



Research Publication

Visiting the Inside: A survey of visitors to NSW Correctional Centres

Judy McHutchison
Research Officer

Research Publication No. 43
May 2000
ISSN 0813 5800

NSW Department of Corrective Services

**Visiting the Inside:
A survey of visitors to NSW
Correctional Centres**

A study undertaken for the
NSW Department of Corrective Services

Judy McHutchison
Research Officer

MAY 2000

Acknowledgements

This study of visitors to New South Wales correctional centres was commissioned by the Operations Branch of the NSW Department of Corrective Services.

Thanks to CRC Justice Support for providing comments on the draft questionnaire used in this study.

Gratitude is also expressed to the members of the Research and Statistics Unit of the NSW Department of Corrective Services for their assistance with the study. Special thanks to Margaret Bowery the supervisor of this study and Simon Eyland, Director of the Research and Statistics Unit. Special thanks to Simon Corben for his assistance with the preparation of the data set of visitors names and addresses used in the mail out of the survey. Acknowledgements should also go to Antonia Barila and Barbara Thompson for their comments on drafts of this report.

During the preparation stage of this study the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre, Goulburn Correctional Centre, and Malabar Special Programs Centre were visited. Many thanks to the Officers-in-Charge of the visits sections of these centres for making time available to answer questions on the operation of those sections.

Most importantly sincere thanks is extended to the many visitors who made the time and effort to respond to this survey and therefore ensuring the success of the study.

Research Publication No. 43
ISSN 0813 5800

©NSW Department of Corrective Services

Research & Statistics Unit,
NSW Department of Corrective Services,
Level 11, 24 Campbell Street,
Sydney. NSW 2000

Telephone 02 9289 1554 Facsimilie: 02 9289 1590
Email: enquiries.nswdcs@a1.com.au

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	2
Methodology	5
Results	8
General survey	8
The correctional centres visited	8
Description of respondents	8
The relationship between visitors and inmates	8
The correctional centres visited by respondents	9
Travelling to visits	9
How long is the travelling time one way	9
How often do you visit?	9
Who brings children to the visits	10
Ages of children brought to visits	10
How would you describe the facilities for children	12
Problems when visiting	12
Waiting time at correctional centres	12
Satisfaction with visiting procedures	13
Opinions on visiting area	14
Behaviour of officers towards visitors	14
Factors which discourage visitors visiting more often	14
Information concerning visiting rights and conditions	15
Results of BIS section	16
Description of BIS respondents	16
Visitor opinions of BIS procedures	16
Access to written information on BIS	20
Visitor understanding of the BIS procedures	20
Protection of privacy	22
Discussion	23
The care of children	23
Transportation	24
Facilities in the visiting area	24
Visiting procedures	25
Provision of written information	26
Bio-metric Identification System (BIS)	26
Concerns of visitors	27
Privacy concerns of visitors	27
Pamphlet for BIS visitors	28
Concerns that BIS is time consuming or inefficient	28
References	29
Endnotes	29

Visiting the Inside: A survey of visitors to NSW Correctional Centres

Executive Summary

This study sought to obtain information which would assist the NSW Department of Corrective Services in providing appropriate facilities for visitors who visit inmates in the Department's correctional centres. Therefore the information sought pertained to the characteristics of visitors themselves and their opinions on the visiting facilities and conditions at the centre they were visiting.

During May 1999 the visitors who had visited NSW correctional centres in the month of March 1999 were mailed a survey with a return reply paid envelope.

Response rate

Of the 6044 surveys mailed to visitors of NSW correctional centres 1471 were returned completed. Therefore a response rate of 24% was achieved. This response rate varied across correctional centres from 11% at Parramatta to 57% at the minimum security section at the Malabar Correctional Centre (see Table 1).

Critical comments

The results in this report need to be carefully interpreted. Only 24% of visitors surveyed

responded. There is no way of knowing if the characteristics and experiences of these respondents are representative of the general population of visitors to NSW correctional centres.

Additionally, some of the results presented in this report are the collective responses of respondents from all the correctional centres rather than individual correctional centres. Although this overall information provides an indication of the level of visitor satisfaction generally there are a number of qualifications regarding its usefulness:

- the overall responses may not reflect what is happening at an individual correctional centre;
- the number of respondents varies across correctional centres. Therefore the overall responses are biased towards that of the respondents who visit correctional centres which have a large number of respondents to the survey.

This study is not directly comparable with the Eyland (1996) study. It is not possible to say if either study obtained a representative samples of visitors. The respondents in the Eyland study differed in characteristics

from the respondents in this study including the type of relationship they had with the inmate.

RESULTS

Below are the main findings of the study. For results in greater detail and the number of missing cases please refer to the main body of the report.

Description of survey respondents:

- 68% of the respondents were female;
- 78% of respondents were born in Australia;
- the respondents ages ranged from 5 years to 86 years an average age of 44 years;
- 7% of the respondents considered themselves to be Australian Aborigines or Torres Strait Islanders, and
- 38% of respondents were directly caring for children.

The correctional centres visited

- 28% of respondents visited maximum security centres;
- 18% of respondents visited median security centres, and
- 54% of respondents visited minimum security centres.

The relationship between visitors and inmates (see Table 3)

- 30% of respondents were visiting their son/daughter;
- 25% of respondents were visiting a friend;
- 14% of respondents were visiting their husband/defacto husband;
- 13% of respondents were visiting a brother/sister;
- 4% of respondents were visiting a father/mother;
- 1% of respondents were visiting a

- wife/defacto wife, and
- 13% other

Travelling to visits (see Table 4)

- 70% of respondents travelled to visits in their own car/motor cycle;
- 15% of respondents travelled to visits in someone else's car;
- 8% of respondents used public transport as their only means of travel;
- 4% of respondents used public transport plus taxi;
- 2% used the CRC bus;, and
- 2% other

Travelling time to correctional centre one-way

- 10% of respondents spent 20 minutes travelling time or less;
- 30% of respondents spent 50 minutes travelling time or less;
- 50% of respondents took one and half hours travelling time or less, and
- 10% of respondents spent four hours or more travelling time.

Travelling times to non-metropolitan centres took an average time of 149 minutes, whilst travelling time to metropolitan centres took an average time of 95 minutes. This was a statistically significant difference.

How often do you visit (see Table 5)

- 13% of respondents visited 2-3 times a week;
- 23% of respondents visit once a week;
- 27% of respondents visit 2-3 times a month;
- 27% of respondents visit once a month;
- 8% of respondents visit once or twice a year, and
- 2% of respondents visit less than once a year.

Who brings children to visits

- overall 43% of respondents brought children less than 18 years of age with them when they visited the correctional centre;
- 75% of respondents directly caring for a child in the community bring children to visits;
- 22% of respondents not directly caring for a child in the community also bring children to visits;
- 29% of respondents bringing children with them to visits were visiting their son/daughter;
- there was no statistically significant difference between the number of respondents taking children to visits at metropolitan and non-metropolitan correctional centres; and
- there was no statistically significant difference in the number of respondents who took children to correctional centres of different security classifications.

See Table 8 for age groups of children brought to visits.

Facilities for children (see Table 9)

- overall 52% of respondents who brought children to visits rated the facilities for children from excellent to fair, and
- there was great variation in how facilities were rated across correctional centres (see Table 30 which contains ratings for all respondents by the correctional centre visited).

Problems when visiting (see Table 10)

Respondents were asked, "How often is the following a problem for you when visiting?" (i.e., distance travelled, cost of visiting, access to public transport and arranging child care).

The following percentages of respondents stated these factors were a problem often or always.

- distance travelled 32%
- cost of visiting 31%
- access to public transport, 21%
- arranging child care, 10%

Waiting time at correctional centres as reported by respondents

- the average waiting time, to be processed, was 21 minutes;
- once processed, the average waiting time before moving to the visiting area was 14 minutes;
- average waiting times for respondents to be processed varied greatly across correctional centres from 3 minutes at Broken Hill Correctional Centre to 38 minutes at Silverwater correctional centre (see Table 31); and
- once processed additional waiting time before moving to the visits area varied from 2 minutes at Glen Innes Correctional Centre to 30 minutes at Goulburn (maximum security) (see Table 31).

Satisfaction with visiting procedures

Respondents were asked, "How satisfied have you been with the following?" (i.e., waiting time, visiting hours and security checks).

The following percentages of respondents stated they were rarely or never satisfied with these factors.

- waiting time 17%
- visiting hours 32%
- security checks 9%

Opinions on the visiting area

An itemised list of visiting facilities were presented to visitors in order to obtain a rating on the standard of those facilities. For the items listed respondents provided ratings of between excellent to fair in the following proportions.

	%	Missing data
Toilets	69	4
Lockers	77	6
Furniture - tables/chairs	77	2
Lighting	92	3
Temperature	80	4
Space	72	1
Disabled access	48	29
Waiting area	72	4
Drink machine	73	5
Food machine	51	10
Tea/coffee facilities	61	5
Canteen/cafeteria	32	16
Baby change area	27	35

Behaviour of officers towards visitors

Respondents were asked, "Are you treated politely by officers when you visit this gaol?"

- 77% of respondents reported being treated politely 'always' or 'usually';
- 16% of respondents reported being treated politely 'sometimes'; and
- 7% of respondents reported being treated politely 'rarely' or 'never'.

Factors which discourage visitors visiting more often

Respondents were asked, "Is there anything

which discourages you from visiting more often?"

Almost half the respondents (45%) stated that there were factor/s which discouraged them from visiting more often.

The main factors which discouraged respondents from visiting more often were:

- 20% of respondents reported distance, cost problems with transport;
- 7% of respondents reported the visiting hours;
- 6% of respondents reported the conditions within the visiting area;
- 6% of respondents reported the behaviour of officers; and
- 4% of respondents reported the waiting time.

As seen above 6 percent of respondents reported 'conditions within the visiting area' as discouraging them from visiting more often. The main concerns about conditions were:

- lack of recreation area for children (n=17);
- lack of space (n=15);
- food or drink machines unavailable or not operating (n=12);
- general atmosphere or conditions (n=10);
- either cold in winter or hot in summer (n=10);
- not being able to speak in private (n=9); and
- dirty toilets (n=7).

Information concerning visiting rights and conditions

More than one in five respondents (22%)

stated that they have received written information on visiting times, rules and conditions.

These 22% of respondents rated the written information as follows:

- 79% as excellent to good;
- 19% as fair;
- 3% as poor.

SUMMARY FOR BIS SECTION

Of the 6044 surveys mailed to visitors 1397 surveys were mailed to visitors who visit centres in which Biometric Identification System (BIS) technology is used to verify the identity of the visitor. Of the 1397 surveys mailed to visitors at BIS centres 319 (23%) surveys were completed and returned.

BIS is in operation at the following maximum security centres for male offenders:

- Lithgow Correctional Centre;
- Metropolitan Medical Transit Centre (MMTC);
- Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC), and
- in the maximum security sections of both Malabar Special Program Centre (MSPC) and Goulburn Correctional Centre.

