</u>
Thefts	404 (430)	920 (894)	1324
Conversions	109 (86)	157 (180)	206
Forgeries	<u>9 (6)</u>	<u>9 (12)</u>	<u>18</u>
	522	1086	1608

(The expected values - based on the hypothesis of independence between type of offence and racial classification - are given in parenthesis):

$$\chi^2 = 13.67 \quad \text{for 2 d.f.} \quad 0.01 > p > 0.001$$

$$\chi^2 = 11.10 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad p < .001 \text{ (omitting forgery)}$$

2. Categories: Motor vehicle conversion (except motor cycle); theft.

	<u>Maoris</u>	<u>Non-Maoris</u>	<u>Total</u>
Motor vehicle	67 (52)	98 (113)	165
Theft	<u>404 (419)</u>	<u>920 (905)</u>	<u>1324</u>
	471	1018	1489

$$\chi^2 = 6.91 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad 0.01 > p > 0.001$$

3. Categories: burglary versus car conversion

$$\chi^2 = 0.22 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad 0.70 > p > 0.50$$

4. Categories: motor vehicle conversion (except motor cycle), versus burglary

$$\chi^2 = 0.10 \quad \text{for 1 d.f.} \quad 0.80 > p > 0.70$$

Comment:

Among the offences of dishonesty, Maori boys commit conversion significantly more frequently than expectation.

SUMMARY CONCERNING OFFENCES

The results obtained concerning the actual offences may be summarized as follows:

- (i) Age distribution is not an underlying variable giving rise to differences between Maoris and Non-Maoris in the type of offence committed.

It was judged earlier (when age was being considered) that the age distributions for Maoris and Non-Maoris aged 10 to 17 were similar, both in the population at risk and in the offender sample. Age could thus be regarded as a controlled factor in the results obtained. As it is certain that the type of offence committed depends very much on a maturity factor, the test is a further indication that age is controlled.

- (ii) The Maori males have a different offence pattern from the Non-Maori males. Maoris have a greater proportion of "Offences of Dishonesty" and the discrepancy results in Non-Maoris scoring higher (in gross proportion, not in rates) in all the other offence groupings, except for Misconduct where Maoris score slightly higher. The Non-Maoris score particularly highly in the "Other offences against property" (e.g. wilful damage) category.
- (iii) In the female samples, differences between the races were not significant and although there is a trend towards Maoris scoring more highly on "Dishonesty" (58% of all offences compared with 49%) and Non-Maoris higher on "Sexual Offences" (16% to 12%) and Misconduct (24% to 21%), this trend is to be discounted when an accurate analysis has been undertaken. The latter offences are those giving rise to a complaint which cannot be placed under the other categories given. Complaints were involved in 36% of the Maori girls and 45% of the Non-Maori girls. (The corresponding percentages for boys were 8% and 6%).
- (iv) Conclusion. The difference between Maoris and Non-Maoris in the type of offence committed is significant only for the boys. A greater proportion of Maori boys commit offences involving theft. It was shown that differing age distributions are not an explanation.

15. THE NUMBER OF CHARGES

Table XXVIII

	<u>Maori</u> <u>Males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	309	50	914	59	74	52	120	47
2	90	15	239	15	10	7	12	5
3	56	9	103	7	3	2	7	3
4	28	5	72	5	2	1	4	2
5	21	3	44	3	1	1	0	0
6	14	2	33	2	1	1	2	1
7	7	1	36	2				
8	9	1	11	1				
9	5	1	11	1				
10	3	0	7	0				
11+	3	0	24	2				
Not coded	76	12	63	4	51	36	108	43
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Means

1.34

1.33

Analysis:

Males: Categories: As above with 6+ combined

$\chi^2 = 9.36$ for 5 d.f. $.10 > p > .05$

Females: Categories: As above with 3+ combined

$\chi^2 = 1.02$ for 2 d.f. $.70 > p > .50$

Comment:

In all four cases the median and mode are 1 charge. (The male means cannot be calculated exactly because definite values for 11+ are not known, but in both cases they would be just over 2 charges).

