

Inmate Family Relocation Study

A Report of Research Undertaken by the Ministry of Justice for the Department of
Corrections

Tony Waldegrave

Ministry of Justice
Te Manatu Ture

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank several people for their contributions to this project.

Firstly to Pauline Ramsey from the Department of Corrections for linking the project and the prisons and facilitating the data collection process. Thanks to Prison Management and staff for advice and co-operation, particularly to Bob Patterson at Wanganui Prison and Chris Smith at Rimutaka Prison for acting as 'on-site liaisons' during the data collection.

To the interview team Seti Fiti, Tata Parata, Bill Kaua and Chappie Te Kani. He mihi ki a koutou nga kairangahau mo a koutou mahi. Fa'afetai tele mo lou galuega. Thanks also to Loudeen Parsons and John Clarke for methodological advice, for organising translations and for recommending interviewers.

For oversight of the project including advice and review thanks to Mary Craythorne, David Yeboah and Judy Paulin. Thanks also to Alison Chetwin for helping to train the interviewers and for providing comments on a draft, and to Natasha Rickett for reviewing the statistics.

May, 1999

Tony Waldegrave

Research Adviser
Criminal Justice Group
Ministry of Justice

This research was commissioned by the Department of Corrections from the Ministry of Justice. The report has been prepared by the author and the views expressed in it are the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Corrections.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Background	3
2 Research Specifications	4
3 Research Methodology	5
3.1 Method of Data Collection	5
3.2 Consultation with Prison Management	5
3.3 Questionnaire	6
3.4 Demographic and Sentencing data	6
3.5 Pilot of Questionnaire	7
3.6 Consent and Interviewing	7
3.7 Interviewing Arrangements	7
3.8 Interview Team and Training	8
4 Findings	9
4.1 Response from Populations	9
4.1.1 Rimutaka Prison	9
4.1.2 Wanganui Prison	10
4.2 Sample Description	11
4.2.1 Ethnicity	11
4.2.2 Age	12
4.2.3 Sentence Length	12
4.3 Inmate and Inmate Family Residency	13
4.3.1 Rimutaka Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment	13
4.3.2 Rimutaka Inmate Family Residency	14
4.3.3 Wanganui Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment	15
4.3.4 Wanganui Inmate Family Residency	16
4.4 Inmate Family Relocation	17
4.4.1 Rimutaka Sample	17
4.4.2 Wanganui Sample	18
4.5 Inmates Plans on Release	19
4.5.1 Rimutaka Sample	19
4.5.2 Wanganui Sample	20
4.5.3 Leaving or Staying	21
4.5.4 Reasons for Leaving or Staying	22
5 Conclusions	24
References	27
Appendices	28
Appendix 1: Inmate Family Relocation Study Questionnaire (English, Maori and Samoan language versions)	
Appendix 2: Poster publicising Inmate Family Relocation Study to Inmates (English, Maori and Samoan language versions)	
Appendix 3 Deed of Confidentiality and Declaration of Criminal History	
Appendix 4 Ethnic Group Card	
Appendix 5 Inmate Family and Friend Relocation Tables	

Tables

Table 4.1	Participation of Inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui Prisons	9
Table 4.2	Ethnic Composition of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples	11
Table 4.3	Age of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples	12
Table 4.4	Total Sentence Length of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples	12
Table 4.5	Region of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment – Rimutaka Sample	13
Table 4.6	City of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment – Rimutaka Sample from the Wellington Region	14
Table 4.7	Region of Inmate Family Residency – Rimutaka Sample	14
Table 4.8	Region of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment –Wanganui Sample	15
Table 4.9	City/Town of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment – Wanganui Sample from Wanganui Region	16
Table 4.10	Region of Inmate Family Residency - Wanganui Sample	16
Table 4.11	Total Movement Related to Inmate Imprisonment at Rimutaka Prison	17
Table 4.12	Total Movement Related to Inmate Imprisonment at Wanganui Prison	18
Table 4.13	Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Rimutaka Sample	19
Table 4.14	City in Wellington Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Rimutaka Sample	20
Table 4.15	Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Wanganui Sample	20
Table 4.16	Number and Percent of Inmates who Planned to Leave and Stay in the Wellington Region when released – Rimutaka Sample	21
Table 4.17	Number and Percent of Inmates who Planned to Leave and Stay in the Wanganui Region when Released – Wanganui Sample	21
Table 4.18	Main Reasons for Planning to Leave or Stay in the Wellington Region on Release – Rimutaka Sample	22
Table 4.19	Main Reasons for Planning to Leave or Stay in the Wanganui Region on Release – Wanganui Sample	23

Executive Summary

The Department of Corrections commissioned this research project to collect information for use in its site acquisition process. The study population comprised all inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons serving sentences of 365 days or more.

Researchers were asked to establish whether family members of current inmates at the prisons had relocated to be nearer inmates, what specific reasons for movement were, and whether movement was permanent. Researchers were also asked to determine whether inmates planned to stay on in the region in which they were imprisoned when released.

A research team of four interviewers completed face to face questionnaires with inmates over four days at each prison. Eleven interviews were conducted in Samoan.

One hundred and forty six inmates (60% of the eligible population) at Rimutaka and 236 inmates (68% of the eligible population) at Wanganui participated in the research.

Fifty percent of the Rimutaka and 48% of the Wanganui participant population identified as Maori. Seventeen percent of each participant population identified as Samoan. At Rimutaka 30% of the participants identified as European and at Wanganui 32% identified as European. The Wanganui participants were slightly older and were serving longer sentences than the Rimutaka inmates.

Almost half (49%) of the Rimutaka participants reported residing in Wellington prior to their current imprisonment. Eight inmates (6%) reported living in Upper Hutt prior to their current imprisonment. Twelve percent of the Rimutaka participants came from the neighbouring regions of Horowhenua/Kapiti (5%) and Wairarapa (7%). The families of inmates at Rimutaka were similarly dispersed with 41% living in the Wellington region and 10% living in the neighbouring regions of Horowhenua/Kapiti (4%) and Wairarapa (6%).