The BIS involves

Enrolment on the BIS involves an officer:

- entering identification details provided by the visitor into the systems computer software system,
- photographing the visitor's head and shoulders; and
- scanning the visitor's thumb and/or finger(s).

Once visitors are enrolled on the BIS, subsequent visits would normally entail the entering of the visitor's name into the computer and the scanning of visitors thumb/finger to match the existing analogue for that visitor.

On the experience of being photographed visitors responded as follows:

- 31% of respondents nominated the experience as good;
- 54% of the respondents nominated the experience as satisfactory; and
- 11% of visitors respondents nominated the experience as unsatisfactory.

Of the 278 BIS respondents who stated the experience was good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory only 177 (64%) gave a reason for feeling the way they did (i.e., good 63%, satisfactory 59% and unsatisfactory 89%). The main reasons given by these 177 respondents for feeling the way they did are as follows:

Positive comments

- understood the need for security (27%);
- behaviour of officers good (13%);
- efficient (10%).

Negative comments

- invasion of privacy (11%);
- time consuming or inefficient (8%);
- the experience made them feel like an inmate (7%).

Respondents who had their fingers scanned described the 'first' experience as follows:

- 24% nominated the experience as good;
- 52% nominated the experience as satisfactory;
- 19% nominated the experience as unsatisfactory.

Of the 247 respondents who stated the experience was good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory only 155 (63%) gave a reason for feeling the way they did (i.e., good 50%, satisfactory 61% and unsatisfactory 83%). The main reasons given by these 155 respondents for feeling the way they did are as follows :

Positive comments

- understand the need for security (23%);
- behaviour of officers good (6%);
- it was no problem (6%).

Negative comments

- time consuming or inefficient (33%);
- invasion of privacy or intrusive (8%);
- the experience made them feel like an inmate (5%).

Respondents who had their fingers scanned on more than one occasion described the subsequent experiences as follows:

- 20% nominated the experience as good;
- 45% nominated the experience as satisfactory; and
- 25% nominated the experience as unsatisfactory.

Of the 167 respondents who stated the experience was good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory only 101 (60%) gave a reason for feeling the way they did (i.e., good 51%, satisfactory 50% and unsatisfactory 91%). The main reasons given by these 101 respondents for feeling the way they did are as follows :

Positive comments

- understand the need for security (13%)
- it was no problem (6%)
- behaviour of officers good (4%).

Negative Comments

- time consuming or inefficient (45%)
- invasion of privacy or intrusive (5%)
- the experience made them feel like an

inmate (6%)

Information for visitors on the operation of BIS

Only a very small number of the BIS respondents (approximately 3%) had received a copy of the BIS pamphlet or the visitors handbook.

Visitors level of knowledge on BIS procedures

On the quiz to establish the level of knowledge visitors had on BIS procedures:

- only 10% of respondents correctly stated that the BIS stored the image of their finger as a number;
- only 7% correctly stated that the data stored on their finger could not be recreated into a finger print.

The respondents were asked, “*Your privacy is protected because?*” Categories 1 2 and 3 were all correct with category 3 being the most accurate. The following responses were achieved:

- (i) the finger scanning system is not compatible with other systems (3.8%);
- (ii) there are strict regulations to protect your privacy (20.4%);
- (iii) both 1 and 2 above (34.0%); and
- (iv) don't know (29.2%).

Note: 12.6% respondents did not respond to this question.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the following issues receive careful consideration in the implementation of any visits policy and operating

procedures and in the revision of the current Visits Management Plan.

Children of visitors

- when new correctional centres are planned, serious consideration be given to incorporating indoor and outdoor activity areas for the children of visitors; and
- as financial resources permit, that this also happen in existing correctional centres.

Conditions within visiting areas

- the Department develop minimum acceptable hygiene standards for tea and coffee and toilet facilities in the visits sections; and
- when designing or renovating visitor sections high priority be given to including design features and materials which add to the amenity of the visits section such as those which reduce noise and those which are visually pleasing.

Visiting procedures

- Operations Branch should establish a working party to investigate the value of replacing correctional officers with civilian clerical staff in performing administrative tasks related to visitor processing. This would allow correctional officers to concentrate on security matters associated with visits, and
- Corrective Services Academy include customer relations skills as an essential component of the primary training of correctional officers.

Provision of information

- Operations Branch ensure that all correctional centres have appropriate written information in the form of a leaflet freely available to visitors on visiting rules, times and conditions;
- an enlarged version of this information be prominently displayed on a notice board in the visits waiting area;
- the phone number of the Inmate Placement Officer should continue to be prominently displayed on all written material so visitors can quickly establish the whereabouts of the inmate they wish to visit and
- additionally, unless there are policy or security reasons for not doing so, the phone number of the Inmate Placement Officer should be clearly displayed in the Sydney Telephone Directory.

Recommendations for operation of BIS

- the standard operating procedure should include distribution of the BIS pamphlet to each visitor during their initial enrolment on BIS;
- the BIS pamphlet be revised to include:
 - simpler language;
 - to address the concerns visitors have with being photographed;
 - more information to increase visitors understanding of the need for strict security measures, and
- given the level of concern by visitors on the time involved in BIS processing that the Operations Branch investigate measures to improve the efficiency of BIS.

Introduction

This study, commissioned by the Operations Branch of the NSW Department of Corrective Services, sought to obtain information which would assist the Department in providing appropriate facilities for visitors who visit inmates in the Department's correctional centres. Therefore the information sought pertained to the characteristics of visitors themselves and their opinions on the facilities and conditions of the centres they visited.

The operation of visiting sessions which allow inmates to receive visits from family and friends plays a prominent part in the routine of all correctional centres in NSW. In the year 1997 to 1998, 289,950 individual adult visitors participated in 187,226 visits¹ (Annual Report, 1998, p.42). Visiting facilities are provided at each correctional centre in NSW.

Why correctional centre visiting is important

Accommodating visits by members of the public places increased security, economic and human resource demands on the Department. However, there are considerable benefits to be gained by the criminal justice system and the broader community if relationships between inmates and their family and friends can be maintained.

Whilst the value of family and friends in assisting offenders away from crime would depend on their personal attributes and values there is evidence that generally families have a positive impact on offenders. A number of studies have found that offenders, with close family connections, were more likely to experience post release success as a result of the 'natural support system' which flowed from those connections

(Glaser, 1964; Holt and Miller, 1972; Schafer, 1991; Schafer, 1994).²

Other benefits that emanate from inmate visiting concerns the beneficial impact on the morale of inmates which results in more positive behaviour within correctional centres (Schafer, 1994, p.17; Aungles, 1994, p.112).

Visiting in NSW Correctional Centres

In order to assist inmates to maintain family and other personal relationships, visiting facilities are provided at all correctional centres in NSW. Beyond the standard requirements as set down in the Regulations under the Correctional Centres Act (1952) and the Department's Operations Procedures Manual, visiting hours and length are at the discretion of Governors at each correctional centre.

Inmate visitation is resource intensive because of the nature of the visiting situation which requires the identifying, screening and scanning of visitors as well as the locating, processing and searching of inmates and the supervision of visits. Some correctional centres have more than one visiting section in order to segregate inmates of different security classifications. The facilities for visitors and the visiting rules and conditions can vary markedly from centre to centre as well as between visiting sections within the same correctional centre.

Personal identification is required from all visitors who attend correctional centres in NSW. At their first attendance, all adult visitors are recorded on the Offender Management System (OMS) and given a Visitor Identification Number (VIN). At each visit adult visitors must fill in a slip with their

personal details and the name of the inmate they wish to visit. Visitors must be over 18 years of age unless accompanied by an adult. Restrictions stipulate the type of belongings visitors can take with them into visits sections. Usually lockers are available in which visitors can place their belongings for the duration of the visit.

The Department assists visitors to non-metropolitan correctional centres with the cost of visiting by financially subsidising a bus service through CRC Justice Support. Also visitors experiencing financial hardship can apply to the Department for financial assistance for transport and accommodation costs in order to visit a particular inmate.

The establishment of the Biometric Identification System (BIS)

In recent years new developments have occurred in the processing of visitors to NSW correctional centres. In 1996, the Biometric Identification System (BIS)³ was introduced into a number of maximum security centres. BIS is used to scan the thumb or fingers of inmate visitors, correctional centre staff and inmates. The BIS has been operating at the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre since the commencement of operations at that centre in July 1997. The stated aims for the implementation of BIS were to improve visitor processing, help prevent escapes and prevent trafficking in drugs

BIS is one of a number of developments in technology which have been used to assist in the management and security at correctional centres. In NSW, as well as the BIS, cameras, smart cards and wrist bands are employed to enhance safety, security and efficiency of inmate management.

In order to be permitted entry to maximum

security correctional centres adult visitors are required to be registered on BIS. When visitors are first registered on the BIS the process involves an officer entering the personal identification details of the visitor into the systems computer software system. In addition, the process involves:

- photographing the visitor's head and shoulders; and
- scanning the visitor's thumb and/or finger(s).

Once a visitor is enrolled on the BIS, subsequent visits would normally entail the entering of the visitor's name into the computer and the scanning of visitor's thumb/finger to match the existing analogue for that visitor. Officers can also visually match the visitor's physical appearance with the photographic image which comes up on the computer screen once the visitor has been matched with an existing entry in the data base.

Since the implementation of BIS into NSW correctional centres, a number of non-government and government bodies including the NSW Privacy Committee, have expressed concern regarding the potential of BIS to breach the privacy of visitors. It has been claimed that requiring a visitor to be photographed or fingerprinted is treating them in a manner which is normally associated with criminality (Godfrey, 1998).

In November 1997 the Department introduced new regulations to govern the operation of BIS in order to address these privacy concerns. In summary, the regulations prohibit:

- the storing of fingerprint data once a biometric analogue is constructed;
- the storing of this information on any

other Departmental data base, and

- attempting to reconstruct a finger print pattern from the biometric analogue.

The regulations also include a requirement that the photo image of the visitor must be eliminated six months after their last visit or as soon as possible after that person has requested a deletion from the computer system.

A pamphlet for inmate visitors explaining the BIS system titled, *Biometric Visitor Identification System: Information for Visitors*, was produced after the implementation of BIS. This pamphlet draws attention to the intrinsic features of BIS which prevent its use in a manner which could compromise privacy, that is:

- it does not store a finger print;
- a finger print cannot be recreated, and
- the information stored is not in a form which would be compatible with that of other government agencies.

To further address concerns with BIS it was proposed to conduct a research study at a later date which would ascertain visitors experience with BIS. This current study therefore, as well as investigating visiting conditions in general, sought to gather information on visitors' experiences with BIS.