These results indicate that there is little difference between Maoris and Non-Maoris on the number of separate charges involved in one court appearance.

16. MULTIPLE CHARGES*

Table XXIX

	<u>Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	483	78	1225	79	133	94	243	96
1	103	17	236	15	6	4	9	4
2	23	4	71	5	3	2	1	0
3	9	1	19	1				
4	2	0	4	0				
5	1	0	2	0				
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100
Mean	1.37		1.39		1.33		1.10	

Analysis:

Categories: Multiple charges v no multiple charge

Males: $\chi^2 = 0.21$ for 1 d.f. $.70 > p > .50$

Females: $\chi^2 = 1.13$ for 1 d.f. $.30 > p > .20$

Comment: These results indicate little difference between Maoris and Non-Maoris on the incidence of multiple charges.

17. COMPANIONS IN OFFENCE

Table XXX

	<u>Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	201	32	340	22	64	45	81	32
1	139	22	444	29	30	21	65	26
2	90	15	299	19	14	10	30	12
3	68	11	150	10	7	5	15	6
4	38	6	121	8	5	4	3	1
5	24	4	43	3	1	1	6	2
6	11	2	23	1	2	1	2	1
7	3	0	24	2	-	-	1	-
8	5	1	9	1	-	-	1	-
9	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
10	6	1	5	-	-	-	-	-
11+	1	-	9	1	-	-	1	-
Not coded	35	6	87	6	19	13	48	19
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100
Medians	1.18		1.36		0.47		0.83	

*The number of different offences (in terms of the general categories, excluding the one regarded as most serious) involved in the same court appearance.

Analysis:

Males: Categories: as above - 6+ combined
 $\chi^2 = 36.11$ for 6 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: Categories: as above - 4+ combined
 $\chi^2 = 5.62$ for 4 d.f. $.30 > p > .20$

Categories: Companions v no companions

Males: $\chi^2 = 26.96$ for 1 d.f. $p < 0.001$

Females: $\chi^2 = 4.89$ for 1 d.f. $.05 > p > .02$

Comment:

A difference is found. Maoris tend to offend more on their own, and if accompanied to have fewer companions. This trend is consistent for males and females.

18. TIME OF OFFENCE:

The Punch cards were also considered on this variable but we decided that the coding was completely inadequate and the results were of no value. Only 43% of the cards were coded under this heading.

19. DECISION

Table XXXI

	<u>Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>females</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Admonished etc.	117	19	619	40	14	10	41	16
C.W. Supervision	299	48	658	42	64	45	122	48
Committed	113	18	148	10	47	33	78	31
Convicted	5	1	16	1	-	-	-	-
Probation	63	10	79	5	9	6	6	2
Borstal	18	3	15	1	6	4	5	2
Adjourned	6	1	22	1	2	1	1	-
Total	621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Analysis:

Males: Categories: Admonished, Supervision, Committed, Convicted, Probation, Borstal, Adjourned.
 $\chi^2 = 121.50$ for 6 d.f. $p < .001$

Females: Categories: Admonished, Supervision, Committed, Borstal or Probation.
 $\chi^2 = 9.18$ for 3 d.f. $.05 > p > .02$

Significance tests were also performed on each separate decision against all other decisions - for males only and all ages combined. These are mentioned in table XXXII and are given in fuller detail on page 34.

Table XXXII.