In contrast only 11% of participants at Wanganui prison came from the Wanganui region. Seventeen percent of the Wanganui participants came from the neighbouring regions of Taranaki and Manawatu but almost half (49%) of the Wanganui participants came from Auckland (42%) or Northland (7%). The families of Wanganui participants lived predominantly in Auckland (36%). Only 9% of Wanganui participant families were reported to live in the Wanganui region.

Reports of the location of inmate families indicated the need for half of Rimutaka inmate families and two thirds of Wanganui inmate families to move if they wanted to be closer to inmates who were in prison.

At Rimutaka a total of 13 inmates (9% of participants at Rimutaka prison) reported 16 cases of movement or planned movement to be closer to an inmate while he was in prison. A total of 52 people had moved or planned to move to be nearer Rimutaka prison. Of the 13 inmates who reported movement or planned movement eight had resided outside the Wellington area prior to commencing their current imprisonment. These eight participants represented 11% of the 71 inmates who were from outside the Wellington area.

At Wanganui a total of 18 inmates (8% of participants at Wanganui prison) reported 17 cases of movement or planned movement to be closer to an inmate while he was in prison. A total of 43 people had moved or planned to move to be nearer to Wanganui prison. All 17 inmates who reported movement or planned movement had resided outside of the Wanganui area prior to their imprisonment. These 17 inmates represented 9% of the 211 Wanganui participants who were from outside the Wanganui area.

Inmates' plans on release were the final consideration of the study. At Rimutaka 40% of participants were planning to live in the Wellington region with 6% planning to live in Upper Hutt. The percentage who planned to live in Upper Hutt is the same as the percentage who reported coming from Upper Hutt prior to their imprisonment. Twelve fewer inmates planned to live in the Wellington region than had reported coming from the region prior to their imprisonment. Sixty two percent of those who planned to leave the Wellington region and 55% of those who planned to stay in the Wellington region stated their main reason for their decision was to be at home or to be close to family.

In contrast to the plans of Rimutaka participants, only 14% of Wanganui inmates planned to stay in the Wanganui region when released. This figure is slightly higher than the 11% who reported living in the Wanganui region prior to their imprisonment. Inmates gave similar reasons for leaving or staying in the Wanganui area. Sixty six percent of those leaving the Wanganui region and 45% of those staying in the Wanganui region said their main reason for doing so was either to be at home or be closer to family.

Given the reasonably high response rate, the findings can probably be generalised to all inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons serving sentences of 1 year or more. However, care needs to be taken in extrapolating the findings to prison populations as a whole.

1 Background

The New Regional Prisons Programme is the name of the Department of Corrections prison site acquisition process. The Department is currently looking for sites in Northland and Auckland.

The Programme involves detailed consultation with affected communities. The consultation process includes presenting information on the impacts of prisons on local people to stakeholders.

An issue for some stakeholders is the potential for inmates' families to relocate from their home area to the prison in order to be closer to the inmates, and for out-of-town inmates to resettle in the region upon their release.

Anecdotal evidence in Wanganui suggests that inmates' families relocate from their home area to the prison area in order to be closer to the inmates, and out-of-town inmates resettle in the prison region upon their release.

Rimutaka is considered to be a "regional prison" with most of its inmates originating from the (North) Wellington region. There is some evidence that a significant proportion of Rimutaka inmates do not settle in the immediate region when they are released.

2 Research Specifications

In September of 1998 the Department of Corrections approached the Ministry of Justice Research Team to conduct research that would measure the extent to which inmates families moved. In response the Ministry produced a proposal for research. Officials overseeing the project from the Ministry of Justice and the Department of Corrections specified the following objectives for the research.

1. a) to establish whether family members of current inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons have relocated to the prison region as a result of the imprisonment, and
- b) to determine whether those who move do so permanently or leave after the inmate is released
2. to collect specific reasons for the relocation of inmate family members to the prison region
3. to determine whether current inmates plan to stay on in the region in which they are imprisoned when they are released

3 Research Methodology

The research population was inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons who were serving sentences of 365 days or more. Inmates who were serving shorter sentences and remand inmates were excluded from participation as there was expected to be less movement of their supporters. Interviewers sought to make contact with all inmates at the two prisons that were eligible to participate.

Ministry of Justice experience with the Census of Prison Inmates 1997 (Lash, 1998) informed the choice of data collection methodology for this project. Brief face to face interviews with inmates were considered the appropriate method to use so that as many inmates as possible could make an informed decision to participate and complete the questionnaire in the limited time.

3.1 Method of Data Collection

The decision to use interviewer-administrated questionnaires to collect data for this research was based on an understanding that self-completion or officer administration of questionnaires may be problematic for several reasons. A significant concern was the Census of Prison Inmates' observation of high levels of illiteracy in New Zealand prisons. This indicated that a method that did not involve reading and writing would be needed to achieve a reasonable response rate. It was also possible that if a questionnaire was distributed to inmates for self-completion some could misunderstand questions and fail to complete questionnaires. It was further anticipated that interest and participation in the research would be increased if participants had face to face contact with people conducting the research.

Administration by prison officers was not a preferred option as this was expected to place a considerable burden on prison officers. The progress of the research would have also been dependent on their being able to complete this task. It was undesirable for the research to place any unnecessary stress on officer-inmate dynamics. Officers were asked to assist in their usual capacity (escorting and supervising inmates). It was hoped that this research process would cause as little disruption as possible on the prison context.

3.4 Consultation with Prison Management

During the development of the research consultation meetings were held with site and unit managers at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons. Attendees were briefed on the purpose and objectives of the study and were consulted about the research methodology.

Managers at both prisons indicated their support for the methodology, endorsing the proposed progression of interviewers from unit to unit in the prisons. They advised that unit staff should manage access to inmates, the flow of inmates to interviews, security of interviewers, and provide an area for interviewing to be conducted.

A unit manager at each prison was appointed prison liaison for the research. The role of ‘liaisons’ was to co-ordinate the development of timetables for interviewing, arrange access to inmates at the appropriate times and oversee the movement of interviewers around their prison.

Managers also made recommendations about the composition of the interview team. They advised that the team should be ethnically representative of the prison population, and that interview and publicity materials should be produced in Maori and Samoan languages as well as English. The consensus among staff at both prisons was that a three or four person team could complete interviewing at each prison within a week.