Previous research in NSW

In 1994, as part of NSW Department of Corrective Services' contribution to the International Year of the Family, the Research and Statistics Unit undertook a study of visitors to correctional centres. The report, Eyland (1996), contained a number of recommendations for the improvement of

visiting facilities and conditions. These included:

- information packages including information pertinent to visitors of specific centres to be printed and distributed;
- appropriate training modules for Officer-In-Charge of visits;
- improvement of visiting areas, and
- the development of standardised grievance handling procedures.

On the basis of these recommendations, the Operations Branch developed and implemented a Visits Management Plan⁴. The implementation of this plan was evaluated by the Operations Branch in early 1998 using information provided by Regional Commanders.

Aims of this present study

The aims of this study were to obtain information which would provide a social profile of visitors and an understanding of factors which influence their visiting behaviour and their satisfaction with the facilities provided.

Included in this study were questions relating to visitors' experience with BIS. It was anticipated that such information would assist the Department in identifying and meeting the needs of inmate visitors to NSW correctional centres.

Methodology

A questionnaire largely based on the visitors' survey employed in the Eyland (1996) study was drafted. This draft questionnaire was made available to relevant personnel within the Department and to community support groups for comment. These comments were taken into account in the final version of the questionnaire.

Usable names and addresses of visitors who were family or friends of the inmate visited (i.e., not legal, police, professional or religious visitors) and who had visited a NSW correctional centre in March 1999 were downloaded from the Offender Management System (OMS) by the Information Technology Branch (ITB).

A data set of 10,023 names and addresses was received from the ITB. The number of inmates varies from correctional centre to correctional centre. Consequently correctional centres also vary in the number of visitors attending them. In this study, in those cases in which a correctional centre had a large number of visitors, a random sample of visitors was extracted from those visiting that centre. The percentages (or weights) used for the larger centres were intended to produce a data set of approximately 250 names and addresses. The number selected for the MRRC was larger because as a remand centre, inmates may have more quickly been transferred to other centres or released making it less likely that the visitors would respond to the survey.

The mailing of the survey commenced on 17th May 1999. A total of 6044 surveys were mailed to inmate visitors. To encourage visitors to respond to the survey, a large poster was placed in a prominent position in all visiting sections informing visitors of the impending survey. Some leaflets, the same

design as the poster, were also made available for visitors.

A telephone interpreter service was made available to non-English speaking visitors but only one visitor made use of this service and upon doing so decided not to respond to the survey.

Response rate

Of the 6044 surveys mailed to visitors registered on the Department's data base of visitors 1471 surveys were completed and returned. Table 1 lists the correctional centres included in the survey and states the number of surveys mailed to visitors and the number of surveys returned completed or returned unopened. As seen in Table 1 the overall response rate was 24 percent of the surveys mailed, the same response as for the Eyland (1996) study. There were 471 surveys returned unopened because either the visitor had moved from that address or had given an incorrect address when registering for a visit. If the number of surveys returned unopened are subtracted from the number mailed a net response rate of 26 percent is derived.

The response rate, as seen in Table 1, varied markedly from correctional centre to correctional centre:

- the minimum security section of the Malabar Special Programs Centre (MSP) achieved the highest response rate of 57%, and
- the Parramatta Correctional Centre and Broken Hill Correctional Centre achieved the lowest response rates of 11 percent and 12 percent respectively⁵.

Table 1: Surveys mailed and the number and percentage returned

Centre	Usable addresses	Weight	Number mailed	Number completed & returned	% returned (a)	Number returned unopened	% returned (b)
Berrima	84	100	84	32	38	7	42
Broken Hill	84	100	84	10	12	10	14
Bathurst - medium	157	100	157	27	17	9	18
Bathurst - minimum	227	100	227	49	22	17	23
Cessnock (F-wing)	3	100	3	0	0	1	0
Cessnock (D/E-wings)	119	100	119	31	26	9	28
Cessnock (ABC wings)	489	50	244	59	24	20	26
Emu Plains - main	115	100	115	30	26	7	28
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	84	100	84	25	30	10	34
Goulburn - maximum	188	100	188	49	26	18	29
Goulburn - minimum	128	100	128	34	27	3	27
Glen Innes	52	100	52	12	23	1	24
Grafton - female	23	100	23	3	13	3	15
Grafton - medium	98	100	98	21	21	11	24
Grafton - minimum	156	100	156	41	26	11	28
Junee - medium	159	100	159	59	37	19	42
Junee - minimum	144	100	144	42	29	15	33
Kirkconnell	309	80	247	80	32	19	35
Long Bay Hospital	139	100	139	31	22	13	25
Lithgow	333	80	266	71	27	14	28
Mannus	106	100	106	39	37	15	43
Muswellbrook (St. Heliers)	296	80	236	57	24	21	27
Metro. Med. Transient Centre	500	50	250	50	20	28	23
Metro. Rem. & Rec. Centre	2243	20	474	92	19	41	21
Malabar Sp. Progs. - maximum	219	100	219	57	26	8	27
Malabar Sp. Progs. - minimum	80	100	80	46	57	10	66
Mulawa	430	70	296	54	18	23	20
Oberon	101	100	101	27	27	8	29
Parklea	531	50	266	69	26	16	28
Parklea - minimum work release	219	100	219	40	18	19	20
Parramatta	338	70	236	26	11	8	11
Silverwater	636	40	254	58	23	19	25
Tamworth	108	100	108	24	22	3	23
Training Centre	613	40	245	53	22	25	24
Windsor (John Morony)	474	50	237	73	31	10	32
TOTAL	9985		6044	1471	24	471	26

Notes:

- (a) This is the return rate without subtracting the surveys returned unopened from number mailed.
- (b) this is the return rate after subtracting the number returned unopened from the number mailed.

Other correctional centres which achieved high response rates were:

- Berrima Correctional Centre, which achieved a response rate of 38% (the same response as in the Eyland (1996) study), and
- Mannus Correctional Centre and Junee (medium security) which both achieved a response rate of 37 percent.

In this study Mulawa Correctional Centre, one of the two female correctional centres in NSW, received a low response rate 18% (the same response rate as in the Eyland (1996) study). The other women's correctional centre, Emu Plains Correctional Centre, received a higher response rate than Mulawa for both its main visiting section and the Jacaranda cottage visiting section (26% and 30% respectively).

Results

The results of this survey are set out below.

The correctional centres visited

- 28% of respondents visited maximum security centres;
- 18% of respondents visited median security centres; and
- 54% of respondents visited minimum security centres.

Description of respondents

- 68% of the respondents were female;
- 78% of respondents were born in Australia;
- the respondents ages ranged from 5 years to 86 years (an average age of 44 years);
- seven percent of the respondents considered themselves to be Australian Aborigines or Torres Strait Islanders; and
- 38% of respondents were directly caring for children.

Table 2 contains the sex and age group of respondents to correctional centres. It can be seen that although there is a strong showing in the age groups from 40-44 to 50-54 the other age groups are also well represented.

The relationship between visitors and inmates

Table 3 contains the responses regarding the

type of relationship between inmates and respondents. As with the Eyland (1996) study, the most common relationship described by respondents in this study was that the inmate was their son/daughter (30%). Due to the higher representation of male inmates in the correctional system, it is likely that most of these parents were visiting a son.

Table 2: Age by gender for all respondents

Age	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female		Num.	%
	Num.	%	Num.	%		
< 18	4	0.9	10	1.0	14	1.0
18-20	18	3.9	61	6.3	79	5.6
21-24	31	6.8	93	9.6	124	8.7
25-29	29	6.4	106	11.0	135	9.5
30-34	20	4.4	93	9.6	113	7.9
35-39	28	6.1	75	7.8	103	7.2
40-44	50	11.0	102	10.6	152	10.7
45-49	69	15.1	102	10.6	171	12
50-54	61	13.4	112	11.6	174	12.2
55-59	45	9.9	80	8.3	125	8.8
60-64	34	7.5	44	4.6	78	5.5
65+	67	14.7	87	9.0	154	10.8
Total	456	100.0	965	100.0	1422	100.0

Notes: There is missing data for 49 cases in this table.

The next most common relationship between inmates and respondents was friend (25%). This is higher than what was found in the Eyland (1996) study. If the response categories (of friend and boyfriend/girlfriend) in the Eyland study are aggregated a percentage of only 19 percent is achieved for the Eyland study.

In this study, the category of husband/defacto achieved a response of 14%, a lower response than the 22% achieved by the Eyland (1996) study. However, the category of wife/defacto achieved exactly the same response as in the Eyland (1996) study of 1.2%.

Table 3: Relationship of inmate to visitor

Relationship to respondent	Num.	%
Husband/de facto	196	13.5
Wife/defacto	18	1.2
Friend/boyfriend girlfriend	365	25.1
House mate	6	0.4
Brother/sister	184	12.7
Son/daughter	432	29.7
Father/mother	59	4.1
Brother/sister/defacto in-laws	37	2.5
Former partner	6	0.4
Fiancee	11	0.8
Other	140	9.6
Total	1454	100

Note: There is missing data for 17 cases in this table.

The correctional centres visited by respondents

- 28% of respondents visited maximum security centres;
- 18% of respondents visited medium security centres; and
- 54% of respondents visited minimum security centres.

Travelling to visits

In response to the question, “*How do you usually travel to the gaol?*” the following responses were received:

As can be seen in Table 4 most respondents (70%) travelled to visits using their own vehicle or motor cycle. Only 8 percent of respondents used public transport to visit centres. When visitors to metropolitan correctional centres were compared with visitors to non-metropolitan correctional centres the visitors to metropolitan correctional centres tended to use public transport more than respondents visiting non-metropolitan correctional centres (14% and 2% respectively).

How long is the travelling time one way

Respondents were asked the time it took to travel one way to the correctional centre they were visiting. Of the 1471 respondents, 1450 responded to this question.

- the average time respondents spent travelling one-way was two hours one way;
- 10% of respondents spent 20 minutes travelling time or less;
- 30% of respondents spent 50 minutes travelling time or less;
- 50% of respondents took one and half hours travelling time or less; and
- 10% of respondents spent four hours or more travelling time.

Travelling times to non-metropolitan centres took an average time of 149 minutes, whilst travelling time to metropolitan centres took an average time of 95 minutes. This was a statistically significant difference.

An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the average travelling times experienced by visitors to non-metropolitan correctional centres ($x=149$ minutes) compared to visitors to metropolitan correctional centres ($x=95$ minutes); ($t=-4.6$, $df=1448$, $p<.001$).

How often do you visit?

In response to this question, “*On average how often do you visit this prisoner in gaol?*” the following responses were received.

Table 4: Usual means of transport to correctional centres for visits

Transport	Metropolitan centres		Non-metropolitan centres		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Own car/motor cycle	470	69.1	529	71.5	999	70.4
Someone else's car	85	12.5	126	17.0	211	14.9
Public transport only	96	14.1	16	2.2	112	7.9
Walk/push bike			10	1.4	10	0.7
Taxi only	1	0.1			1	0.1
Public transport plus taxi	18	2.6	35	4.7	53	3.7
CRC bus	5	0.7	18	2.4	23	1.6
Other	5	0.7	6	0.8	11	0.8
Total	680	100.0	740	100	1420	100

Note: There is missing data for 51 cases in this table.

