

CHAPTER 6

LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF COURT AND CONFERENCE

All RISE offenders have been approached for a 'second wave' interview two years after they came into the study. The purpose of the interview is to find out about what has happened to them since the disposition of their case and to seek their views about their experience from a longer-term perspective. This Chapter describes the differences and similarities revealed in these interviews between offenders who were assigned to court and those assigned to conferences.

All of these analyses are based on offender interviewing still in progress. As reported in Chapter 2, the total completion rates for the interviews by experiment are as follows. It is pleasing that there is no significant difference in the completion rates for court cases compared with conference cases for these Year 2 data.

Drink Driving	78.1 percent
Juvenile Personal Property	69.7 percent
Juvenile Property (Security)	66.7 percent
Youth Violent Crime	66.7 percent

To begin with, respondents were asked about salient life events that may have happened to them over the twelve months prior to their second wave interview. Our hypothesis is that any differences between the groups are attributable to their treatment experience.

Tables 6-1 through 6-4 show the range of both positive and negative events that occurred in the lives of these offenders. While there was no significant difference between the court cases and conference cases in the Juvenile Personal Property experiment, there were interesting differences in the other experiments. Juvenile Property (Security) offenders who were treated in court significantly more often reported that they had experienced financial pressures in the preceding year and that they had had 'serious troubles or problems with people who were close to you'. Youth Violence offenders who had been to court significantly more often said that they had changed jobs during the preceding year, while Drink Driving offenders who had been to court significantly more often had dropped out of full time study or been fired or laid off from a job in that period.

PREVALENCE OF LIFE EVENTS (Tables 6-1 – 6-4)**Table 6-1: Drink Driving – Prevalence of Life Events, court vs. conference**

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Serious illness or injury in past year	224	13.0%	243	15.6%	.407
Attended school during the past year	224	23.2%	243	19.8%	.365
Graduated from full time study in past year	63	12.7%	53	13.2%	.936
Dropped out of full time study in past year	55	10.9%	45	.0%	.013 *
Changed jobs during the past year	224	37.5%	243	33.3%	.348
Retired or resigned from job in past year	224	21.4%	243	23.0%	.675
Fired or laid off from a job in the past year	224	10.7%	243	5.4%	.034 *
Significant financial pressures in past year	224	46.0%	243	42.8%	.490
Married or new romance in past year	224	23.2%	243	21.8%	.718
Divorced or broke off romantic relationship	224	17.0%	243	17.3%	.927
Serious troubles with others in past year	224	20.5%	243	23.0%	.512
Someone close died during the past year	224	24.5%	243	23.0%	.703
I or my partner became pregnant in past year	224	8.0%	243	10.7%	.323
Unemployed during past six months	215	8.8%	225	8.0%	.753
Currently unemployed	224	18.3%	244	17.6%	.849
Have been homeless at any point in the past	224	7.1%	243	9.9%	.290
Have been homeless in past year	224	1.3%	242	2.1%	.544
Homeless when the police arrested me	224	.0%	242	.8%	.158
Had been homeless before being arrested	224	5.4%	242	8.3%	.212

Table 6-2: Juvenile Personal Property – Prevalence of Life Events, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Serious illness or injury in past year	29	20.7%	32	28.1%	.507
Attended school during the past year	29	75.9%	32	68.8%	.542
Graduated from full time study in past year	22	13.6%	25	8.0%	.549
Dropped out of full time study in past year	19	26.3%	24	16.7%	.462
Changed jobs during the past year	29	44.8%	32	37.5%	.569
Retired or resigned from job in past year	29	24.1%	32	21.9%	.837
Fired or laid off from a job in the past year	29	20.7%	32	9.4%	.228
Significant financial pressures in past year	29	44.8%	32	53.1%	.525
Married or new romance in past year	29	31.0%	32	31.3%	.986
Divorced or broke off romantic relationship	29	6.9%	32	9.4%	.728
Serious troubles with others in past year	29	34.5%	32	31.3%	.793
Someone close died during the past year	29	37.9%	32	28.1%	.426
I or my partner became pregnant in past year	29	6.9%	32	3.1%	.513
Unemployed during past six months	26	19.2%	29	24.1%	.666
Currently unemployed	29	51.7%	32	59.4%	.556
Have been homeless at any point in the past	29	24.1%	32	25.0%	.939
Have been homeless in past year	29	6.9%	32	9.4%	.728
Homeless when the police arrested me	29	10.3%	32	9.4%	.901
Had been homeless before being arrested	29	20.7%	32	15.6%	.616