3.2 Questionnaire

A brief questionnaire, for administration by research interviewers, was designed around the research objectives. The questionnaire took into account demographic and sentencing information that was available from the Department of Corrections. Consultation meetings with site and unit managers at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons were undertaken to further inform decisions about the content and structure of the questionnaire.

3.3 Demographic and Sentencing Data

The Department of Corrections provided demographic and sentencing data for inmates who were eligible to participate in the research at the two prisons. This was drawn from the Integrated Offender Management Computer System (IOMS). Information on the following variables was provided:

- Institution
- Unit
- Offender Name
- Person Record Number (PRN)
- Drivers Licence Number (DL)
- Date of Birth (DOB)
- Sentence Commencement Date (SCD)
- Parole Eligibility Date (PED)
- Final Release Date (FRD)
- Sentence Expiry Date (SED)
- Length in Days
- Ethnicity
- Employment
- City/Town/Locale

Ethnicity data for some inmates was not complete. Also, although the Department of Corrections provided some information about inmate residency prior to imprisonment, more specific information was sought with the questionnaire.

3.5 Pilot of Questionnaire

Two members of the interviewing team piloted the questionnaire in early February with 13 inmates at Wellington prison. Subsequent to pilot findings the content of the questionnaire was reviewed and minor adjustments to its structure were made. The English, Maori and Samoan versions of the questionnaire used for the main study are attached as Appendix 1

3.6 Consent and Interviewing

Efforts were made to inform inmates about the rights of research participants at their first potential point of contact with the project. Posters distributed to the prisons prior to the start of interviewing outlined the purpose of the research and informed inmates of the eligibility criteria and the rights of participants.

When eligible inmates arrived at the interview scene interviewers introduced themselves and completed a standardised briefing and consent procedure. This process was intended to enable inmates to make an informed decision about whether or not they wished to participate. Interviewers read a series of statements to inmates about participant rights and how information would be managed (refer to front page of Questionnaires (Appendix 1)). Interviewers asked inmates if they understood each point and recorded their answers. If inmates understood all points and agreed to participate they were asked to sign their informed consent as participants in the research. If an inmate did not understand issues after further detail was provided, was not prepared to confirm his answers by signing the consent form, or did not wish to participate for any other reason, he was thanked for his time and the next inmate was shown in.

Interviews took approximately 5 – 10 minutes each to complete although this varied by unit. In some units inmates were better informed about the purpose and aims of the research from posters and unit staff, and did not require detailed explanation about the research process and participation issues.

3.7 Interviewing Arrangements

Prison 'liaisons' were sent lists of inmates in units at their prison who were eligible to participate in the research. 'Liaisons' distributed copies of these lists to units and requested staff to select a time, or times during the week that researchers would be at their prison, for interviewing to be conducted in their unit. Times for interviewing were to be selected based on the availability of inmates outside of work, programmes, meal times, lock-up times, or any other regularly scheduled daily activities. Interviewers were available to interview during the day, evening, and weekend of the week scheduled for each prison. Prison 'liaisons' returned completed timetables to the Ministry of Justice before interviewing took place.

Posters publicising the research to inmates were also sent to the prison 'liaisons'. The posters outlined the purpose of the research, eligibility criteria and participation information. The posters were translated into Maori and Samoan. 'Liaisons' were asked to post copies of the three versions of the posters in each unit at their prison (copies of the posters are attached as Appendix 2).

3.8 Interview Team and Training

Researchers sought to assemble a four-person interviewing team consisting of one Pakeha, two Maori and one Samoan interviewer. Maori and Pacific Peoples advisers in the Ministry of Justice nominated two external candidates to contract as interviewers based on criteria provided by the research team. Summary information about the individuals in the interviewing team follows:

1 st Interviewer	Project Researcher from the Ministry of Justice New Zealander of Pakeha Ethnicity
2 nd Interviewer	Member of the Ministry of Justice Tangata Whenua Student Work Programme New Zealander of Maori Ethnicity Fluent speaker of Te Reo Maori
3 rd Interviewer	External Contractor New Zealander of Maori Ethnicity Fluent speaker of Te Reo Maori
4 th Interviewer	External Contractor New Zealander of Samoan Ethnicity Fluent Speaker of Samoan language

All interviewers had research experience or experience working with inmates.

A briefing and training session for interviewers was held at the Ministry of Justice in early February 1999. Department of Corrections New Regional Prisons Programme Co-ordinator Mary Craythorne briefed attendees on the background and purpose of the project. Ministry researchers then outlined the research methodology. Ministry of Justice Senior Research Adviser Alison Chetwin addressed interviewers about research interviewing in the prison context. The two members of the interviewing team who had completed the pilot exercise simulated hypothetical interviewing scenarios. Following this, interviewers practised questionnaire administration. Finally, interviewers were briefed on the interviewing schedules and other administrative issues for the two weeks of data collection.

Before interviewing commenced, contracted interviewers signed a deed of confidentiality and a declaration as to their criminal histories (copies of the templates of these two documents are attached as Appendix 3). This provided prison administrators with the security assurance needed before interviewers could spend two weeks in contact with inmates. The Ministry employees were not asked to make these declarations. This security assurance process was approved by prison management and completed the final step in preparing for data collection.

4 Findings

4.1 Response Rates from Prison Populations

Table 4.1: Participation of Inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui Prisons

Prison	Sentenced Inmates		Eligible to participate		Inmates Contacted		Participant/contact rate		Not willing to participate		Overall Response Rate
	A	B	B/A	C	C/B	D	D/C	E	E/B	D/B	
Rimutaka	271	243	89.8%	178	73.3%	146	82.0%	32	13.2%	60.1%	
Wanganui	392	346	88.4%	283	81.8%	236	83.4%	47	13.6%	68.2%	

Table 4.1 presents the relevant statistics about participation of inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons in this research.

Column A contains the average number of sentenced inmates resident at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons during the periods of interviewing at each prison. This shows that the population of sentenced inmates resident at Rimutaka averaged 271 between the 15th and 19th of February 1999. The population of sentenced inmates at Wanganui prison averaged 392 between the 22nd and 25th of February 1999.