Table 5: How often do you visit this prisoner

Respondents visiting	Number	%
2-3 times a week	180	12.6
Once a week	335	23.4
2-3 times a month	379	26.5
Once a month	381	26.6
Once every six weeks or more	8	0.6
Once or twice a year	119	8.3
Less than once a year	25	1.7
Total	1427	100

Note: There is data missing from 44 cases in this table.

The results in Table 5 show that 36 percent of respondents visited at least once a week with a further 27 percent visiting at least once a fortnight.

Who brings children to the visits

Overall 620 respondents (42%) reported bringing children less than 18 years with them when they visited the correctional centre.

As seen in Table 6, 75 percent of respondents directly caring for a child in the community bring children to visits whilst 22 percent not directly caring for a child in the community also bring a child to visits.

The characteristics of respondents who directly care for children in the community and bring children to visits are shown below in Table 7a.

The characteristics of respondents who do not directly care for children in the community and bring children to visits are shown below in Table 7b.

Ages of children brought to visits

Table 8 contains the number of children in each age group that respondents brought with them to visits.

As seen in Table 8 respondents to this survey bring a total of 1260 children with them when they visit correctional centres.

There was no statistically significant difference in the number of respondents who brought children to visits between non-metropolitan correctional centres and metropolitan correctional centres. Nor was there a statistically significant difference between the number of respondents who took children to correctional centres of different security classifications.

Table 6: Number of respondents who bring children to visits by the number directly caring for children

Brings children to visit	Parent or person directly caring for a child				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	415	74.5	186	22.4	601	43.3
No	142	25.5	645	77.6	787	56.7
Total	557	100	831	100	1388	100

Note: There are 84 cases missing cases in this table.

Table 7a: Respondents who care for children in the community and bring children to visits

Inmate relationship to visitors	Gender of respondents				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Husband/defacto			111	34.4	111	27.5
Wife/defacto	5	6.3	4	1.2	9	2.2
Friend	17	21.3	52	16.1	69	17.1
House mate			1	0.3	1	0.2
Brother/sister	14	17.5	43	13.3	57	14.1
Son/daughter	29	36.3	68	21.1	98	24.3
Father/mother	6	7.5	13	4.0	19	4.7
Brother/sister/defacto inlaws	4	5	9	2.8	13	3.2
Former partner			3	0.9	3	0.7
Fiancee			1	0.3	1	0.2
Other	5	6.3	18	5.6	23	5.6
Total	81	100.0	323	100.0	404	100.0

Table 7b: Respondents who do not care for children in the community and bring children to visits

Inmate relationship to visitors	Gender of respondents				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Husband/defacto			10	8.1	10	5.4
Friend	10	16.7	16	12.9	26	14.1
House mate	1	1.7	2	1.6	3	1.6
Brother/sister	10	16.7	17	13.7	27	14.7
Son/daughter	26	43.3	53	42.7	79	42.9
Father/mother	4	6.7	7	5.6	11	6.0
Brother/sister/defacto in laws	2	3.3	2	1.6	4	2.2
Fiancee			3	2.4	3	1.6
Other	7	11.7	14	11.3	21	11.4
Total	60	100.0	124	100.0	184	100.0

Table 8: Age group of children brought to visits

Age groups of children	Numbers in age groups	Percentage of total number of children
<2 years	198	16.7
3-5 years	332	26.3
5-12 years	417	33
13+	313	24.8
Total	1260	100

How would you describe the facilities for children

The survey asked respondents to rate the facilities provided for children within the centres on a five point scale ranging from 'excellent' to 'doesn't exist'.

Table 9 compares the responses of respondents according to the security classification of the correctional centre they visit. Although overall the facilities for children were rated more positively the lower the security classification of the correctional centre visited, it can be seen in Table 30 in Annex 1 that there was great variation in how facilities for children were rated within security classifications.

Problems when visiting

Table 10 shows the distribution of responses received in relation to the question "*How often is the following a problem for you when visiting?*"

As can be seen approximately a third of respondents have a problem 'often' or 'always' with the distance travelled and the cost of visiting. Twenty one percent have a problem 'often' or 'always' with access to public transport whilst 10 percent have a problem 'often' or 'always' with arranging child care'.

Waiting time at correctional centres

In reply to the question, "*Once you have arrived for a visit how long do you usually have to wait to be processed?*"

- respondents reported an average waiting time of 21 minutes;
- 50% of respondents reported a waiting time of 15 minutes or less; and
- 10% of respondents waited 45 minutes or more.

Visitors were asked, "*Once you have been processed how long do you usually have to wait before you are allowed to move to the area where the visit will take place?*"

The average waiting time before permission to move to the actual visiting area was 14 minutes.

- 50% of respondents had a waiting time that was ten minutes or less, and
- 25% of respondents reported a waiting time of 30 minutes or more.

When analysis was undertaken on the basis of the security classification of the centre visited the mean waiting time to be processed was:

- 29 minutes at maximum security centres;
- 22 minutes at medium security centres, and
- 16 minutes at minimum security centres.

Table 9: Facilities for children by security classification

Facilities for children	Security classification						Total	
	Maximum		Medium		Minimum			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Excellent	6	1.9	4	1.8	47	7.2	57	4.7
Good	30	9.4	43	18.9	198	30.1	271	22.5
Fair	81	25.5	63	27.8	211	32.1	355	29.5
Poor	115	36.2	76	33.5	121	18.4	312	26.0
Don't exist	86	27.0	41	18.1	80	12.2	207	17.2
Total	318	100.0	227	100.0	657	100.0	1202	100.0

Table 10: Problems when visiting

Problems	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Distanced travelled	31.5	11.2	25.7	9.4	22.2	100
Cost of visiting	35.5	12.7	21.3	11.7	18.8	100
Access to public transport	64.1	6.8	8.2	6.0	14.7	100
Arranging child care	77.7	4.3	8.2	3.1	6.7	100

A statistical test comparing these mean waiting times for processing showed a statistically significant difference in average waiting times between the correctional centres of different security classifications. However, as seen in Table 31 in Annex 1 mean waiting times varied considerably between correctional centres within security classifications.

Once processed the mean waiting time before respondents were admitted to the visits area was:

- 23 minutes for maximum security;
- 13 minutes for medium security; and
- 9 minutes for minimum security.

A statistical test comparing these mean waiting times showed a statistically significant difference in average waiting times between the correctional centres of different security classifications. However, again mean waiting times varied considerably

between correctional centres within security classifications(see Table 31).

Satisfaction with visiting procedures

Table 11 shows the distribution of responses received in relation to the question, “How satisfied have you been with the following?”

As seen in Table 11 seventeen percent of respondents were ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ satisfied with the waiting time and 16 percent were ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ satisfied with the visiting hours. Nine percent were ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ satisfied with the security checks. The responses in Table 11 were divided into two categories ‘very - mostly’ and ‘sometimes-never’. These results are presented in Tables 32, 33 and 34 (Annex 1). As can be seen in these tables satisfaction with the waiting times, visiting hours and security checks varied between correctional centres.

Table 11: Satisfied with visiting procedures

Visiting procedures	Very	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Waiting time	24.4	35	22.7	10.2	6.8	100
Visiting hours	35.3	34.5	14.7	8.8	6.8	100
Security checks	43	33.8	14.1	4.9	4.1	100

Opinions on visiting area

An itemised list of visiting facilities were presented to visitors in order to obtain a rating on the standard of those facilities. For the items listed respondents provided ratings of between excellent to fair in the following proportions.

Table 12: opinions on visiting area

Visiting area	Excellent/Fair	
	% of respondents	% of missing cases
Toilets	69	4
Lockers	77	6
Furniture tables/chairs	77	2
Lighting	92	3
Temperature	80	4
Space	72	1
Disabled access	48	29
Waiting area	72	4
Drink machine	73	5
Food machine	51	10
Tea/coffee facilities	61	5
Canteen/cafeteria	32	16
Baby change area	27	35

As seen in Table 12 there was a substantial number of missing cases for some of the items particularly disabled access, baby change area and canteen/cafeteria. It appears that where respondents have no direct experience of specific facilities or a facility is not present at the correctional centre they are visiting that some decline to provide a response.

Behaviour of officers towards visitors

In response to the question “Are you treated politely by officers when you visit this gaol?” the following results were achieved.

Table 13: Are you treated politely by officers

Treatment by Officers	Number	Percent of respondents
Always	612	43.1
Usually	476	33.5
Sometimes	229	16.1
Rarely	68	4.8
Never	36	2.5
Total	1421	100

Note: There is data missing for 50 cases in this table.

As seen in Table 13, 77 percent of visitors reported being treated politely ‘always’ or ‘usually’; 16 percent reported being treated politely ‘sometimes’, whilst seven percent reported being treated politely either ‘rarely’ or ‘never’. As seen in Table 35 in Annex 1 responses regarding the politeness of officers varied across correctional centres.

Factors which discourage visitors visiting more often

Visitors were asked, “Is there anything which discourages you from visiting more often?”

Of the 1471 respondents 657 (44.7%) stated there were factor/s which discouraged them visiting more often.

Table 14: Factors which discourage respondents visiting more often.

Factors	Number	Percent of all respondents
Distance cost problems with transport	293	19.9
Visiting hours	105	7.1
Conditions within visiting area	87	5.9
Behaviour of officers	81	5.5
Waiting time	60	4.1
Due to own personal reasons lack of time etc	47	3.2
Rules of visiting	26	1.8
Not enough time with inmate	25	1.7
Behaviour of inmates	7	0.5
Other	67	4.6

Notes: Some respondents gave more than one reason for being discouraged.

As seen in Table 14, 20 percent or one in five respondents, stated that the ‘distance and cost of transport’ was the thing which discouraged them from visiting more often. Seven percent cited visiting hours the majority of these preferring to visit on week days rather than weekends.

Six percent of respondents, or approximately one in twenty, cited the conditions within the visiting area as a factor which discouraged them from visiting more often. The most common conditions cited were

- lack of recreation area for children (n=17);
- the lack of space (n=15);
- not being able to speak in private (n=9);
- either cold in winter or hot in summer (n=10);
- dirty toilets (n=7);
- food and drink machines not available or operating (n=12);
- general atmosphere and conditions (n=10), and

- the level of noise (n=3).

As seen in Table 14 six percent referred to the ‘behaviour of officers’ as factors which discouraged them from visiting more often. Visitors described this behaviour as impolite or treating them in a manner they perceived as more appropriate for inmates.

Table 15: Standard of written information

How would you describe this information	Number	% of respondents who received written information
Excellent	68	21.5
Good	180	57
Fair	60	19
Poor	8	2.5
Total	316	100

Note: There were 9 missing cases missing in this table.