Table 6-3: Juvenile Property (Security) – Prevalence of Life Events, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Serious illness or injury in past year	24	16.7%	24	16.7%	1.000
Attended school during the past year	24	70.8%	24	75.0%	.752
Graduated from full time study in past year	17	23.5%	18	44.4%	.202
Dropped out of full time study in past year	13	30.8%	12	8.3%	.169
Changed jobs during the past year	24	33.3%	23	43.5%	.486
Retired or resigned from job in past year	24	29.2%	24	16.7%	.313
Fired or laid off from a job in the past year	24	8.3%	24	12.5%	.645
Significant financial pressures in past year	24	37.5%	24	8.3%	.017 *
Married or new romance in past year	24	37.5%	24	41.7%	.774
Divorced or broke off romantic relationship	24	25.0%	24	8.3%	.128
Serious troubles with others in past year	24	58.3%	24	20.8%	.007 *
Someone close died during the past year	24	37.5%	24	25.0%	.361
I or my partner became pregnant in past year	24	12.5%	24	4.2%	.308
Unemployed during past six months	23	30.4%	24	8.3%	.060
Currently unemployed	24	58.3%	24	54.2%	.777
Have been homeless at any point in the past	24	33.3%	24	16.7%	.190
Have been homeless in past year	24	12.5%	24	.0%	.083
Homeless when the police arrested me	24	8.3%	24	8.3%	1.000
Had been homeless before being arrested	24	25.0%	24	16.7%	.488

Table 6-4: Youth Violence – Prevalence of Life Events, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Serious illness or injury in past year	11	9.1%	12	8.3%	.952
Attended school during the past year	11	72.7%	12	41.7%	.144
Graduated from full time study in past year	8	12.5%	5	.0%	.351
Dropped out of full time study in past year	7	57.1%	5	20.0%	.222
Changed jobs during the past year	11	54.5%	11	9.1%	.024 *
Retired or resigned from job in past year	11	36.4%	12	16.7%	.311
Fired or laid off from a job in the past year	11	27.3%	12	25.0%	.907
Significant financial pressures in past year	11	72.7%	12	41.7%	.144
Married or new romance in past year	11	36.4%	12	8.3%	.126
Divorced or broke off romantic relationship	11	36.4%	12	8.3%	.126
Serious troubles with others in past year	11	27.3%	12	25.0%	.907
Someone close died during the past year	11	45.4%	12	41.7%	.863
I or my partner became pregnant in past year	11	18.2%	12	.0%	.167
Unemployed during past six months	11	18.2%	12	33.3%	.428
Currently unemployed	11	45.4%	12	66.7%	.329
Have been homeless at any point in the past	11	27.3%	12	8.3%	.264
Have been homeless in past year	11	27.3%	12	.0%	.082
Homeless when the police arrested me	11	.0%	12	.0%	
Had been homeless before being arrested	11	.0%	12	8.3%	.339

PERCEIVED JUSTICE MEASURES (Tables 6-5 – 6-8)

The five items in Tables 6-5 through 6-8 examine various justice measures. Overall, both treatment groups in all experiments believed that they had been treated consistently, as measured by their response to the statement that ‘you feel that people who have committed the same offence are treated the same way by conferences/the courts’. Both the Juvenile Personal Property offenders and the Drink Driving offenders who went to court significantly more often said that ‘compared to the way people are normally treated for this sort of offence’, they were treated about the same rather than better or worse. This appears to show that court-treated offenders in these two experiments felt that their treatment was relatively impartial, but this needs to be understood in the context of whether the majority of conference-treated offenders believed they had been treated better or worse than others (data unavailable at the present time).