Interviewers visited some units several times to contact as many inmates as possible. Despite this, 26.7% and 18.2% of inmates who were eligible to participate were not contacted at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons respectively due to one, or a combination, of the following reasons:

- Inmate was in punishment cell and therefore was not offered the opportunity to participate
- Inmate was engaged in other activities such as work, treatment programmes, kapahaka practice, social activities
- Inmate did not present themselves to place of interviews when requested to do so by warden

4.1.1 Rimutaka Prison

The total number of Rimutaka inmates who were eligible to participate in the research was derived from demographic and sentencing data provided by the Department of Corrections. Two hundred and forty three of the inmates (89.8% of the total sentenced inmate population) for whom data was provided were resident at Rimutaka prison and eligible to participate in the research at the time of interviewing.

The overall response rate for Rimutaka prison has been derived from the number of interviews completed divided by the total number of eligible inmates at Rimutaka. One hundred and forty six (60%) of the 243 eligible inmates at Rimutaka completed interviews. No contact was made with 65 (27%) of the 243 inmates who were eligible to participate. The remaining thirty-two (13%) of the 243 eligible inmates appeared for an interview but were not willing to participate in the research.

¹ Department of Corrections National Muster Co-ordination forms (completed on a daily basis).

4.1.2 Wanganui Prison

The total number of Wanganui inmates who were eligible to participate in the research, derived from demographic and sentencing data provided by the Department of Corrections, and resident at Wanganui prison at the time of interviewing was 346 (88.4% of the total sentenced inmate population).

The overall response rate for Wanganui prison has been derived by dividing the number of interviews completed by the total number of eligible inmates at Wanganui. Two hundred and thirty six of the 346 eligible inmates (68%) completed an interview. No contact was made with 63 (18.2%) of the 346 inmates who were eligible to participate. The remaining forty seven (14%) of the 346 eligible inmates appeared for an interview but were not willing to participate in the research.

Response rates were lower in the high security wing at Wanganui. One suggested reason for this was that the inmates were reluctant to support research by the Department of Corrections or the Ministry of Justice. At Rimutaka lower response rates were recorded in units with a high proportion of workers. Prison officers explained that inmates in these units were unlikely to give any of their limited spare time after work and before lock up to complete the survey.

Despite these difficulties the overall response rates of 60% and 68% would be looked on favourably by survey research methodologists. Senese (1997) suggests that response rates greater than 50% should be both welcomed and encouraged. Babbie's (1986) rule of thumb for evaluating response rates, based on a review of survey literature, suggests a 60% response rate is good and a 70% response rate is very good.

The effect of posters, which were used to publicise the research prior to the week of interviewing, was not measured formally but was apparent in comments of interviewees. Several inmates who were familiar with the purpose and focus of the interview prior to contact with interviewers reported reading posters in their units. Conversely, some of the inmates who refused to participate also cited the posters and one prison officer reported that some inmates who had seen from the posters that the research was being conducted by the Department of Corrections and the Ministry of Justice would not have appeared at interviews.

Efforts that had been made to recognise the significance of cultural factors in interviewing were well received. The Samoan questionnaire was used in five interviews at Rimutaka prison and six at Wanganui prison. Inmates seemed to appreciate the availability of Maori and Samoan interviewers.

4.2 Sample Description

4.2.1 Ethnicity

Participants were asked to identify the ethnic group or groups that they identified with from a card listing the ethnic groupings classified in the 1996 Statistics New Zealand Population census (the ethnic group card is attached as Appendix 4). Responses were coded into four categories using Statistics New Zealand guidelines for categorising ethnicity. With this system a respondent who reported New Zealand Maori as one of the ethnic groups they identified with was recorded as New Zealand Maori. If respondents reported identifying with a Pacific Peoples ethnic group then they were recorded as Pacific Peoples ahead of others mentioned except New Zealand Maori. If respondents reported identifying with any ethnic group apart from those classifiable as European they were classified under 'other ethnic group' otherwise they were classified as European.

Table 4.2: Ethnic Composition of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples

Ethnic Group	Rimutaka		Wanganui	
New Zealand Maori	73	50.0%	112	47.5%
Pacific Peoples	25	17.1%	39	16.5%
Other Ethnic Groups	6	4.1%	9	3.8%
European	42	28.8%	76	32.2%
Total	146	100.0%	236	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.2 presents the ethnic composition of the Rimutaka and Wanganui samples. The Census of Prison Inmates 1997 (Lash, 1998) reports that 44% of the total male sentenced inmate population nation-wide identified themselves as Maori only while a total of 53% indicated that they had some Maori ancestry. This study's finding that 50% and 48% of the samples at Rimutaka and Wanganui identified as Maori indicates the sample was ethnically representative of the national prison population.

4.2.2 Age

Table 4.3: Age of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples

Age range	Rimutaka		Wanganui	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
17 – 19 years	10	6.8%	8	3.4%
20 – 24 years	33	22.6%	51	21.6%
25 – 29 years	35	24.0%	50	21.2%
30 – 34 years	23	15.8%	39	16.5%
35 – 39 years	14	9.6%	22	9.3%
40 – 49 years	23	15.8%	37	15.7%
50 + years	8	5.5%	29	12.3%
Total:	146	100.0%	236	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.3 presents age groupings for the Rimutaka and Wanganui samples. While the figures recorded for each of the age groups are fairly similar, they indicate that the Wanganui sample was marginally older. Fifty three percent of participants at Rimutaka were 29 years of age or under while for Wanganui this figure was 46%. At Wanganui 12% of participants were over 49 years old or older compared with 6% who were over 49 years old at Rimutaka.

4.2.3 Sentence Length

Table 4.4 Total Sentence Length of Rimutaka and Wanganui Prison Samples

Length of Sentence	Rimutaka		Wanganui	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
More than 1 Year to 2 Years	43	29.5%	34	14.4%
More than 2 Year to 3 Years	28	19.2%	28	11.9%
More than 3 Year to 5 Years	24	16.4%	60	25.4%
More than 5 Year to 7 Years	22	15.1%	38	16.1%
More than 7 Years to 10 Years	19	13.0%	46	19.5%
More than 10 Years	10	6.8%	30	12.7%
Total:	146	100.0%	236	100.0%

Notes: 1 The 'More than 10 Years' grouping includes inmates serving sentences of life imprisonment and preventive detention

2 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.4 presents the total sentence lengths of the Rimutaka and Wanganui samples. It is noticeable that while 30% of inmates in the Rimutaka sample were serving sentences between 1 and 2 years only 14% of the Wanganui sample were in this group. The Wanganui sample however had a higher proportion of inmates serving longer length sentences. Forty eight percent of participants at Wanganui were serving sentences of more than 5 years while 35% of the Rimutaka sample were in this group. This indicates that the sample at Wanganui were imprisoned for more serious offending and would spend more time in prison than the Rimutaka sample.