Information concerning visiting rights and conditions

Visitors were asked, “*Have you been provided with written information by the Department about visiting times, visiting rules and conditions etc?*”

Twenty two percent of the respondents reported having obtained written information on visiting times, rules and conditions. Those respondents rated the quality of the

information as shown in Table 15.

As seen in Table 15, 79 percent of respondents rated the written information either excellent or good.

(b) Results of BIS section

BIS is in operation at the following maximum security centres for male offenders:

- Lithgow Correctional Centre;
- Metropolitan Medical Transit Centre (MMTC);
- Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC), and
- in the maximum security sections of both Malabar Special Program Centre (MSPC) and Goulburn Correctional Centre.

As seen in Table 16 of the 1397 surveys mailed to visitors of correctional centres in which BIS is in operation 319 surveys were returned completed, a response rate of 23%. One hundred and nine were returned unopened due to the address not being correct or the visitor having left the address.

Description of BIS respondents

- 70% of the BIS respondents were female;
- 78% of the BIS respondents were born in Australia;
- 9% of the BIS respondents identified themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders;
- the BIS respondents ranged in age from 5 years to 80 years with an average age of 43 years; and
- 41% the BIS respondents were directly

caring for children.

The centres in which BIS operate in NSW are maximum security centres containing male inmates.

Visitor opinions of BIS procedures

Two hundred and eighty three respondents (283) who visited BIS centres reported being photographed. These visitors were asked, “*Was this experience ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’?*” The 278 responses to this question are in Table 18.

As can be seen in Table 18, 33 percent of the respondents who had been photographed stated that this experience was ‘good’, whilst 56 percent stated that the experience was ‘satisfactory’ and 12 percent stated that the experience was ‘unsatisfactory’.

Visitors who responded to the above question were then asked, “*Why do you feel this way?*”. The response categories to this question are in Table 19. A high number of visitors who cited the experience was ‘good’ or ‘satisfactory’ did not explain why they felt this way and are therefore not included in this table. Visitors who nominated the experience of being photographed as ‘unsatisfactory’ were more likely to provide an explanation as to the reason they felt that way and therefore more likely to be included in this table.

As can be seen in Table 19, the highest number of responses in both the ‘good’ and ‘satisfactory’ columns was the ‘*understand the need for security*’ category (35% and 30% respectively) . Another high response in the ‘good’ column was for the category titled ‘*behaviour of officers good*’ (33%).

Table 16: Surveys mailed and the number and percentage returned

Centre	Usable addresses	Weight (a.)	Number mailed	Number completed & returned	% returned (b.)	Number returned unopened	% returned (c.)
GLB Max	188	100	188	49	26	18	29
LGW	333	80	266	71	27	14	28
MMTC	500	50	250	50	20	28	23
MRRC	2243	20	474	92	19	41	21
MSP Max	219	100	219	57	26	8	27
TOTAL	9985		1397	319	23	109	25

Notes:
 (a) Percentage of the usable addresses used in mail out.
 (b) This is the return rate without subtracting the surveys returned unopened from the number mailed.
 (c) This is the return rate after subtracting the number returned unopened from the number mailed.

Table 17: Age by gender for BIS respondents

Age	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female		Number	%
	Number	%	Number	%		
Under 18			2	0.9	2	0.7
18-20	6	6.7	12	5.5	18	5.9
21-24	4	4.4	25	11.5	29	9.4
25-29	1	1.1	25	11.5	26	8.5
30-34	6	6.7	24	11.1	30	9.8
35-39	8	8.9	14	6.5	22	7.2
40-44	7	7.8	21	9.7	28	9.1
45-49	16	17.8	25	11.5	41	13.4
50-54	12	13.3	30	13.8	42	13.7
55-59	9	10	20	9.2	29	9.4
60-64	4	4.4	11	5.1	15	4.9
65+	17	18.9	8	3.7	25	8.1
Total	90	100	217	100	307	100

Note: There are 12 missing cases in this table.

Table 18: Experience of being photographed by correctional centre

Centre	Good		Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %
GLB -Max	14	36.8%	20	52.6%	4	10.5%	38	100.0%
LGW	15	25.4%	37	62.7%	7	11.9%	59	100.0%
MMTC	15	31.9%	27	57.4%	5	10.6%	47	100.0%
MRRC	32	40.0%	39	48.8%	9	11.3%	80	100.0%
MSP - Max	15	27.8%	32	59.3%	7	13.0%	54	100.0%
Total	91	32.7%	155	55.8%	32	11.5%	278	100.0%

Note: Two hundred and eighty three respondents had been photographed. There are five missing cases in this table.

Table 19: The experience of being photographed and the reasons for response

Why do you feel this way	good		satisfactory		unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Understand need for service	20	35.1	27	29.7			47	27
Behaviour of officers good	19	33.3	4	4.4			23	13
Efficient	9	15.8	9	9.9			18	10
No problem	5	8.8	5	5.5			10	6
Invasion of privacy			9	9.9	10	35.7	19	11
Behaviour of officers poor			4	4.4	2	7.1	6	3
Time consuming or inefficient	1	1.8	8	7.7	5	17.9	14	8
Feel like an inmate			7	7.7	6	21.4	13	7
Not necessary			1	1.1	1	3.6	2	1
Personal reasons	1	1.8	4	4.4	2	7.1	7	3
Uncomfortable			2	2.2	1	3.6	3	2
Other	2	3.5	12	13.2	1	3.6	15	8
Total	57	100.0	92	100.0	28	100	177	100

Notes: Caution needs to be used in interpreting this table. Thirty one of the visitors who stated the experience was good, 61 visitors who stated the experience was satisfactory and three visitors who stated the experience was unsatisfactory did not give a reason for feeling this way and they are therefore not included in this table.

Looking at the responses in the ‘unsatisfactory’ column it can be seen that the most common reason given by visitors for stating that the experience was unsatisfactory was that they viewed being photographed as an ‘invasion of privacy’ (36%). Other reasons for the experience being ‘unsatisfactory’ included ‘feel like an inmate’ (21%) and that it was ‘time consuming or inefficient’ (18%).

scribed it as ‘satisfactory’ and 21 percent as ‘unsatisfactory’.

Table 20: Thumb or fingers scanned

	Number	% of responses
Yes at one visit only	65	20.4
Yes at more than one visit	186	58.2
No	40	12.6
Unsure	2	.6
Missing	26	8.2
Total	319	100.0

Table 20 shows the number of respondents who had a thumb/fingers scanned. Sixty-five respondents only had their finger scanned at one visit and 186 respondents had their fingers scanned on more than one visit.

Respondents were asked why they felt ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’ about their first experience of finger scanning. These responses are in Table 22. Table 22 also needs to be interpreted with caution because of the large number of responses missing from the ‘good’ and ‘satisfactory’ columns. Again (as with Table 19) those visitors nominating the experience as ‘unsatisfactory’ were more likely to give a reason for feeling this way.

As seen in Table 21, 24 percent of visitors described the first experience of finger scanning as ‘good’, whilst 55 percent de-

scribed it as ‘satisfactory’ and 21 percent as ‘unsatisfactory’.

As can be seen in Table 22 in the ‘good’ column the ‘understand the need for security’ was the category with the highest number of responses (53.3%). The highest number of responses in both the ‘satisfactory’ column and the ‘unsatisfactory’ column were for the ‘time consuming or inefficient’ category (29% and 63% respectively).

In Table 23, it can be seen that 12 respondents, 10% who found their first experience of finger scanning either ‘good’ or ‘satisfactory’, found it ‘unsatisfactory’ on subsequent occasions.

Table 21: The first experience of finger scanning by correctional centre

Centre	good		satisfactory		unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %
GLB - Max	11	26.8%	17	41.5%	13	31.7%	41	100.0%
LGW	9	14.8%	43	70.5%	9	14.8%	61	100.0%
MMTC	14	29.2%	28	58.3%	6	12.5%	48	100.0%
MRRC	16	36.4%	19	43.2%	9	20.5%	44	100.0%
MSP - Max	10	18.9%	28	52.8%	15	28.3%	53	100.0%
Total	60	24.3%	135	54.7%	52	21.1%	247	100.0%

Note: There are 251 respondents who had their fingers scanned on a least one occasion. There are four missing cases in this table.

Table 22: The first experience of finger scanning and the reason for this response

Why do you feel this way	good		satisfactory		unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Understand the need for security	16	53.3	19	23.2			35	23
Behavior of officers good	6	20.0	3	3.7			9	6
Efficient	2	6.7	2	2.4			4	2
No problem	4	13.3	5	6.1			9	6
Invasion of privacy			5	6.1	7	16.3	12	8
Behavior of officers poor			2	2.4			2	1
Time consuming or inefficient			24	29.3	27	62.8	51	33
Feel like an inmate			3	3.7	4	9.3	7	5
Not necessary			3	3.7	1	2.3	4	3
Personal reasons			1	1.2	1	2.3	2	1
Uncomfortable					1	2.3	1	1
Other	2	6.7	15	18.3	2	4.7	19	12
Total	30	100.0	82	100.0	43	100	155	100

Notes: Caution needs to be used in interpreting this table. Twenty nine visitors who stated the experience was good, 49 visitors who stated the experience was satisfactory and five visitors who stated the experience was unsatisfactory did not give a reason for feeling this way and they are therefore not included in this table.

Seven respondents, 17 percent of those who found the experience ‘unsatisfactory’ on the first experience, found it ‘satisfactory’ on subsequent occasions. However, 83 percent of the respondents who found the experience ‘unsatisfactory’ the first time also found it ‘unsatisfactory’ on subsequent occasions.

Respondents were asked why they felt the experience of finger scanning after the first time was ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’. The responses to this question are in Table 24. Caution needs to be used in

interpreting this table. Approximately 50% of the respondents in both the ‘good’ and ‘satisfactory’ columns did not provide an explanation for why they felt this way. These two columns are of value only as a matter of interest. Visitors nominating the experience as ‘unsatisfactory’ were more likely to give a reason for feeling this way. Most of the respondents who claimed the experience as ‘unsatisfactory’ stated that it was because the procedure was ‘time consuming or inefficient’ (72%).

Table 23: Opinions of first finger scanning by opinions of later scanning

Finger scanning the first time	Finger scanning after the first time			
	good	satisfactory	unsatisfactory	Total
Numbers of respondents				
good	26	5	2	33
satisfactory	9	70	10	89
unsatisfactory	0	7	34	41
Total	35	82	46	163

Note: This table includes only the responses of visitors who were finger scanned on more than one occasion and responded to both questions. Data is missing for 23 cases.

Access to written information on BIS

The Department has published a pamphlet on BIS and information on BIS is also included in the visitor handbook. Two questions were put to visitors to ascertain if they had access to printed information on BIS.