Most offenders did not believe that the outcome of their treatment had been particularly retributive, as measured by their response to the question: ‘how severe did you feel the outcome of the conference/court was for you?’ However, significantly more of the Juvenile Property (Security) offenders who had been to a conference felt that their outcome had been severe.

There were significant differences between the court-treated and conference-treated offenders in three of the four experiments on measures relating to restorative justice. In Juvenile Property (Security) and Drink Driving significantly more of the conference-treated agreed that the

conference allowed them to repay society for their offence and this measure approached significance for the Juvenile Personal Property offenders as well. Likewise, when offenders were asked whether the treatment had allowed them to repay their victims for the harm they had caused them, significantly more of the Juvenile Property (Security) conference-treated offenders agreed with this, and the difference approached significance for the conference-treated in the Juvenile Personal Property and Youth Violence experiments as well (the question was not asked in Drink Driving).

Table 6-5: Drink Driving – Perceived Justice Measures, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Consistency:					
Offenders with same offence treated the same	219	45.7%	232	50.9%	.270
Impartiality:					
Felt treated no better or worse than others	216	50.5%	225	24.9%	.000 *
Retributive Justice:					
The outcome from my treatment was severe	219	47.0%	236	41.5%	.238
Restorative Justice:					
The treatment allowed me to repay society	219	38.8%	234	73.1%	.000 *

Table 6-6: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Justice Measures, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Consistency:					
Offenders with same offence treated the same	27	51.8%	28	42.9%	.513
Impartiality:					
Felt treated no better or worse than others	25	48.0%	30	16.7%	.015 *
Retributive Justice:					
The outcome from my treatment was severe	27	25.9%	28	35.7%	.441
Restorative Justice:					
The treatment allowed me to repay society	26	42.3%	28	67.9%	.061
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	26	42.3%	28	67.9%	.061

Table 6-7: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Justice Measures, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Consistency:					
Offenders with same offence treated the same	23	43.5%	23	69.6%	.077
Impartiality:					
Felt treated no better or worse than others	24	50.0%	24	37.5%	.394
Retributive Justice:					
The outcome from my treatment was severe	23	4.3%	23	26.1%	.043 *
Restorative Justice:					

The treatment allowed me to repay society	23	26.1%	23	73.9%	.001 *
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	22	27.3%	23	52.2%	.091

Table 6-8: Youth Violence – Perceived Justice Measures, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Consistency:					
Offenders with same offence treated the same	11	54.5%	11	36.4%	.416
Impartiality:					
Felt treated no better or worse than others	11	36.4%	11	9.1%	.143
Retributive Justice:					
The outcome from my treatment was severe	11	27.3%	11	9.1%	.293
Restorative Justice:					
The treatment allowed me to repay society	11	18.2%	11	54.5%	.084
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	11	9.1%	11	63.6%	.007 *

REINTEGRATIVE SHAMING (Tables 6-9 – 6-12)

Tables 6-9 through 6-12 measure aspects of perceived reintegrative shaming. Both in the Juvenile Personal Property and the Juvenile Property (Security) experiments significantly more of the conference-treated offenders agreed that ‘people have made it clear to me that I could put the whole thing behind me’ and this approached significance in the Drink Driving as well. Significantly more of the Youth Violence offenders who were conference-treated said that they had been able to clear their conscience, that people had said that it was not like them to offend and that their family had given them more support since the disposition. Drink Driving conference-treated offenders also significantly more often reported that they were able to clear their conscience and that people had said that it was not like them to offend; in addition, significantly more of them said that they had felt able to make up for what they had done and that their friends felt that the offence was wrong. (This last may indicate a change in attitude among friends who had been influenced by what they observed and learned themselves when they attended the conference; it may even mark a shift in attitude about drink driving, traditionally a ‘low shame’ offence.) In Youth Violence, court-treated offenders were more likely to say ‘People noted aspects of me that they like’. This effect did not appear in any other experiment.