Unfortunately information about when inmates arrived at the prison (reception data) was not available for this study. This means that although the total length of an inmate’s sentence was known, it was not known how long the inmate had served at the particular prison. Some of the inmates at the Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons would not have commenced their sentences at the prison they were in but may have been transferred there during their sentence. In Wanganui prison for example there is likely to be a significant number of inmates who were transferred from Auckland prisons part way through their sentences. Also, some inmates at Rimutaka prison mentioned that they had spent part of their current sentence in a South Island prison.

4.3 Inmate and Inmate Family Residency

4.3.1 Rimutaka Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment

Table 4.5 Region of Inmate Residency Prior To Imprisonment –Rimutaka Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	5	3.4%
Auckland	20	13.7%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	10	6.8%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	3	2.1%
Taupo/Taranaki	3	2.1%
Wanganui/Manawatu	4	2.7%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	7	4.8%
Wairarapa	10	6.8%
Wellington	71	48.6%
Nelson/Marlborough	2	1.4%
Canterbury	3	2.1%
Otago/Southland	7	4.8%
Overseas	1	0.7%
Total	146	100.0%

Notes: 1 The Wellington region includes Wellington City, Upper Hutt City, Hutt City, Porirua City (North of Wellington City and South of Paekakariki)

2 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.5 presents the region in which inmates in the Rimutaka sample resided prior to commencing their current imprisonment sentence. This indicates that almost half (49%) of inmates in the sample were from the Wellington region and another 12% were from the neighbouring regions of Horowhenua/Kapiti and Wairarapa. Just over 8% of inmates reported living in the South Island prior to their present term of imprisonment.

Table 4.6 City of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment -Rimutaka Sample from the Wellington Region

City	Number	Percent
Upper Hutt	8	11.3%
Lower Hutt	22	31.0%
Porirua	13	18.3%
Wellington	28	39.4%
Total:	71	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.6 presents the city that Wellington based inmates lived in prior to their current sentence of imprisonment. Eight (11.3%) of the 71 inmates from the area reported residing in Upper Hutt prior to their current sentence of imprisonment.

4.3.2 Rimutaka Inmate Family Residency

Table 4.7 Region of Inmate Family Residency - Rimutaka Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	4	2.7%
Auckland	18	12.3%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	11	7.5%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	6	4.1%
Taupo/Taranaki	3	2.1%
Wanganui/Manawatu	6	4.1%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	6	4.1%
Wairarapa	9	6.2%
Wellington	60	41.1%
Nelson/Marlborough	1	0.7%
Canterbury	3	2.1%
Otago/Southland	7	4.8%
Overseas	2	1.4%
Around NZ	7	4.8%
Don't know	1	0.7%
No response:	2	1.4%
Total:	146	100.0%

Notes: 1 In one of the 'No response' cases the inmate stated he had no family, in the other case the inmate reported that some of their family lived in the town they lived in before prison but no further information was provided.

2 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Inmates were asked if their family members lived in the same place that they had been living prior to their imprisonment. The regions in which inmates' families lived, based on responses to this question, is presented in Table 4.7. Family was not further defined for inmates, so the responses reflect their own definitions of family.

Forty one percent of inmates reported that their families also lived in the Wellington region. A further 10% of Rimutaka participants were from neighbouring Horowhenua/Kapiti and Wairarapa. Depending on other restrictions to access this may suggest that Rimutaka prison was reasonably accessible to the family members of just over half of the inmates who participated from Rimutaka.

4.3.3 Wanganui Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment

Table 4.8 Region of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment – Wanganui Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	17	7.2%
Auckland	98	41.5%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	23	9.7%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	4	1.7%
Taupo	4	1.7%
Taranaki	26	11.0%
Wanganui	25	10.6%
Manawatu	15	6.4%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	3	1.3%
Wellington	8	3.4%
Nelson/Marlborough	2	0.8%
Canterbury	5	2.1%
West Coast	1	0.4%
Otago/Southland	3	1.3%
Overseas	2	0.8%
Total:	236	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.8 presents the region in which participants at Wanganui lived prior to commencement of their current term of imprisonment. A total of 211 (89%) of the 236 participants reported being from outside the area. Forty two percent of the sample reported that they were from Auckland. Only 11% of inmates in the sample were from the Wanganui region. A further 11% and 6% were from the neighbouring regions of Taranaki and Manawatu respectively. In comparison, 49% of the Rimutaka population had reported living in the local Wellington region (refer to Table 4.5).

Table 4.9 City/Town of Inmate Residency Prior to Imprisonment –Wanganui Sample from the Wanganui Region

City/Town	Number	Percent
Ohakune	1	4.0%
Taihape	2	8.0%
Marton	1	4.0%
Wanganui	20	80.0%
Sanson	1	4.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Table 4.9 shows that while 20 (80%) of the 25 participants from the Wanganui area came from Wanganui city the other 5 (20%) came from one of four regional towns.

4.3.4 Wanganui Inmate Family Residency

Table 4.10 Region of Inmate Family Residency–Wanganui Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	14	5.9%
Auckland	84	35.6%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	24	10.2%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	7	3.0%
Taupo	4	1.7%
Taranaki	22	9.3%
Wanganui	21	8.9%
Manawatu	13	5.5%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	2	0.8%
Wellington	10	4.2%
Nelson/Marlborough	2	0.8%
Canterbury	6	2.5%
West Coast	1	0.4%
Otago/Southland	3	1.3%
Overseas	10	4.2%
Around NZ	9	3.8%
No response ¹	4	1.7%
Total ²	236	100.0%

Notes: 1 Three inmates stated that they had no family and could therefore not answer the question
2 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.10 presents the responses of inmates at Wanganui when asked whether their families also lived where they (the inmate) lived prior to their imprisonment. The table shows that 36% of inmates reported that their families also lived in the Auckland area, a slightly lower percentage of inmates than were living in Auckland prior to their imprisonment (42%). Nine percent reported that their families lived in the Wanganui region with a further 9% and 6% lived in Taranaki and Manawatu respectively. These figures, when compared with the percentage of Rimutaka inmates who reported that their families resided in the Wellington area (41%) indicate that fewer inmates at Wanganui had family in the local region.