Visitors were asked if they had received a copy of the BIS pamphlet. It can be seen in

Table 25 that only a very small number of respondents (2.5%) claimed to have been provided with a copy of the BIS pamphlet. A similar response was received when BIS visitors were asked if they had received a copy of the visitors handbook. As seen in Table 26 only 2.2% of visitors claim to have received a copy of the visitors handbook.

Visitor understanding of the BIS procedures

Respondents were asked two questions to establish if they understood how finger scanning operated. Firstly, visitors were asked, "When your thumb or finger is scanned the computer stores it as...". Visitor responses to this question are in Table 27.

It can be seen in Table 27 that only 10% of visitors selected the correct answer, that it is stored as 'a set of numbers'. The highest response was for the 'fingerprint' category (44%). However, 26 percent of visitors selected the 'don't know' category.

Table 24 The experience of finger scanning subsequent to the first time and the reason for this response

Why do you feel this way	good		satisfactory		unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Understand need for security	5	27.8	7	17.9	1	2.3	13	13
Behavior of officers good	3	16.7	1	2.6			4	4
Efficient	2	11.1	2	5.1			4	4
No problem	4	22.2	2	5.1			6	6
Invasion of privacy			2	5.1	3	7	5	5
Behavior of officers poor			1	2.6	1	2.3	2	2
Time consuming or inefficient	1	5.6	13	30.8	31	72.1	45	45
Feel like an inmate			3	7.7	3	7	6	6
Not necessary			2	5.1	1	2.3	3	3
Personal			1	2.6			1	1
Other	3	16.7	6	15.4	3	7	12	12
Total	18	100.0	40	100.0	43	100	101	100

Note: Caution needs to be used in interpreting this table. Eighteen visitors who stated the experience was good, 44 visitors who stated the experience was satisfactory and four visitors who stated the experience was unsatisfactory did not give a reason for feeling this way and they are therefore not included in this table.

Table 25: The number of visitors who received a copy of BIS pamphlet

	Number	Percent of responses
Yes	8	2.5
No	281	88.1
Unsure	4	1.3
Missing	26	8.2
Total	319	100

Table 26: Number of visitors who have received a copy of the visitors handbook

	Number	Percent of responses
Yes	7	2.2
No	295	92.5
Unsure	4	1.3
Missing	13	4.1
Total	319	100

Table 27: The computer stores finger as?

	Number	Percent of responses
A set of numbers	31	9.7
A fingerprint	141	44.3
A photo of your finger	31	9.7
Don't know	85	26.4
Missing	31	9.7
Total	319	100

Table 28: Can finger scan be recreated into an image of your finger print?

	Number	Percent of responses
Yes	136	42.8
No	22	6.9
Unsure	134	41.8
Missing	27	8.5
Total	319	100

Secondly, visitors were asked, “Can the information held by the computer on your finger scan be recreated into an image of

your fingerprint?” As seen in Table 28, 43 percent of visitors thought that the image of their finger could be recreated into an image of their finger print. Only seven percent of visitors selected the correct answer, which is the ‘no’ category. However, 42% stated they were ‘unsure’.

Protection of privacy

Table 29 contains the responses of visitors to the question, “Your privacy is protected because..”. Categories 1, 2 and 3 presented in the quiz were correct. However, the more accurate category was category 3, ‘both 1 and 2 above’. Category 3 achieved the highest number of responses (34%). Also 20 percent of respondents selected ‘strict regulations which protect your privacy’. A large percentage of the visitors (29%) nominated the ‘don’t’ know’ category and 13 percent of responses were missing⁶.

Table 29: Your privacy is protected because:

	Number	Percent of responses
Not compatible with other systems	12	3.8
Strict regulations which protect your privacy	65	20.4
Both 1 and 2 above	108	34
Don't know	94	29.2
Missing	40	12.6
Total	319	100

Discussion

Discretion needs to be exercised in the interpretation and application of the results of this study. In this study only 24 percent of the visitors who were surveyed responded. Respondents may differ in characteristics and/or experience from those visitors who did not respond. It was not possible to compare the characteristics of the respondents to this survey with the general population of visitors visiting during March 1999 because much of the computerised data on the OMS system was either missing or unreliable.

It could also be that some people who would like to visit friends or relatives in NSW correctional centres do not do so because of their personal circumstances, the distance they have to travel or concerns with the visiting facilities. Obviously it is not possible to include the opinions of these people in this study.

Additionally, some of the tables contain the collective responses of visitors to all the correctional centres in NSW rather than the itemised results for individual correctional centres. Although this provides an indication of the level of satisfaction of respondents generally, there are a number of qualifications with regards to their usefulness:

- the overall responses in these tables may not reflect what is happening at an individual correctional centre; and
- the number of respondents varies between correctional centres therefore the overall responses are biased towards that of the respondents who visit correctional centres which have a large number of respondents.

This study is not directly comparable with

the Eyland (1996) study. It is not possible to say if either study obtained a representative sample of visitors. The respondents in the Eyland study differed in characteristics from the respondents in this study including the type of relationship they had with the inmate. Compared with the Eyland study this present study had a higher percentage of respondents who described their relationship with the inmate as one of friend whilst a lower percentage described the inmate as their husband.

The care of children

A large number of respondents (43%) brought children with them when they visited. Clearly it is essential, if the visit is to be a positive one for all concerned, that the children are reasonably content during the visit and not disruptive to those around them.

As seen in Table 30 in Annex 1, the rating respondents gave the facilities for children vary markedly between correctional centres. Some correctional centres have no facilities for children. The majority (60%) of the children respondents brought to visits are in the two to 12 year age groups (Table 8). Even if the visit is only for an hour this is a long time to expect children of this age group to remain inactive.

When asked which factors discouraged visitors from visiting more often 17 respondents referred to the lack of facilities for children.

Thirty eight percent of respondents reported directly caring for children in the community. Twenty six percent of these respondents did not bring children with them when they visited. Ten percent of respondents

stated that arranging child care was a problem 'often' or 'always' (Table 10). It may be that some of these visitors would bring children to the visits if the facilities for children were improved.

It would appear worthwhile if visiting facilities were more amenable to children. When new correctional centres are planned serious consideration needs to be given to incorporating indoor and outdoor activity areas for children. As economic resources permit this should also happen in existing correctional centres.

Transportation

Transport to correctional centres was a problem for a substantial number of respondents. As seen in Table 10, 32 percent of respondents cited distance travelled as a problem 'often' or 'always' and 31 percent cited the cost of visiting was a problem 'often' or 'always'. When asked if there was anything which discouraged them visiting more often, 20 percent of respondents cited *distance, cost or problems with transport*. The difficulties the respondents had with travelling shows the importance of the need for good planning in the location of correctional centres.

Contributing to the problems with transport was the lack of public transport. As seen in Table 10, 21 percent of respondents stated that access to public transport was a problem 'often' or 'always'. That only eight percent of respondents use public transport to visit may reflect the fact that most correctional centres in NSW are not ideally situated for access to public transport. Respondents were more likely to use public transport if they were visiting a correctional centre in the metropolitan area.

The Department subsidises the CRC bus service to non-metropolitan correctional

centres. Only 1.6 percent of respondents reported using this bus service. Additionally, the Department makes financial assistance available for visitors who are financially disadvantaged in order that they can visit a particular inmate. The availability of this assistance is included in the visitors handbook. Wider distribution of this handbook would make the availability of the bus service and financial assistance better known.

Facilities in the visiting area

With regard to the facilities in the visiting area the majority of the items were rated by visitors as good to fair (Table 12). Visitors had a tendency not to rate an item that was not relevant to them, for example disabled access and baby change area. Items causing the most concern amongst respondents were the toilets, lack of space, food machine, tea and coffee facilities.

As seen in Table 14 'conditions within the visiting area' was the third most common factor which discouraged respondents visiting more often. Clearly the highest priority needs to be given to factors important to visitors' health and safety. The offender population is known to be a high risk group for communicable diseases. Those who visit inmates may also be at higher risk than the general NSW population. Therefore it is imperative that facilities, particularly tea and coffee and toilet facilities follow the highest standards of hygiene. The Department needs to develop minimum acceptable standards for these facilities.

Whilst maintaining the highest standards in security it should be possible by good design and use of colour to make visiting sections visually pleasing. In the design or renovation of visitors' sections high priority should be given to including design features

and materials which add to the amenity of the visits section such as those which reduce noise and those which are visually pleasing.

Visiting procedures

As seen in Table 11, 17 percent of respondents reported being 'rarely' or 'never' satisfied with the waiting time at correctional centres. However, as shown in Table 31 in Annex 1 the average waiting times varied between correctional centres. For some correctional centres if the waiting time to be processed is combined with the waiting time after processing the average aggregate waiting time, is approximately one hour. With delays of this length it is understandable that waiting time is of concern to some visitors.

The cause of the delay may not always lie with the processing of visitors. The delay is sometimes due to the inmate's failure or slowness to respond when called. Inmates may be at some distance from the visits section when the visitor arrives.

As seen in Table 11, 16 percent of respondents stated that they 'rarely' or 'never' were satisfied with the visiting hours. Also as seen in Table 14 visiting hours was the second most common factor which discouraged respondents from visiting. Dissatisfaction with visiting hours was expressed mainly by respondents who would like to visit on weekdays. Some respondents would like visiting hours to finish later in the afternoon.

Respondents appeared to be more satisfied with security checks than the waiting time or visiting hours. Forty three percent of respondent reported being 'very' satisfied with security checks whilst 34 percent reported being 'mostly' satisfied. In Table 12 it was seen that 9 percent of respondents were 'rarely' or 'never' satisfied with the

security checks. Therefore it appears that most respondents are accepting of the security measures they encounter.

Although 77 percent of respondents reported being treated politely by officers 'always' or 'usually' this left 23 percent of respondents stating that they are treated politely only 'sometimes' 'rarely' or 'never'. It must be emphasised the difficult task working in visits sections is for correctional officers. They have onerous security and administration responsibilities. Yet whilst carrying out these duties, visits staff have to deal with a large volume of people who may be stressed, impatient, tired from their journey and not always cooperative.

At many correctional centres correctional officers are only rostered on to the visits section every few months. This means that the correctional officers not only have to deal with the usual demands of the visits section, but also the need to re-familiarize themselves with the computer software for registering visitors. In establishing the mailing list of visitors for this survey it was found that the information entered by officers on visitors was sometimes not done correctly. One notable error was that a substantial number of visitors had more than one VIN.

As inmates do not have access to the area in which visitor processing occurs, it may be that after appropriate training the processing of visitors could be more efficiently undertaken by regular civilian staff. The Operations Branch should establish a working party to investigate the value of replacing correctional officers with civilian staff in performing administrative tasks related to visitor processing. This would allow correctional officers rostered to visits to concentrate on matters of visits security.

The written responses provided by visitors

imply that the behaviour of correctional officers is very important to visitors. Some respondents reported being frightened on their first visit to correctional centres until they were put at ease by visits officers. Other visitors were willing to tolerate delays in processing with good humour because they viewed the behaviour of officers as friendly.