Table 6-9: Drink Driving – Perceived Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
I now feel that my offence was wrong	223	95.5%	242	95.5%	.975
My friends feel that my offence was wrong	223	84.3%	241	90.9%	.033 *
My family was hurt by my offence	224	60.7%	240	62.5%	.693
I was able to make up for what I did	219	38.8%	235	72.3%	.000 *
I was able to clear my conscience	219	26.5%	235	48.1%	.000 *
People said it was not like me to offend	219	37.9%	233	47.6%	.036 *
People said I can put the offence behind me	218	54.6%	234	62.8%	.076
People accept me as basically law-abiding	220	82.3%	235	86.0%	.284
People noted aspects of me that they like	218	54.1%	235	51.9%	.638
I have been treated as a trustworthy person	218	91.3%	235	94.0%	.263
My family has given me more support	215	28.8%	230	30.4%	.713
My friends have given me more support	220	29.6%	234	27.8%	.678

Table 6-10: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
I now feel that my offence was wrong	28	96.4%	31	93.6%	.617
My friends feel that my offence was wrong	26	57.7%	31	67.7%	.445
My family was hurt by my offence	28	92.9%	31	80.7%	.169
I was able to make up for what I did	26	38.5%	28	64.3%	.060
I was able to clear my conscience	26	34.6%	28	57.1%	.100
People said it was not like me to offend	26	53.9%	28	42.9%	.429
People said I can put the offence behind me	26	61.5%	28	85.7%	.047 *
People accept me as basically law-abiding	26	50.0%	28	57.1%	.607
People noted aspects of me that they like	26	53.9%	28	46.4%	.594
I have been treated as a trustworthy person	26	53.9%	28	75.0%	.110
My family has given me more support	27	51.8%	28	42.9%	.513
My friends have given me more support	25	28.0%	28	28.6%	.964

Table 6-11: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
I now feel that my offence was wrong	24	91.7%	24	95.8%	.561
My friends feel that my offence was wrong	24	54.2%	24	70.8%	.242
My family was hurt by my offence	24	70.8%	24	87.5%	.162
I was able to make up for what I did	23	39.1%	23	60.9%	.147
I was able to clear my conscience	23	30.4%	23	47.8%	.236
People said it was not like me to offend	23	39.1%	23	65.2%	.080
People said I can put the offence behind me	23	52.2%	23	82.6%	.028 *
People accept me as basically law-abiding	23	47.8%	23	52.2%	.774
People noted aspects of me that they like	23	60.9%	23	60.9%	1.000
I have been treated as a trustworthy person	23	69.6%	23	82.6%	.311
My family has given me more support	23	34.8%	22	40.9%	.680
My friends have given me more support	23	13.0%	22	18.2%	.645

PERCEIVED STIGMATIC SHAMING (Tables 6-13 – 6-16)**Table 6-12: Youth Violence – Perceived Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference**

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
I now feel that my offence was wrong	10	70.0%	12	75.0%	.806
My friends feel that my offence was wrong	10	10.0%	12	41.7%	.094
My family was hurt by my offence	11	81.8%	12	75.0%	.707
I was able to make up for what I did	11	36.4%	11	63.6%	.219
I was able to clear my conscience	11	18.2%	11	63.6%	.031 *
People said it was not like me to offend	11	36.4%	11	81.8%	.031 *
People said I can put the offence behind me	11	72.7%	11	90.9%	.293
People accept me as basically law-abiding	11	54.5%	11	81.8%	.187
People noted aspects of me that they like	11	72.7%	11	27.3%	.034 *
I have been treated as a trustworthy person	11	63.6%	11	63.6%	1.000
My family has given me more support	11	.0%	11	54.5%	.006 *
My friends have given me more support	11	27.3%	11	36.4%	.666

Tables 6-13 through 6-16 examine aspects of perceived stigmatic shaming. Significantly more of the court-treated offenders in the Juvenile Personal Property experiment said that since the court case they had been ‘treated as though I was a bad person’, while significantly more of them in the Juvenile Property (Security) experiment said that they had been ‘treated as though I was a criminal.’ In Youth Violence significantly more of the court-treated offenders said that ‘people will not let me forget what I have done even though some time has passed.’ The Drink Driving results were noteworthy mainly for the low levels of stigmatic shaming recorded by both the court-treated and the conference-treated offenders and there was no significant difference between the groups on any of these measures.