SENTENCING AMONG MAORI AND NON-MAORI MALES
DECISIONS IN CHILDREN'S COURT, APRIL 1959-MARCH 1960, BY AGES

Age	Admonished		Supervision		Committed		Convicted		Probation		Borstal		Adjourned		Total Cases
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
10	Maoris	7	38.9	8	44.4	3	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
	Non-Maoris	15	34.9	24	55.8	4	9.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43
11	Maoris	12	33.3	19	52.8	5	13.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
	Non-Maoris	41	41.4	52	52.5	6	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99
12	Maoris	13	28.9	24	53.3	8	17.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45
	Non-Maoris	81	46.3	81	46.3	13	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175
13	Maoris	12	13.6	61	69.3	15	17.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88
	Non-Maoris	79	38.9	99	48.8	25	12.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	203
14	Maoris	17	13.2	73	56.6	37	28.7	-	-	-	1	0.8	1	0.8	129
	Non-Maoris	95	32.8	161	55.5	34	11.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	290
15	Maoris	14	10.9	76	58.9	26	20.2	1	0.8	6	4.7	4	3.1	2	1.6
	Non-Maoris	128	42.4	132	43.7	31	10.3	3	1.0	5	1.7	-	-	3	1.0
16	Maoris	39	24.8	57	23.6	15	9.6	4	2.5	47	29.9	12	7.6	3	1.9
	Non-Maoris	163	41.2	100	25.3	35	8.8	11	2.8	57	14.4	14	3.5	16	4.0
17	Maoris	3	15.8	1	5.3	4	21.1	-	-	10	52.6	1	5.3	-	19
	Non-Maoris	17	34.7	9	18.4	-	-	2	4.1	17	34.7	1	2.0	3	6.1
TOT- AL:	Maoris	117	18.8	299	48.1	113	18.2	5	0.8	63	10.1	18	2.9	6	1.0
	Non-Maoris	619	39.8	658	42.3	148	9.5	16	1.0	79	5.1	15	1.0	22	1.4
	Total	736	*	957	*	261	*	21		142	*	33	*	28	2178

*Difference between Maori and Non-Maori result is statistically significant to a 5% level of confidence. Note that percentages add horizontally to 100.

<u>Decision</u>	<u>χ^2</u> (1 d.f.)	<u>p</u>
Admonished	8.68	.01 > p > .001
Supervision	6.25	.02 > p > .01
Committed	31.79	p < .001
Convicted	0.23	.90 > p > .80
Probation	18.73	p < .001
Borstal	11.14	p < .001
Adjourned	0.70	.80 > p > .70

Comment:

(i) Males:

In the sample as defined, a clear trend is visible: Maoris are more severely dealt with by the Court. At all ages, proportionately fewer Maoris are dealt with by admonishment (with or without an additional minor penalty), and the trend is substantial. In consequence:

- (a) Proportionately, slightly more Maoris than Non-Maoris are admitted to Child Welfare supervision.
- (b) Proportionately more Maoris than Non-Maoris are committed to care, given Probation, or sent to Borstal.

(ii) Females:

The same trends exist, though not so markedly. This may be owing to the fact that smaller numbers are involved in the sample than for males.

(iii) Status of Results:

The finding may be regarded with confidence. Statistical checks show that the difference observed is large enough to allow odds of at least twenty to one that the same trend will be discernible if another year is scrutinised. Furthermore, another year has been dealt with (by Mr J. Booth, Research Officer in the Department of Maori Affairs) and very similar results were found.

20. LOCALITY.

(i) Size of Population

85% of Non-Maoris, but only 47% of Maoris came from towns with more than 5000 inhabitants. Attempts to match the categories of the Child Welfare code with those of the Department of Statistics figures on distribution of population by locality were not successful. Hence we cannot judge whether urban areas (or rural areas, or neither) contribute more than a fair share to the offence statistics for either race.

(ii) Descriptive

A similar unsolved problem arose here. No inferences are possible, but the facts are as recorded in the following table.

*1960 Calendar year, the source being the Justice Statistics.