4.4 Inmate Family Relocation

Participants were asked whether family members or friends had moved to the prison area since they had been in prison. If movement was reported interviewers asked where people moved had moved from and to, how many people moved and why the move was made. To gain a complete picture of movement due to the inmates' imprisonment participants were also asked whether family members or friends planned to move to the prison region because of the inmates' imprisonment there.

To gauge whether movement and planned movement to the prison area was permanent or temporary participants were asked subsequent questions based on whether they planned to leave or stay in the region when they were released. Those that planned to stay when released were asked whether other people would join them. Inmates who were planning to leave the region when released who had reported that family or friends had moved or planned to move were asked whether these people would also leave when they (the inmate) left the region.

4.4.1 Rimutaka Sample

Table 4.11 Total Movement Related to Inmate Imprisonment at Rimutaka Prison

Type of Movement	Number of Reports	Number who moved
Family moved to Upper Hutt	4	9
Friends moved to Upper Hutt	0	0
Family or Friends planned to move to Upper Hutt	0	0
Family moved to/within Wellington Region	8	25
Friends moved to/within Wellington Region	1 ₁	12
Family or Friends planned to move to Wellington Region	3 ₂	4
Family or Friends who were expected to move to the region due to inmate plans to live in Wellington on release	(+)1	(+) 3
Family and Friends that moved or plan to move to the region who were expected to leave when Inmate leaves the region	(-)1	(-) 1
Total reported movement within/to Wellington region	16₃	52

Notes

- 1 The inmate who reported friends had moved had also reported family movement
- 2 Two of the inmates who reported planned movement had also reported that family or friends planned to move to the area
- 3 Due to some inmates reporting two different types of movement the total number of reports does not represent the total number of inmates who reported movement. The total number of inmates is less than the total number of reports.

Table 4.11 presents number of reports and the number of people who moved by type of movement reported by participants at Rimutaka prison. There were a total of 16 reports of movement or planned movement to be closer to an inmate while he was in prison. These 16 reports were made by a total of 13 inmates (9% of the total sample of 146 inmates). There were two further reports, which are not presented in the table, in which a total of two family members moved to a neighbouring region to be closer to their family members at Rimutaka prison.

Included in the totals are those who will leave the area when the inmate is released and those who will join the inmate if the inmate stays in the area when released. These cases are added or subtracted from the totals (A more detailed breakdown of these cases is attached as Appendix 5).

Of the 13 inmates who reported movement or planned movement eight had reported that they were living outside of the Wellington region prior to their current term of imprisonment. These eight inmates

represented 11% of the total 71 inmates who were from outside the area. They reported a total of 10 cases of movement affecting 38 people.

4.4.2 Wanganui Sample

Table 4.12 Total Movement Related to Inmate Imprisonment at Wanganui Prison

Type of Movement	Number of Reports	Number who moved
Family moved to Wanganui City	7	21
Friends moved to Wanganui City	4 ₁	5
Family or Friends who planned to move to Wanganui	8 ₂	22
Family moved to Wanganui Region (exc. Wanganui city)	0	0
Friends moved to Wanganui Region	1	2
Family or Friends who planned to move to Wanganui Region	0	0
Family and Friends that moved or planed to move who were expected to leave when Inmate leaves area	(-) 3	(-) 7
Total Reports of movement to Wanganui region	17₃	43
Notes		
1	Two of the inmates who reported friends had moved to Wanganui also reported planned movement	
2	Two of the inmates who reported plans to move reported movement of friends	
3	Due to some inmates reporting two different types of movement the total number of reports does not represent the total number of inmates who reported movement. The total number of inmates is more than the total number of reports.	

Table 4.12 presents number of reports and number of people who moved by type of movement reported by participants at Wanganui prison. There were a total of 17 cases in which family or friends moved or planned to move to the region. Included in the totals are family or friends who were expected to leave or stay in the region depending on the inmates plans when released. The total cases of movement were reported by 18 different inmates. Table 4.12 does not include four cases, in which eight individuals had moved or planned to move to a neighbouring region to be nearer an inmate in Wanganui prison (A more detailed breakdown of the cases is attached as Appendix 5).

The Table shows that there had been 12 cases of movement of family or friends to be nearer to inmates in the Wanganui sample. There were a further 8 cases of planned movement.

Inmates from outside of the Wanganui area made all reports of movement or planned movement. Of the 211 participants (89% of Wanganui participants) who came from outside of Wanganui 18 (8.5%) reported movement or planned movement.

4.5 Inmate Plans on Release

Participants were asked where they planned to live when released from prison. Those who didn't know were asked if they planned to leave or stay in the prison area when released. They were then asked the reason for their answer.

4.5.1 Rimutaka Sample

Table 4.13 Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Rimutaka Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	2	1.4%
Auckland	12	8.2%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	7	4.8%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	9	6.2%
Taupo/Taranaki	4	2.7%
Wanganui/Manawatu	2	1.4%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	8	5.5%
Wairarapa	6	4.1%
Wellington	59	40.4%
Nelson/Marlborough	1	0.7%
Canterbury	3	2.1%
Otago/Southland	6	4.1%
Overseas	4	2.7%
Don't know	23	15.8%
Total	146	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.13 presents the regions in which Rimutaka inmates planned to live on their release. One hundred and twenty three (84%) of the 146 participants at Rimutaka knew where they planned to live when released from prison. The remaining 23 participants (16% of total) did not know where they were going to live when they were released. A frequent comment of those who did not know where they planned to live was that their release date was still a long way away. Fifty nine (40%) of the 146 Rimutaka participants planned to stay in the Wellington region when released.

