

CHAPTER 8

POLICE ATTITUDES TOWARDS COURT AND CONFERENCE

This Chapter describes how police officers involved in RISE have reacted to the two forms of treatment.

Tables 8-1 through 8-4 report on analysis of the Facilitator Questionnaire, which is filled out by the conference facilitating police officer. It can only be answered by officers involved in successfully completed conferences so it cannot be used experimentally to compare court and conference. There were no significant changes from last year.

Tables 8-5 through 8-8 refer to a second source of data on police attitudes, referred to as the Informant Questionnaire. This is completed by the officers who investigated the offences and referred the case into RISE. Because this instrument was sent to officers whose offenders had been assigned to both court and conference, these data can be used to make experimental comparisons between the two treatment groups. . There were very few changes from last year: the only significant differences were in Juvenile Personal Property where now significantly more of the informants whose cases were assigned to court reported that they knew the details of the treatment outcome,

Table 8-1: Drink Driving - Conference Facilitator Reactions

	<i>n</i>	Value
Satisfied with the conference outcome	366	89.6%
Not satisfied with the conference outcome	366	3.6%
Felt conference outcome was too lenient	361	11.9%
Felt conference outcome was fair	361	84.2%
Felt conference outcome was too severe	361	3.9%
Less attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	347	80.7%
More attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	347	5.2%

Table 8-2:- Juvenile Personal Property - Conference Facilitator Reactions

	<i>n</i>	Value
Satisfied with the conference outcome	38	89.5%
Not satisfied with the conference outcome	38	2.6%
Felt conference outcome was too lenient	38	7.9%
Felt conference outcome was fair	38	76.3%
Felt conference outcome was too severe	38	15.8%
Less attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	37	94.6%
More attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	37	.0%

Table 8-3: Juvenile Property (Security) - Conference Facilitator Reactions

	<i>n</i>	Value
Satisfied with the conference outcome	36	77.8%
Not satisfied with the conference outcome	36	11.1%
Felt conference outcome was too lenient	36	13.9%
Felt conference outcome was fair	36	86.1%
Felt conference outcome was too severe	36	.0%
Less attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	36	88.9%
More attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	36	2.8%

Table 8-4: Youth Violence - Conference Facilitator Reactions

	<i>n</i>	Value
Satisfied with the conference outcome	23	91.3%
Not satisfied with the conference outcome	23	8.7%
Felt conference outcome was too lenient	23	4.3%
Felt conference outcome was fair	23	82.6%
Felt conference outcome was too severe	23	13.0%
Less attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	22	95.5%
More attention would have been paid to community/victims in court	22	.0%

Table 8-5: Drink Driving – Informant Reactions, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Attended the treatment	290	4.8%	245	9.4%	.044 *
Knew about the outcome from treatment	288	50.3%	245	24.1%	.000 *
Satisfied with the outcome	142	70.4%	57	61.4%	.236
Felt outcome was too lenient	142	23.2%	57	28.1%	.490
Felt outcome was fair	142	75.3%	57	71.9%	.627
Felt outcome was too severe	142	1.4%	57	.0%	.158
Pleased with treatment rather than alternative	285	29.5%	240	36.3%	.101
Less job satisfaction with alternative	285	19.0%	238	14.3%	.152
More job satisfaction with alternative	285	11.6%	238	12.2%	.832

Table 8-6: Juvenile Personal Property – Informant Reactions, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Attended the treatment	39	33.3%	28	21.4%	.283
Knew details of treatment outcome	39	74.4%	28	50.0%	.046 *
Satisfied with the outcome	29	58.6%	14	64.3%	.730
Felt outcome was too lenient	29	34.5%	14	21.4%	.375
Felt outcome was fair	29	65.5%	14	78.6%	.375
Felt outcome was too severe	29	.0%	14	.0%	
Pleased with treatment rather than alternative	39	41.0%	28	60.7%	.116
Less job satisfaction with alternative	39	17.9%	27	25.9%	.456
More job satisfaction with alternative	39	17.9%	27	3.7%	.054
Less attention paid to victim with alternative	38	.0%	27	14.8%	.043 *
More attention paid to victim with alternative	38	28.9%	27	3.7%	.004 *

Table 8-7: Juvenile Property (Security) – Informant Reactions, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Attended the treatment	31	35.5%	26	11.5%	.031 *
Knew about the outcome from treatment	31	71.0%	26	23.1%	.000 *
Satisfied with the outcome	20	80.0%	6	83.3%	.865
Felt outcome was too lenient	20	5.0%	6	33.3%	.242
Felt outcome was fair	20	90.0%	6	66.7%	.333
Felt outcome was too severe	20	5.0%	6	.0%	.330
Pleased with treatment rather than alternative	30	36.7%	26	50.0%	.325
Less job satisfaction with alternative	30	10.0%	26	23.1%	.202
More job satisfaction with alternative	30	20.0%	26	11.5%	.392
Less attention paid to victim with alternative	28	.0%	23	8.7%	.162
More attention paid to victim than alternative	28	10.7%	23	4.3%	.392

Table 8-8: Youth Violence – Informant Reactions, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Attended the treatment	18	44.4%	17	35.3%	.593
Knew about the outcome from treatment	18	72.2%	17	52.9%	.252
Satisfied with the outcome	12	66.7%	9	77.8%	.593
Felt outcome was too lenient	12	41.7%	9	33.3%	.713
Felt outcome was fair	12	41.7%	9	55.6%	.554
Felt outcome was too severe	12	16.7%	9	11.1%	.729
Pleased with treatment rather than alternative	17	35.3%	16	62.5%	.126
Less job satisfaction with alternative	18	38.9%	16	25.0%	.400
More job satisfaction with alternative	18	33.3%	16	6.3%	.048 *
Less attention paid to victim with alternative	17	5.9%	15	6.7%	.930
More attention paid to victim than alternative	17	17.6%	15	6.7%	.353