Table XXXIII

Locality, Descriptive

		<u>Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>males</u>		<u>Maori</u> <u>Females</u>		<u>Non-Maori</u> <u>Females</u>	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
City	{ State Housing Area	40	6	312	20	11	8	38	15
	{ Other <u>normal</u> town								
	{ residential	139	22	801	51	43	30	157	62
	{ Sub-standard town								
	{ residential	37	6	102	7	11	8	9	4
	Small town	71	11	101	6	9	6	14	6
Country	{ Semi-rural	29	5	44	3	3	2	6	2
	{ Rural	182	29	117	8	28	20	13	5
	{ Isolated rural	7	1	4	0	0	0	0	0
	Maori pa or settle- ment	73	12	4	0	18	13	0	0
	Construction camp, etc., including market gardens	18	3	16	1	2	1	2	1
	Not stated	25	4	56	4	17	12	14	6
Totals		621	100	1557	100	142	100	253	100

Our information is so coded as to allow no attack on the question whether urban or rural areas differ in the amount of juvenile crime detected in each, proportionate to population; nor can we say whether Maoris and Non-Maoris are different in this respect. However, less than half of the Maori offenders in this sample (which is representative of all juvenile offenders over the whole country) come from towns of over 5000 population. We clearly have no warrant to ignore what may crudely be called "crime in the country" and worry exclusively, or even mostly, about urban areas.

Some who have considered crime amongst Maoris have appeared to attach overwhelming importance to the cities, and Auckland especially. It is perhaps well to remember that crime happens where people live, that a great many Maoris live elsewhere than in large cities, and that related to this is the fact that less than half of juvenile Maori offenders are living in a city at the time of their offence.

APPENDIX II

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF SAMPLE:

Total number of cards initially: 3723 - a complete year, all included.

1. Sex Males: 3261
 Females: 462

<u>2. Race</u>				<u>Classification</u>
		<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Adopted</u>
				<u>in this Study</u>
(1)	European	276	2184	Non-Maori
(2)	Maori	131	639	Maori
(3)	Other e.g. Polynesian, Asian	6	43	Non-Maori
(4)	Half or more Maori	28	106	Maori
(5)	Less than half Maori	13	53	Non-Maori
(6)	Maori/Asian, other Maori blends	0	10	Maori
(7)	Other racial blends	4	21	Non-Maori
(8)	Reject (not coded)	4	205	not included
Total		462	3261	

Maori Females: 159
Non-Maori Females: 299

Maori Males: 755
Non-Maori Males: 2301

3. Offence

The numbers remaining after cards for technical and minor traffic offences are omitted are:

Maori Females: 157
Non-Maori Females: 278

Maori Males: 721
Non-Maori Males: 1840

4. Previous Appearances in Current Year

Second and subsequent appearances in the year being studied were deleted so that the number of children appearing, as opposed to the number of appearances, could be studied. This reduced the number of cards to:

Maori Females: 144
Non-Maori Females: 258

Maori Males: 634
Non-Maori Males: 1599

5. Age

Column 35 divides those under 10 from those over 10. The number of children under 10 was given in the text. After these were deleted from the samples, the cards were sorted on column 36. Children aged 18 and 19 were also deleted from the sample. This gave the final sizes of the samples:

Maori girls: 142
Non-Maori girls: 253

Maori boys: 621
Non-Maori boys: 1557

R E F E R E N C E S

1. Joint Committee on Young Offenders Research Report (1962) Recent Research on Crime Amongst Maoris
(unpublished)
 2. Ausubel D.P. (1960) Maori Youth
Victoria University of Wellington
Publications in Psychology No.14 (Price Milburn 1961)
 3. Currie Sir G. et al (1962) Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand.
R.E. Owen, Government Printer, Wellington
(by authority)
 4. O'Neill D.P. (1952) Catholics and Delinquency
The New Zealand Child Welfare Workers' Bulletin, Vol.II, No.2 January 1952, pp 25 - 36
 5. Wilkins L.T. (1960) Delinquent Generations
A Home Office Research Unit Report (H.M.S.O.)
-