It is in the interests of the Department that:

- visits are a positive experience for both the visitors and the inmates, and
- that correctional officers are appropriately trained for the demands placed upon them.

The Corrective Services Academy has developed specialist training modules for visits staff which includes sections on customer service focus, dealing with complaints and visits procedures. It is recommended that the Corrective Services Academy extend this training to correctional officers in primary training programs.

Provision of written information

It is of concern that only 22 percent of the respondents claim to have received written information on visiting times, rules and conditions. The responses from the individual correctional centres varied from none at Tamworth to 48 percent at Mulawa. As all correctional centres, with the exception of Tamworth, had some visitors reporting that they had obtained written material there must be some level of availability of this material. Perhaps the material is available from information stands in visits sections but not all visitors are aware that it is there. Or perhaps visitors interpreted the meaning of the question as referring to printed information given directly.

Having a loved one in a correctional centre can be a stressful and confusing time for those involved. It can be of assistance to visitors if they are briefed on visiting times, rules and conditions. Written information provides visitors with the opportunity to have the information at hand when they need to refer to it.

The importance of written information was emphasised in the Eyland (1996) report and recommendations were made concerning a general pamphlet and specific information pertaining to individual correctional centres. In response to this recommendation the Operations Branch developed a general visitors handbook. Additionally, a visiting package was to be made available for inmates to send to family members and friends nominated by the inmate. This process must have been discontinued as this study found a substantial number of respondents did not receive printed information.

Visitors are sometimes uncertain about the actual correctional centre in which their family member or friend has been placed. The phone number of the Inmate Placement Officer should be prominently displayed on all written material so visitors can quickly establish the whereabouts of the inmate. Additionally, unless there are policy or security reasons for not doing so, this phone number should be clearly displayed in the Sydney Telephone Directory.

Bio-metric Identification System (BIS)

Most respondents who had visited centres where BIS operated found the procedures associated with BIS good or satisfactory. This was so for 85 percent of the responses with regards to being photographed, 76 percent with regard to the first experience of finger scanning and 64 percent for subsequent experiences of finger scanning.

The main reasons visitors gave for their experience being good or satisfactory was that they 'understood the need for security' or that 'the behaviour of officers was good'. A number of visitors responded that their experience was satisfactory despite giving reasons for feeling that way which were critical of the procedure. This was particularly so for finger scanning with a substantial number claiming the experience was satisfactory despite stating that it was time consuming or inefficient (29% the first time and 31% subsequent to the first time).

Although the respondents who stated their experiences with BIS procedures were unsatisfactory were in the minority, it was not an insubstantial minority. Eleven percent of visitors stated that the experience of being photographed was unsatisfactory, 19 percent stated that the first experience of finger scanning was unsatisfactory, whilst 24 percent found the subsequent experiences of finger scanning were unsatisfactory.

Concerns of visitors

Whilst the main concern of visitors with being photographed was that they viewed it as 'an invasion of privacy', the main concern visitors had with finger scanning was that it was 'inefficient or time consuming'. Only a small number of visitors referred to finger scanning as an invasion of privacy.

Few respondents claimed to have had access to written information on BIS. It is not surprising then that a large number responded incorrectly to the quiz on finger scanning. Nevertheless, despite not understanding how BIS operated, as stated above, few viewed finger scanning as an invasion of privacy. As well over half of the BIS respondents were aware that there were strict regulations which protected their privacy.

Privacy concerns of visitors

What can be done to address the main concerns of visitors with BIS procedures? Firstly let us consider responses that refer to BIS procedures, particular being photographed, as an invasion of privacy.

When BIS was first introduced into the NSW correctional system, concerns were expressed by groups such as the NSW Privacy Committee that the operation of BIS had the potential to infringe upon visitor's privacy. The Department took such concerns very seriously and introduced regulations to protect the privacy of visitors. These regulations came into effect on 1 November 1997.

Under the regulations, the Department can only use information on BIS for the purpose of administering the right to enter and exit maximum security correctional centres. The regulations prohibit the information being shared with any other agency.

No respondent in this study cited an incident in relation to privacy. The concerns of visitors voiced in this study apparently arise from their perception of the process rather than actual incidents which could constitute a breach of privacy. It appears that visitors are objecting in principle to undergoing a procedure they view as intrusive and unnecessary.

Technology is a growing part of the security measures used in the criminal justice system. More needs to be done to educate visitors on the reasons for the procedures that is, the importance of BIS to security and the manner in which the system actually operates. Visitors are entitled to understand what they are taking part in and a greater understanding may assist to allay the concerns of those who would otherwise view the procedures negatively.

Pamphlet for BIS visitors

Respondents to the BIS centres were less likely overall to have access to written information than respondents generally. More widespread understanding of BIS procedures among visitors is required. This appears to be best achieved by revising the BIS pamphlet to reflect the information obtained in this survey and wider distribution of the pamphlet.

Revision of the BIS pamphlet needs to address the following:

- the pamphlet needs to be written in simpler language to cater for the fact that some visitors, as evidenced in written responses to this survey, have a low level of English literacy;
- the pamphlet needs to reflect to a greater extent the concern visitors have with being photographed; and
- more needs to be done to explain to visitors the importance of security.

Wider distribution of the pamphlet to ensure all visitors to centres containing BIS have access to it by providing each visitor with a copy of the BIS pamphlet at the time of their initial enrolment on BIS at a correctional centre.

Concerns that BIS is time consuming or inefficient

Part of the rationale for the introduction of BIS was that it would assist in the processing of visitors by reducing the time taken to check visitors' identity. The processing of the visitor on their first visit to a correctional centre containing BIS would be expected to take longer than on later occasions. This is because when a visitor is attending for the first time their personal identification details need to be registered

in the BIS data base, and a head and shoulder photograph taken as well as their finger scanned. At subsequent visits after a visitor fills an attendance form only thumb or finger scanning is required. However, as seen in this study at subsequent visits a number of visitors continued to find the experience time consuming.

According to respondents and visits officers the BIS process is time consuming because of the difficulty the BIS equipment has in registering the detail of some visitors' fingers. Some visitors, due to the nature of their occupation (e.g., concreters) have had the definition on their finger eroded.

The Operations Branch have in the past sought to increase the efficiency of the BIS system. The present complaints of visitors should be addressed by the Operations Branch to see if further improvements can be made by the upgrading of equipment or the provision of additional equipment in some centres.

References

AUNGLES, A. (1994) *The Prison & the Home, Monograph Series No 5*, The Institute of Criminology, The University of Sydney: Sydney.

EYLAND, S. (1996) *Inside...Out: A Survey of visitors to New South Wales Correctional Centres*, Research Publication No. 36, NSW Department of Corrective Services: Sydney.

GLASER, D. (1964) *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, Bobbs-Merrill Inc, New York.

GODFREY, J. (1998 a) "Technological Assault", *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol 23 No 1 February 1998.

GODFREY, J. (1998 b) "The Biometric Big Brother", *Arena Magazine* Dec 1997.

HOLT, N. & MILLER, D. (1972) *Explorations inmate family relationships*. Sacramento, California Department of Corrections.

NEW SOUTH WALES DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIVE SERVICES, Annual Report 1997/ 98.

SCHAFFER, N. (1991) "Prison Visiting Policies and Practices", *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35(3).

SCHAFFER, N. (1994) "Exploring the link Between Visits and Parole Success: A survey of Prison Visitors", *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 38 (1).

Endnotes

1. An inmate may be visited by up to four adult visitors at a time.
2. For a fuller description of this material refer to Eyland (1996).
3. Biometric refers to a broad category of technologies which provide precise confirmation of an individual's identity through the use of their personal characteristics such as their physiological characteristics or other distinguishing attribute. Common physiological characteristics used in BIS include finger and hand prints, retina scans and voice recognition.
4. This management plan is ACO:95/115.
5. Excluded is the visiting section for F wing at Cessnock Correctional Centre. There were only three usable addresses for this visiting section and none of the three visitors surveyed responded.
6. Thirteen percent of visitors did not respond to this question. It would seem worthwhile if such a question is put to visitors in future surveys that 'none of the above' or 'other' category be included.

APPENDIX

Table 30: Facilities for children

Security classification	Facilities for children - all respondents					
	Excellent to fair		Poor to non-existent		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Maximum						
Cess D + E Wing	12	46.2	14	53.8	26	100
GLB - Max	8	20.5	31	79.5	39	100
LBH	2	10.5	17	89.5	19	100
Lithgow	17	28.8	42	71.2	59	100
MMTC	9	23.1	30	76.9	39	100
MRRC	38	50.7	37	49.3	75	100
MSP - Max	21	52.5	19	47.5	40	100
PMT	10	47.6	11	52.4	21	100
Average	117	36.8	201	63.2	318	100
Medium						
BTH Med	11	45.8	13	54.2	24	100
Broken Hill	1	11.1	8	88.9	9	100
GRA Med	1	6.3	15	93.8	16	100
Junee Med	42	79.2	11	20.8	53	100
Mulawa	26	61.9	16	38.1	42	100
PKA	22	36.1	39	63.9	61	100
Tamworth	7	31.8	15	68.2	22	100
Average	110	48.5	117	51.5	227	100
Minimum						
Berrima	21	87.5	3	12.5	24	100
BTH Min	25	53.2	22	46.8	47	100
Cess A B + C Wing	48	92.3	4	7.7	52	100
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	22	100.0			22	100
Emu Plains - Main Centre	21	87.5	3	12.5	24	100
GLB MIN - X-Wing	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
Glen Innes	6	22.2	21	77.8	27	100
FRA Females	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
FRA Min	19	51.4	18	48.6	37	100
ITC	29	74.4	10	25.6	39	100
John Morony - Windsor	61	95.3	3	4.7	64	100
Junee Min	28	84.8	5	15.2	33	100
Kirkconnell	30	52.6	27	47.4	57	100
Mannus	29	82.9	6	17.1	35	100
MSP - Min	11	47.8	12	52.2	23	100
Oberon	23	88.5	3	11.5	26	100
PKA Min - work release	9	25.0	27	75.0	36	100
Silverwater	38	74.5	13	25.5	51	100
St. Heliers	28	60.9	18	39.1	46	100
Average	456	69.4	201	30.6	657	100
Overall average	683	56.8	519	43.2	1202	100

Note: As stated elsewhere in this report only 24% of the visitors surveyed responded. For some correctional centres the response rate was very low. In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses may not be representative of those of all visitors to those individual correctional centres. There is data missing for 269 cases in this table.