Table 6-13: Drink Driving – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treated as though would offend again	220	9.1%	235	6.4%	.282
People made negative judgments about me	219	6.8%	235	8.5%	.507
Treated as though I was a criminal	220	5.4%	235	3.0%	.192
People important to me have rejected me	220	1.8%	235	2.1%	.813
Treated as though I was a bad person	219	3.2%	235	3.4%	.902
People will not let me forget what I did	222	17.1%	242	19.4%	.522

Table 6-14: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treated as though would offend again	26	26.9%	28	32.1%	.681
People made negative judgments about me	26	30.8%	27	40.7%	.458
Treated as though I was a criminal	26	30.8%	28	10.7%	.075
People important to me have rejected me	26	.0%	28	10.7%	.083
Treated as though I was a bad person	26	23.1%	28	3.6%	.040 *
People will not let me forget what I did	28	14.3%	31	22.6%	.419

Table 6-15: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treated as though would offend again	23	17.4%	23	21.7%	.718
People made negative judgments about me	23	21.7%	23	17.4%	.718
Treated as though I was a criminal	23	34.8%	23	4.3%	.010 *
People important to me have rejected me	23	8.7%	23	4.3%	.561
Treated as though I was a bad person	23	30.4%	23	8.7%	.067
People will not let me forget what I did	24	25.0%	24	25.0%	1.000

Table 6-16: Youth Violence – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treated as though would offend again	11	36.4%	11	27.3%	.666
People made negative judgments about me	11	27.3%	11	9.1%	.293
Treated as though I was a criminal	11	27.3%	11	9.1%	.293
People important to me have rejected me	11	9.1%	11	.0%	.341
Treated as though I was a bad person	11	27.3%	11	9.1%	.293
People will not let me forget what I did	11	54.5%	12	8.3%	.020 *

PERCEIVED FORGIVENESS (Tables 6-17 – 6-20)

As Tables 6-17 through 6-20 show, overall, across all experiments and for both treatment groups there were relatively high levels of forgiveness recorded by offenders. However, in the Juvenile Property (Security) experiment significantly more of the conference-treated said that since the disposition ‘people have indicated that I was forgiven’, and that ‘people have suggested that they love me regardless of what I did’. Significantly more of the conference-treated Drink Driving offenders also said that they felt forgiven and that since the disposition people had said that they ‘had learnt their lesson and now deserve a second chance’.

Table 6-17: Drink Driving – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	218	48.2%	234	66.2%	.000 *
People said they love me despite the offence	217	72.8%	235	74.5%	.690
People said that I deserve a second chance	219	47.0%	232	56.9%	.036 *

Table 6-18: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	25	76.0%	28	67.9%	.518
People said they love me despite the offence	26	80.8%	28	82.1%	.899
People said that I deserve a second chance	25	60.0%	28	78.6%	.152

Table 6-19: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	23	43.5%	23	91.3%	.000 *
People said they love me despite the offence	23	60.9%	23	91.3%	.016 *
People said that I deserve a second chance	23	56.5%	23	65.2%	.556

Table 6-20: Youth Violence – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	11	54.5%	11	72.7%	.400
People said they love me despite the offence	11	72.7%	11	81.8%	.631
People said that I deserve a second chance	11	54.5%	11	54.5%	1.000

PERCEIVED ANGER (Tables 6-21 – 6-24)

Tables 6-21 through 6-24 indicate that there were relatively low levels of anger expressed by any of the offenders across all experiments. All experimental effects were in the direction of greater bitterness and anger for court-treated offenders, though only three of these were significant. One of these was in Youth Violence where almost half of the court-treated said that they felt bitter about the way they had been treated compared with none of the conference-treated, a significant difference. Significantly more of the court-treated Drink Driving offenders also said that they felt bitter, and also that the treatment ‘just made me angry’.