Table 4.14 City in Wellington Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Rimutaka Sample

City	Number	Percent
Upper Hutt	9	15.3%
Lower Hutt	6	10.2%
Hutt Valley	5	8.5%
Porirua	10	16.9%
Wellington	27	45.8%
Wellington Region	2	3.4%
Total	59	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.14 presents more specific information about where the 59 Rimutaka inmates who planned to live in the Wellington were going to live in when released. This shows that only nine (15%) of the 59 inmates planned to live in Upper Hutt City. Two inmates did not specify the city in the Wellington region they planned to live. It is possible that some of the inmates who said they were moving to Wellington were referring to the Wellington region, not Wellington City in particular.

4.5.2 Wanganui Sample

Table 4.15 Region in which Inmates Planned to Live when Released – Wanganui Sample

Region	Number	Percent
Northland	9	3.8%
Auckland	77	32.6%
Waikato/Bay of Plenty	13	5.5%
Gisborne/Hawkes Bay	7	3.0%
Taupo	1	0.4%
Taranaki	21	8.9%
Wanganui(Not specified whether Wanganui city or region)	33	14.0%
Manawatu	7	3.0%
Horowhenua/Kapiti	2	0.8%
Wellington	10	4.2%
Nelson/Marlborough	2	0.8%
Canterbury	4	1.7%
West Coast	1	0.4%
Otago/Southland	1	0.4%
Overseas	5	2.1%
Don't know	43	18.2%
Total	236	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.15 shows the region in which Wanganui Inmates planned to live when they were released from prison. In comparison to the plans of Rimutaka participants, the table shows that only 14% of inmates planned to stay in the local region when released (40% of Rimutaka participants planned to stay in local region). This figure is slightly higher than the 11% who reported residing in the Wanganui region most recently prior to their current period of imprisonment. The figures in this table for neighbouring Taranaki (10%) and Manawatu (3%) are marginally lower than the percentages of inmates who reported residing in these areas before their current periods of imprisonment (11% and 6%). Although 42% of inmates reported Auckland as their most recent region of residence, 33% planned to live in Auckland when released.

4.5.3 Leaving or Staying

Table 4.16 Number and Percent of Inmates who Planned to Leave and Stay in the Wellington Region when Released – Rimutaka Sample

	Number	Percent
Leaving	66	45.2%
Staying	65	44.5%
Don't know	15	10.3%
Total	146	100.0%

Table 4.16 presents the number of Rimutaka inmates who planned to stay in or leave the Wellington region when released. The number of inmates planning to leave the area (66) and the number planning to stay in the area on release (65) are evenly balanced. The percentage of those who did not know whether they would stay or leave the Rimutaka area (10%) is lower the percentage of respondents who did not know which region they would live in when they left prison (16%).

Table 4.17 Number and Percentage of Inmates who Planned to Leave and Stay in the Wanganui Region when released – Wanganui Sample

	Number	Percent
Leaving	184	78.0%
Staying	38	16.1%
Don't know	14	5.9%
Total	236	100.0%

Table 17 summarises the plans of Wanganui participants in terms of whether they would leave or stay in the Wanganui region when released. This shows that more than three quarters of the sample planned to leave the region when released. The percentage who planned to stay (16%) is slightly higher than the percentage of inmates who reported Wanganui as their most recent place of residence prior to the current sentence imprisonment (11%) (refer to Table 4.8). The percentage of those who did not know whether they would stay or leave the Wanganui area (18%) is lower the percentage of respondents who did not know which region they would live in when they left prison (6%).

4.5.4 Reasons for Leaving and Staying

Table 4.18 Main Reasons for Planning to Leave or Stay in the Wellington Region on Release – Rimutaka Sample

	Leaving	Percent	Staying	Percent
To go home/This is home	24	36.4%	23	35.4%
Be with/nearer to family	17	25.8%	13	20.0%
Employment elsewhere/here	5	7.6%	4	6.2%
House/Other assets elsewhere/here	1	1.5%	3	4.6%
Lifestyle change	1	1.5%	0	0.0%
Like the area	0	0.0%	3	4.6%
No reason given/No particular reason to stay/leave	13	19.7%	10	15.4%
Other	4	6.1%	8	12.3%
Want to get away from prison/area/people	1	1.5%	0	0.0%
To be near friends	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
Total:	66	100.0%	65	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

Table 4.18 presents the main reasons offered by Rimutaka inmates for their plans to leave or stay in the Wellington region. Although some participants offered more than one reason, the first reason offered was presented in the table as the main reason.

The most frequently mentioned reason for inmate plans to leave or stay in the region was to be at home. The next most important reason was to be with, or nearer to family. One of these two reasons was given by 62% of inmates who planned to leave the region and 55% of those who planned to stay in the region.

Table 4.19 Main Reasons for Planning to Leave or Stay in the Wanganui Region on Release – Wanganui Inmates

	Leaving	Percentage	Staying	Percentage
To go home/This is home	64	34.8%	8	21.1%
Be with/nearer to family	57	31.0%	9	23.7%
Employment elsewhere/here	18	9.8%	4	10.5%
House/Other assets elsewhere/here	2	1.1%	2	5.3%
Lifestyle change	1	0.5%	0	0.0%
Like the area	0	0.0%	3	7.9%
No particular reason to stay/leave	12	6.5%	1	2.6%
Religious reasons e.g. church affiliation	1	0.5%	1	2.6%
Other	3	1.6%	3	7.9%
Want to get away from prison/area/people	6	3.3%	0	0.0%
Fresh start	8	4.3%	2	5.3%
No where else to go	1	0.5%	1	2.6%
No personal reason to stay	7	3.8%	0	0.0%
No friends/family here	3	1.6%	0	0.0%
To be near friends	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
Conditions of parole	1	0.5%	1	2.6%
Keep away from place I was living	0	0.0%	2	5.3%
Total:	184	100.0%	38	100.0%

Note: 1 Percentages may not add to exactly 100.0 due to rounding

The main reasons offered by Wanganui participants for leaving or staying in the Wanganui region are presented in Table 4.19. This shows that for 121 (66%) of the 184 inmates planning to leave the region the main reason was because home and family were elsewhere. For 18 (10%) of inmates who planned to leave and four (11%) of those who planned to stay employment opportunities were mentioned as the main reason for their decision.

5 Conclusions

This study was undertaken to collect information for the Department of Corrections prison site acquisition process. It was concerned with the nature and extent to which family and friends of inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons moved to be nearer to where inmates were imprisoned. The study also collected information about where inmates and their supporters planned to live when inmates were released from prison.

