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What’s desistance?

- Universal and voluntary process through which offenders cease offending (Laub & Sampson, 2003)
  - Voluntary?
  - Process?
Levers of desistance

- Protective factors influencing desistance exist (De Vries Robbé et al., 2015):
  - Healthy sexual interest
  - Employment or constructive leisure activities
  - Sobriety
  - Constructive social and professional support network
  - Good problems solving
  - Hopeful, optimistic and motivated attitude to desistance
Current study
Method

- Files consulted at the court
- Collected informations:
  - Motives concerning the end of conditional release
  - Type and number of conditions
  - Negative changes in the conditions during the follow-up
  - Violation of conditions
  - Type of victims (age, sex and relationship)
Method

- **Conditions groups:**
  - **Probation agent (PA):** respect of meeting with PA, inform about the changes
  - **Housing:** living place, moving from living place...
  - **Residency restriction:** not living in the same area than the victims and don’t contact them, don’t approach potential victims
  - **Occupation:** employment and volunteering
  - **Therapy:** compliance at the therapy
  - **Do not commit:** don’t commit a new offense
  - **Addiction:** don’t abuse substances or be in contact with drugs or alcohol environments
Method

• Sample:
  - 118 Paroled sex offenders
  - Age at release: $M = 39.74$ years ($SD = 10.85$)
  - 69.1% completed their supervision
Method

- Non-parametric analyses:
  - Descriptive analyses
    → Victims characteristics/type of offenses
  - Mean rank comparisons (Mann-Whitney)
    → Completion vs. revocation groups
  - Spearman correlations
    → Compare completion vs. revocation groups concerning the arrival of negative changes
  - Logistic regressions
    → Compare completion vs. revocation groups concerning the arrival of negative changes
  - Survival curves
    → Compare completion vs. revocation groups concerning the arrival of negative changes
Results
Descriptive analyses

- **Victims characteristics:**
  - Gender: 84.8% female (N = 95)
  - Age: 64.3% Juvenile (N = 74)
  - Relationship: 47.8% intrafamilial (N = 55)

- **Type of offenses:**
  - 86.6% Hands-on (N = 103)
Mean rank comparisons

- Completion vs. revocation
  - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>865.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The revocation group is younger when released from prison (Hanson, 2002; Laws & Ward, 2011)
Mean rank comparisons

- **Completion vs. revocation**
  - Period of follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>66.13</td>
<td>440.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The period of follow-up is shorter for the revocation group
Mean rank comparisons

- Completion vs. revocation
  - Number of conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>54.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>55.61</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no difference between the group in term of number of conditions
### Mean rank comparisons

- **Completion vs. revocation**
  - Negative changes during the follow-up period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completion(\ N = 76)</th>
<th>Revocation(\ N = 29)</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M) (\text{Mean Rank})</td>
<td>(M) (\text{Mean Rank})</td>
<td>(U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total negative changes</strong></td>
<td>2.74 (49.64)</td>
<td>3.65 (61.79)</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA</strong></td>
<td>2.53 (51.11)</td>
<td>2.55 (57.95)</td>
<td>958.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>2.67 (53.02)</td>
<td>2.59 (52.95)</td>
<td>1100.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residency restriction</strong></td>
<td>0.05 (53.08)</td>
<td>0.03 (52.79)</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td>1.04 (53.07)</td>
<td>0.79 (52.81)</td>
<td>1096.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapy</strong></td>
<td>0.45 (49.2)</td>
<td>0.93 (62.95)</td>
<td>913.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not commit</strong></td>
<td>0.14 (50.03)</td>
<td>0.45 (60.79)</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addiction</strong></td>
<td>0.16 (49.44)</td>
<td>0.65 (62.33)</td>
<td>831.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violation</strong></td>
<td>0.59 (46.04)</td>
<td>1.72 (71.24)</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(*p \leq .05\); **\(p \leq .01\)
Correlations

- Completion and dynamic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at release</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of follow-up</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of conditions</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total negative changes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .01

- Positive correlation between age at release and completion
- Positive correlation between the period of follow-up and completion
**Correlations**

- Completion and negative changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(N =105)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Probation agent</em></td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Housing</em></td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Residency restriction</em></td>
<td>-.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Occupation</em></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Therapy</em></td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Do not commit</em></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Addiction</em></td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Violation of conditions</em></td>
<td>-.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .01*
- Negative correlation between completion and:
  - Compliance at therapy
  - « Do no commit »
  - Addiction problems
  - Violation of conditions
### Regressions

- Logistic regression between completion and dynamic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictive variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$ES$</th>
<th>$W$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Period of follow-up</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>19.39*</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>21.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violation of conditions</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>11.66*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .01 (bilateral)
Motives concerning the end of parole release and follow-up

Kaplan Meier's survival curve of total negative changes during judicial follow of sex offenders by reasons of parole release's end
Motives concerning the end of parole release and follow-up:

- Negative changes arrive less quickly among the completion group
- The revocation group experience negative changes less one year after release on parole
Conclusion

- Age is linked on the success of the follow-up (Hanson, 2002; Laws & Ward, 2011)
- Completion group has less problem in term of therapy, addiction, recidivism context and violation of conditions (De Vries Robbé et al., 2015)

- The violation of conditions is not recidivism
- But this context can lead to it
Group comparisons:
- Between Completion/Non-respect/Recidivism
- With risk assessment instead number of conditions

Logistic regressions between recidivism and negative/positive changes in the conditions

Analyses based on the type of sex offenders

Include experience of sexual victimization

Possibly also a fixed effects regression (but low n)
Thanks for your attention
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