Table 6-21: Drink Driving – Perceived Anger, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel bitter about the way I was treated	219	12.8%	236	6.4%	.021 *
The treatment just made me angry	218	16.5%	235	5.1%	.000 *
I wish I could get back at my accusers	217	.9%	233	.4%	.528

Table 6-22: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Anger court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel bitter about the way I was treated	27	18.5%	29	6.9%	.203
The treatment just made me angry	26	23.1%	28	10.7%	.237
I wish I could get back at my accusers	26	11.5%	28	7.1%	.589

Table 6-23: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Anger, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel bitter about the way I was treated	23	4.3%	24	.0%	.328
The treatment just made me angry	23	21.7%	23	8.7%	.228
I wish I could get back at my accusers	23	4.3%	23	.0%	.328

Table 6-24: Youth Violence – Perceived Anger, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel bitter about the way I was treated	11	45.4%	11	.0%	.016 *
The treatment just made me angry	11	27.3%	11	18.2%	.631
I wish I could get back at my accusers	11	18.2%	11	.0%	.167

PERCEIVED DEFIANCE (Tables 6-25 – 6-28)

Tables 6-25 through 6-28 show relatively low levels of defiance across all offenders and all experiments, with the exception of Youth Violence where two-thirds of the court-treated offenders said they felt that ‘the people who accused me were more wrong than I was’: the difference between court and conference offenders approached significance on this question.

Table 6-25: Drink Driving – Perceived Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel my accusers were more wrong than me	217	6.4%	234	4.7%	.421
Feel glad that I committed the offence	224	4.9%	242	9.5%	.054
Now feel that offence was right	223	.9%	242	.8%	.935

Table 6-26: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel my accusers were more wrong than me	26	30.8%	28	17.9%	.280
Feel glad that I committed the offence	29	6.9%	31	6.4%	.946
Now feel that offence was right	28	3.6%	31	.0%	.326

Table 6-27: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel my accusers were more wrong than me	23	8.7%	23	.0%	.162
Feel glad that I committed the offence	24	.0%	24	4.2%	.328
Now feel that offence was right	24	4.2%	24	.0%	.328

Table 6-28: Youth Violence – Perceived Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel my accusers were more wrong than me	11	63.6%	11	27.3%	.095
Feel glad that I committed the offence	11	18.2%	12	8.3%	.513
Now feel that offence was right	10	10.0%	12	16.7%	.662

PERCEIVED INFORMAL CONTROL (Tables 6-29 – 6-32)

Tables 6-29 through 6-32 reveal high values relating to informal social control across all experiments and both treatment groups on all measures apart from that concerning family closeness. The exception here was Drink Driving where significantly more of the conference-treated said that ‘the time since the conference has brought my family closer together.’ Also in Drink Driving, significantly more of the conference-treated said that they anticipated problems with their family and friends if they should reoffend.

Table 6-29: Drink Driving – Perceived Informal Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	223	66.4%	243	76.1%	.020 *
I learned there are people who care about me	220	82.3%	235	86.0%	.284
I am proud to be a member of my family	224	97.8%	242	96.7%	.480
My family is closer together since treatment	219	17.4%	235	28.9%	.003 *
My family loves me	224	97.8%	242	98.8%	.416
I love my family	224	98.2%	242	97.9%	.826
Increased respect among my family	220	24.1%	235	28.9%	.242

Table 6-30: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Informal Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	29	79.3%	31	80.7%	.899
I learned there are people who care about me	26	50.0%	28	57.1%	.607
I am proud to be a member of my family	29	89.7%	31	87.1%	.762
My family is closer together since treatment	28	17.9%	28	17.9%	1.000
My family loves me	29	96.5%	31	90.3%	.335
I love my family	29	100.0%	31	96.8%	.325
Increased respect among my family	28	50.0%	28	39.3%	.429

Table 6-31: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Informal Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	24	70.8%	24	91.7%	.068
I learned there are people who care about me	23	47.8%	23	52.2%	.774
I am proud to be a member of my family	24	87.5%	24	91.7%	.645
My family is closer together since treatment	23	13.0%	23	8.7%	.645
My family loves me	24	95.8%	24	100.0%	.328
I love my family	24	100.0%	24	100.0%	
Increased respect among my family	23	34.8%	23	34.8%	1.000