Table 31: Average waiting times

Security classification	Wait to be processed (a)	Wait to go to the visiting area (b)
Maximum	Average Minutes	Average Minutes
Cess D + E Wing	21	24
GLB - Max	25	30
LBH	16	9
Lithgow	31	27
MMTC	34	25
MRRC	30	22
MSP - Max	32	21
PMT	31	18
Average	29	23
Medium		
BTH Med	22	11
Broken Hill	3	3
GRA Med	13	12
Junee Med	32	19
Mulawa	17	12
PKA	21	15
Tamworth	30	8
Average	22	13
Minimum		
Berrima	12	5
BTH Min	16	11
Cess A B + C Wing	15	17
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	10	5
Emu Plains - Main Centre	12	5
GLB MIN - X_Wing	13	9
Glen Innes	16	2
GRA Females	6	8
GRA Min	11	6
ITC	18	7
John Moroney - Windsor	15	12
Junee Min	33	18
Kirkconnell	10	6
Mannus	9	4
MSP - Min	12	13
Oberon	12	5
PKA Min - work release	15	9
Silverwater	38	14
St Heliers	18	5
Average	16	9
Overall Average	21	14
<p>Note: In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses of those visitors who responded to the survey may not be representative of all the visitors to those individual correctional centres. There is data missing for 52 cases in column (a) and 82 cases in column (b).</p>		

Table 32: Satisfaction with waiting times

Centres	Very to mostly		Sometimes to never		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Maximum						
Cess D + E Wing	14	51.9	13	48.1	27	100
GLB - Max	19	40.4	28	59.6	47	100
LBH	23	76.7	7	23.3	30	100
Lithgow	26	36.6	45	63.4	71	100
MMTC	23	46.9	26	53.1	49	100
MRRC	38	42.2	52	57.8	90	100
MSP - Max	19	34.5	36	65.5	55	100
PMT	11	42.3	15	57.7	26	100
Average	173	43.8	222	56.2	395	100
Medium						
Broken Hill	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	100
BTH Med	17	65.4	9	34.6	26	100
GRA Med	14	66.7	7	33.3	21	100
Junee Med	24	41.4	34	58.6	58	100
Mulawa	36	69.2	16	30.8	52	100
PKA	24	36.4	42	63.6	66	100
Tamworth	11	45.8	13	54.2	24	100
Average	134	52.1	123	47.9	257	100
Minimum						
Berrima	27	93.1	2	6.9	29	100
BTH Min	25	52.1	23	47.9	48	100
Cess A B + C Wing	37	63.8	21	36.2	58	100
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	22	91.7	2	8.3	24	100
Emu Plains - Main Centre	17	65.4	9	34.6	26	100
GLB MIN - X_Wing	25	75.8	8	24.2	33	100
Glen Innes	11	91.7	1	8.3	12	100
GRA Females	3	100.0			3	100
GRA Min	30	75.0	10	25.0	40	100
ITC	34	66.7	17	33.3	51	100
John Morony - Windsor	54	77.1	16	22.9	70	100
Junee Min	23	54.8	19	45.2	42	100
Kirkconnell	65	83.3	13	16.7	78	100
Mannus	34	87.2	5	12.8	39	100
MSP - Min	38	90.5	4	9.5	42	100
Oberon	22	81.5	5	18.5	27	100
PKA Min - work release	24	61.5	15	38.5	39	100
Silverwater	20	35.1	37	64.9	57	100
St Heliers	42	75	14	25.0	56	100
Average	553	71.4	221	28.6	774	100
Overall average	860	60.3	566	39.7	1426	100

Note: In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses of those visitors who responded to the survey may not be representative of all the visitors to those individual correctional centres. There is data missing for 45 cases in this table.

Table 33: Satisfaction with visiting hours

Centre	Very to mostly		Sometimes to never		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Maximum						
Cess D + E Wing	13	46.4	15	53.6	28	100
GLB - Max	17	37.0	29	63.0	46	100
LBH	21	70.0	9	30.0	30	100
Lithgow	49	70.0	21	30.0	70	100
MMTC	24	50.0	24	50.0	48	100
MRRC	61	67.8	29	32.2	90	100
MSP - Max	28	53.8	24	46.2	52	100
PMT	15	65.2	8	34.8	23	100
Average	228	58.9	159	41.1	387	100
Medium						
BTH Med	14	56.0	11	44.0	25	100
Broken Hill	8	88.9	1	11.1	9	100
GRA Med	12	60.0	8	40.0	20	100
June Med	46	79.3	12	20.7	58	100
Mulawa	36	69.2	16	30.8	52	100
PKA	24	36.4	42	63.6	66	100
Tamworth	14	60.9	9	39.1	23	100
Average	154	60.9	99	39.1	253	100
Minimum						
Berrima	28	87.5	4	12.5	32	100
BTH Min	30	62.5	18	37.5	48	100
Cess A B + C Wing	51	87.9	7	12.1	58	100
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	22	88.0	3	12.0	25	100
Emu Plains - Main Centre	17	60.7	11	39.3	28	100
GLB MIN - X_Wing	25	75.8	8	24.2	33	100
Glen Innes	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100
GRA Min	27	67.5	13	32.5	40	100
GRA Females	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
ITC	35	76.1	11	23.9	46	100
John Morony - Windsor	62	88.6	8	11.4	70	100
June Min	35	83.3	7	16.7	42	100
Kirkconnell	62	81.6	14	18.4	76	100
Mannus	33	91.7	3	8.3	36	100
MSP - Min	33	76.7	10	23.3	43	100
Oberon	23	88.5	3	11.5	26	100
PKA Min - work release	19	48.7	20	51.3	39	100
Silverwater	36	66.7	18	33.3	54	100
St Heliers	52	92.9	4	7.1	56	100
Average	599	78.3	166	21.7	765	100
Overall Average	981	69.8	424	30.2	1405	100

Note: In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses of those visitors who responded to the survey may not be representative of all the visitors to those correctional centres. There is data missing for 66 cases in this table.

Table 34: Satisfaction with security checks

Centres	Very to mostly		Sometimes to never		Total	
	Maximum	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Cess D + E Wing	19	70.4	8	29.6	27	100
GLB - Max	32	69.6	14	30.4	46	100
LBH	27	90.0	3	10.0	30	100
Lithgow	45	65.2	24	34.8	69	100
MMTC	36	76.6	11	23.4	47	100
MRRC	60	66.7	30	33.3	90	100
MSP - Max	34	63.0	20	37.0	54	100
PMT	21	87.5	3	12.5	24	100
Average	274	70.8	113	29.2	387	100
Medium						
BTH Med	21	80.8	5	19.2	26	100
Broken Hill	6	66.7	3	33.3	9	100
GRA Med	13	65.0	7	35.0	20	100
June Med	45	77.6	13	22.4	58	100
Mulawa	38	74.5	13	25.5	51	100
PKA	47	72.3	18	27.7	65	100
Tamworth	13	56.5	10	43.5	23	100
Average	183	72.6	69	27.4	252	100
Minimum						
Berrima	27	93.1	2	6.9	29	100
BTH Min	40	87.0	6	13.0	46	100
Cess A B + C Wing	41	71.9	16	28.1	57	100
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	20	83.3	4	16.7	24	100
Emu Plains - Main Centre	20	76.9	6	23.1	26	100
GLB MIN - X_Wing	27	81.8	6	18.2	33	100
Glen Innes	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	100
GRA Females	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
GRA Min	29	74.4	10	25.6	39	100
ITC	38	79.2	10	20.8	48	100
John Morony - Windsor	56	78.9	15	21.1	71	100
June Min	36	87.8	5	12.2	41	100
Kirkconnell	65	85.5	11	14.5	76	100
Mannus	37	97.4	1	2.6	38	100
MSP - Min	40	93.0	3	7.0	43	100
Oberon	23	88.5	3	11.5	26	100
PKA Min - work release	25	62.5	15	37.5	40	100
Silverwater	38	69.1	17	30.9	55	100
St Heliers	46	82.1	10	17.9	56	100
Average	618	81.2	143	18.8	761	100
Overall Average	1075	76.8	325	23.2	1307	100

Note: In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses of those visitors who responded to the survey may not be representative of all the visitors to those individual correctional centres. There is data missing for 164 cases in this table.

Table 35: Are you treated politely by officers

Centres	Always - usually		Sometimes-never		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Maximum						
Cess D + E Wing	21	75.0	7	25.0	28	100
GLB - Max	34	73.9	12	26.1	46	100
LBH	28	93.3	2	6.7	30	100
Lithgow	54	77.1	16	22.9	70	100
MMTC	37	77.1	11	22.9	48	100
MRRC	50	55.6	40	44.4	90	100
MSP - Max	43	81.1	10	18.9	53	100
PMT	18	69.2	8	30.8	26	100
Average	285	72.9	106	27.1	391	100
Medium						
BTH Med	22	81.5	5	18.5	27	100
Broken Hill	6	66.7	3	33.3	9	100
GRA Med	13	61.9	8	38.1	21	100
Junee Med	39	67.2	19	32.8	58	100
Mulawa	34	65.4	18	34.6	52	100
PKA	47	69.1	21	30.9	68	100
Tamworth	15	65.2	8	34.8	23	100
Average	176	68.2	82	31.8	258	100
Minimum						
Berrima	28	87.5	4	12.5	32	100
BTH Min	29	67.4	14	32.6	43	100
Cess A B + C Wing	44	74.6	15	25.4	59	100
Emu Plains - Jacaranda	17	70.8	7	29.2	24	100
Emu Plains - Main Centre	22	73.3	8	26.7	30	100
GRA Females	3	100.0			3	100
GLB MIN - X_Wing	24	70.6	10	29.4	34	100
Glen Innes	10	90.9	1	9.1	11	100
GRA Females	3	100.0			3	100
GRA Min	27	73.0	10	27.0	37	100
ITC	39	76.5	12	23.5	51	100
John Morony - Windsor	58	81.7	13	18.3	71	100
Junee Min	37	90.2	4	9.8	41	100
Kirkconnell	69	89.6	8	10.4	77	100
Mannus	35	94.6	2	5.4	37	100
MSP - Min	42	95.5	2	4.5	44	100
Oberon	21	77.8	6	22.2	27	100
PKA Min - work release	32	80.0	8	20.0	40	100
Silverwater	43	78.2	12	21.8	55	100
St Heliers	47	83.9	9	16.1	56	100
Average	627	81.2	145	18.8	772	100
Overall Average	1088	76.6	333	23.4	1421	100

Note: In interpreting this table it is important to keep in mind that the responses of those visitors who responded to the survey may not be representative of all the visitors to those individual correctional centres. There is data missing from 50 cases in this table.

Table 36: The experience of finger scanning subsequent to the first time by correctional centre

Centre	good		satisfactory		unsatisfactory		Total	
	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %	Number	Row %
GLB - Max	10	26.3%	19	50.0%	9	23.7%	38	100.0%
Lithgow	10	20.4%	27	55.1%	12	24.5%	49	100.0%
MMTC	14	35.9%	19	48.7%	6	15.4%	39	100.0%
MRRC	6	21.4%	12	42.9%	10	35.7%	28	100.0%
MSP - Max	9	20.9%	18	41.9%	16	37.2%	43	100.0%
Total	49	24.9%	95	48.2%	53	26.9%	197	100.0%