The research populations for the study were inmates at Rimutaka and Wanganui prisons who were serving sentences of 365 days or more. Ninety percent of inmates at Rimutaka prison and 88% of inmates at Wanganui prison were eligible to participate. Interviewers did not have access to all eligible participants, however good response rates of 60% for Rimutaka and 68% for Wanganui were obtained. These response rates were seen to support the decision for interviewers to administer questionnaires face to face, in a context where illiteracy rates, highly restrictive timetables and anti-justice sentiment can be some of the obstacles to research.

The study used the 1996 Statistics New Zealand system for prioritising ethnic groups to determine the ethnic composition of the participant populations at each prison. This showed that 50% of the Rimutaka participants and 48% of the Wanganui participants identified as Maori. Seventeen percent of the inmates in each sample identified as Pacific Peoples. Twenty nine percent of participants at Rimutaka and 32% of participants at Wanganui identified themselves as European only. The Wanganui participants were found to be slightly older, and were serving longer sentences than the Rimutaka participants. Information about how long inmates had spent at the current prison was not available for this study.

Findings about the origin of Rimutaka inmates were consistent with Department of Corrections expectations that the majority of Rimutaka inmates would come from the North Wellington region. The study found that 60% of inmates lived in Wellington, Kapiti/Horowhenua or Wairarapa prior to the commencement of their current term of imprisonment. Inmates' families were similarly distributed with just over half (51%) living in Wellington or a neighbouring region.

The majority (72%) of the Wanganui sample did not come from the local or neighbouring areas. Almost half (49%) of inmates in the Wanganui sample reported Auckland or Northland as their most recent place of residence prior to the commencement of their current term of imprisonment. Eleven percent of the Wanganui sample originated from the Wanganui region with 17% from the neighbouring regions of Taranaki and Manawatu. Ninety one percent of Wanganui participants reported that their families lived outside of the Wanganui region.

The geographical disparity reported between families and those in prison for the two samples indicated a need for supporters of the inmates to move if they wanted to improve their access to the prison. However, findings about the extent of inmate family and friend movement did not indicate significant movement of supporters related to either Rimutaka or Wanganui prison populations.

At Rimutaka prison, 13 (9%) of the 146 respondents reported that family or friends had moved, or planned to move, to be nearer to them while they were in prison. These 13 inmates reported 16 cases of movement in which a total of 52 family members or friends had moved to be nearer to them. In total, nine people were reported to have moved to Upper Hutt City.

Of the 13 inmates from Rimutaka who reported movement eight resided outside the local area prior to the commencement of their current term of imprisonment. These eight inmates represented 11% of the total 71 inmates at Rimutaka prison who were from outside the local area. The other five inmates who reported movement had lived locally prior to their current term of imprisonment and represented 7% of the total of 75 'local' inmates.

Although more of the inmates in the Wanganui sample originated from outside the prison area the study recorded slightly lower percentages of reported movement for the total participant population and the subgroup of inmates who had come from outside the local area. Eighteen (8%) of the 236 Wanganui participants reported movement or planned movement of family or friends to be closer to them. These 18 inmates reported a total of 17 cases of movement in which a total of 43 people moved to the prison area. The 18 inmates who reported movement, or planned movement, were all from outside the Wanganui region and represented 8.5% of the total 211 inmates who were from outside the Wanganui region.

Respondents who reported that family members or friends had moved were asked for the main reasons for the movement. All respondents who reported relocation of family or friends mentioned that the move was related to the need to improve access to the prison or to support the inmate. There were not enough cases of movement reported, nor variation of reasons given, to warrant further analysis of the specific reasons for movement.

This study also sought to determine whether those who had moved to be nearer to inmates did so permanently or would leave when the inmate was released and whether others would move to the area when an inmate was released. Some inmates however found it difficult to provide a response to these two questions either due to the length of their sentences or because they felt they couldn't speak for the plans of their supporters. The responses to these questions were incorporated into Table 4.11 and Table 4.12 to contribute to the picture of total movement. At Rimutaka, one person who had moved to be nearer to inmate was expected to leave when the inmate left the area when released. Three Rimutaka participants reported a total of four people were expected to move to the area due to inmate plans to stay in the area when released. For Wanganui there were no reports of expected movement resulting from inmate plans to stay in the area. Seven people were expected to leave the Wanganui area when their family member or friend was released from Wanganui prison.

Inmates' plans on release from prison were the final consideration of this study. The study showed that an almost identical percentage of Rimutaka participants planned to stay in the Wellington region (40%) as had reported living in the region prior to their imprisonment (41%). Similarly the percentage of inmates planning to stay in Upper Hutt (6%) was the same as the percentage who had lived there prior to their imprisonment (6%). Approximately 60% of those planning to leave and those planning to stay stated that the reason for their decision was to be at home or to be with, or nearer, to family.

For the Wanganui sample 78% of participants planned to leave the area when released, approximately a third planned to live in Auckland. Of the other 22%, 6% did not know where they planned to live, and 16% planned to stay in the area when released. Slightly more inmates planned to live in the Wanganui area (33) than had reported living there before prison (25). Wanganui participants also reported the main reason for leaving or staying in the area was to be at home, or to be with, or nearer, to family. Ten percent of inmates leaving the region and 10% of inmates staying in the region referred to employment opportunities as their main reason for leaving or staying.

The study found that for 9% of participants at Rimutaka and 8% of participants at Wanganui family or friends had moved or planned to move to be nearer to them while they were in prison. When considered in relation to the response rates of 60% for Rimutaka and 70% for Wanganui prison the study's findings about inmate family movement can be considered to offer a fairly accurate picture of movement for the total eligible participant populations at these two prisons. However, care needs to be taken in any generalisation of these findings to other prison populations. The potential for relocation of family and friends in relation to other prisons would need to be considered in terms of the unique demographic, social, geographical and economic pressures associated with the area in question.

References

Babbie, E. (1986). *The Practice of Social Research. 4th ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Lash, B. (1998). *Census of Prison Inmates 1997*, Wellington: Ministry of Justice

Senese, J.D. (1997). *Applied Research Methods in Criminal Justice*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.