Table 6-32: Youth Violence – Perceived Informal Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	11	63.6%	12	83.3%	.311
I learned there are people who care about me	11	54.5%	11	81.8%	.187
I am proud to be a member of my family	11	81.8%	12	100.0%	.167
My family is closer together since treatment	11	9.1%	11	36.4%	.143
My family loves me	11	81.8%	12	91.7%	.513
I love my family	11	100.0%	12	91.7%	.339
Increased respect among my family	11	36.4%	11	54.5%	.416

PERCEIVED DETERRENCE (Tables 6-33 – 6-36)

Tables 6-33 through 6-36 indicate relatively high scores concerning the perceived deterrent effect of both treatments. Not surprisingly, in Juvenile Property (Security) and in Drink Driving, significantly more of the conference-treated believed that getting caught for the same kind of offence again and going to a conference again would create a problem. Interestingly, the only other significant difference between the treatment groups occurs in Drink Driving on the question: ‘If you were caught for drink driving again, how much of a problem would it create for your life if your name and offence were printed in the newspaper?’ (drink driving offenders dealt with in court routinely have their names and offences printed in *The Canberra Times*). Significantly more of the conference-treated than the court-treated said that this would be a problem for them: the court-treated had already had their names in the newspaper following their RISE offence, so it appears that this outcome loses its effect once it has already happened to the offender.

Table 6-33: Drink Driving – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	223	94.6%	243	95.5%	.672
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	224	93.8%	243	97.1%	.084
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	223	58.3%	239	81.6%	.000 *
Newspaper would be a problem if I reoffend	221	62.0%	243	73.7%	.007 *
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	222	74.8%	242	78.5%	.343

Table 6-34: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	29	86.2%	31	80.7%	.569
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	29	100.0%	31	93.6%	.161
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	29	55.2%	31	74.2%	.129
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	29	48.3%	31	51.6%	.800

Table 6-35: Juvenile Property (Security) – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	24	70.8%	24	91.7%	.068
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	24	95.8%	24	100.0%	.328
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	24	41.7%	24	70.8%	.043 *
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	24	41.7%	24	62.5%	.155

Table 6-36: Youth Violence – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	11	81.8%	12	83.3%	.928
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	11	100.0%	12	100.0%	
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	11	36.4%	12	75.0%	.068

SELF-PROJECTED COMPLIANCE (Tables 6-37 – 6-40)

Likely to be caught if I reoffend	11	63.6%	12	66.7%	.886
-----------------------------------	----	-------	----	-------	------

As Tables 6-37 through 6-40 show, there was almost no significant difference between the treatment groups concerning the likelihood of the treatment they experienced helping them to obey the law and not to reoffend. The exception was in Drink Driving, where significantly more of the conference-treated believed that their treatment would indeed help them in this regard.

Table 6-37: Drink Driving – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	218	78.9%	236	88.1%	.008 *
Treatment will help me to obey the law	219	78.5%	235	88.1%	.007 *

Table 6-38: Juvenile Personal Property – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	26	61.5%	28	71.4%	.452
Treatment will help me to obey the law	26	57.7%	28	71.4%	.302

Table 6-39: Juvenile Property (Security) – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	23	73.9%	23	73.9%	1.000
Treatment will help me to obey the law	23	56.5%	23	69.6%	.371

Table 6-40: Youth Violence – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	11	63.6%	11	81.8%	.363
Treatment will help me to obey the law	11	45.4%	11	81.8%	.084

EFFECT OF THE TREATMENT ON FAMILY AND FRIENDS (Table 6.41)

The series of questions in Table 6.41 were asked only of Drink Driving offenders. They indicate that significantly more conference-treated than court-treated offenders believe that their disposition encouraged their family and friends to be more careful about drink driving, that it encouraged their friends to warn others about driving when they have had too much to drink and that it encouraged their friends to find alternative transportation when they have had too much to drink.

Table 6-41: Drink Driving – Effect of Treatment on Family and Friends, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Family more careful about drink driving	213	59.6%	226	71.7%	.008 *
Friends more careful about drink driving	217	50.2%	235	70.2%	.000 *
Friends warn others about drink driving	216	42.6%	234	62.8%	.000 *
Friends find transportation for others	216	47.2%	235	67.2%	.000 *