

# **Experiments In Restorative Policing**

## **Reintegrative Shaming of Violence, Drink Driving and Property Crime: A Randomised Controlled Trial**

**July 1997**



**Australian National University  
and  
The Australian Federal Police**

by

Lawrence W. Sherman, University of Maryland (USA)  
Co-Principal Investigator and Scientific Director

John Braithwaite, Australian National University  
Principal Investigator

Heather Strang, Australian National University  
Project Manager

Geoffrey C. Barnes  
Assistant Project Manager, Data Analysis

Jane Christie-Johnston  
Assistant Project Manager, Observations

Sandra Smith  
Assistant Project Manager, Interviews

Nova Inkpen, Project Staff

July 11, 1997

Australian National University  
Institute Of Advanced Studies  
Research School Of Social Sciences  
Law Program  
Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE)

## **Executive Summary**

In the first two years of the juvenile property crime experiment, the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) have made substantial progress towards a very strong scientific test of the theory and practice of restorative community justice conferences. As of July 4, 1997, a total of 156 cases of juvenile property offences involving almost 200 offenders have been randomly assigned to be treated by court or diversionary conference. Unlike most field experiments (from medicine to criminology) in which there is often widespread failure to comply with the randomly assigned treatment, the Australian Federal Police have followed the scientific protocol in virtually every case. RISE Observers have been present to record what happened at 85 percent of the conferences and court appearances. Over 80 percent of the offenders and 90 percent of the victims treated in court or conference have been interviewed, an excellent response rate for almost any kind of survey.

Based on the very strong scientific methods achieved to date, RISE has produced the following preliminary findings:

### **Sample Characteristics**

- RISE juveniles are very active, averaging over 40 self-reported offences in the last year
- Almost all (97 percent) RISE offenders interviewed have committed prior crimes
- Almost all RISE juvenile property offenders are 14 to 17 years of age
- Most RISE juvenile property offenders are male (79 percent) female

### **Treatment Characteristics**

- Conferences last almost six times as long as court adjudication (70 minutes vs. 12)
- Conferences involve almost three times as many friends and relatives of the offenders
- Court cases begin treatment sooner than conferences, but require more appearances
- Penalties were similar in court and conference cases, with more community service in conference cases

### **Victim Perspectives**

- Not one case assigned to court had a victim present at court
- Victims attended 82 percent of conference cases involving personal victims
- Victims almost never receive compensation or an apology from the court process
- Almost all conferences attended by victims produced an apology, compensation or both
- Conferences make victims less fearful of the offender and of crime in general

### **Offender Perspectives**

- Offenders feel more ashamed of themselves and their crimes after conferences than court
- Conferences make offenders feel more obligation to repay society for their crime
- Conferences increase offenders respect for police and the legal system more than court
- Conferences make offenders feel closer to more of their friends and family than court
- Conferences give offenders no less fear of formal punishment than court
- Conferences give offenders more concern about family reactions if they re-offend
- Offenders are more likely to say they will not re-offend after conference than after court

# Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Research Design and Methods
3. Sample Characteristics
4. Treatment Characteristics
5. Victim Perceptions
6. Offender Perceptions
7. Conclusion: Progress and Prospects

# 1. Introduction

In recent years, criminological research evidence has increasingly pointed to the shortcomings of punishment in reducing future offending. In juvenile justice, the failure of a hard-line 'law and order' approach has been matched by failures in the 'welfare' model as well. At the same time, victims around the world have expressed growing dissatisfaction with their limited role in the criminal justice system generally. Meanwhile, the costs associated with crime and crime control have risen exponentially. All these concerns demonstrate the need to investigate alternatives to traditional ways of dealing with offenders.

Such an alternative, known as Conferencing, has been developed by Australian police, based in part on New Zealand juvenile justice reform. Its focus is away from the traditional adversarial model of doing justice and towards a restorative justice approach. There are strong theoretical reasons to believe that conferences should be more effective than court in preventing future offending for certain kinds of crime. Normal court processing may stigmatise offenders as well as offences, whereas the capacity of offenders to lead responsible lives in the future may depend upon their acknowledging the consequences of their offending behaviour, experiencing the shame of their act and being reintegrated into their 'community of care' - those people whom they respect and who care most about them. The conferencing model provides a valuable opportunity to test the theory, providing as it does the means of achieving both shame and reintegration.

Conferencing is one part of a broader world-wide restorative justice movement. The momentum of this movement has led to the establishment of Australian-style conferencing programs in Europe and North America, with many enthusiastic claims being made for their effectiveness. Few of these programs, however, have been the subject of rigorous evaluation and none of them has been the subject of a successfully implemented randomised trial. Only the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) in Canberra, where the Australian Federal Police ACT Region established a conferencing program in 1994, tests the effectiveness of conferencing compared with court on a fully controlled basis. Advocates, researchers, policy advisers and practitioners around the world keenly await the results.

## The Juvenile Property Experiment

This experiment will include a total of 300 cases. As a relatively high proportion of these cases are shoplifting matters, it was decided to separate the Juvenile Property Experiment into two halves: one half (150 cases) consists of offences committed in stores employing security staff whose task it is to apprehend offenders, while the other half (150 cases) consists of all other juvenile property offences not referred initially by store security personnel. The separation uses an experimental procedure called "blocking," in which random assignment to court and conference is allocated separately for each half. For analytic purposes, however, the two halves can be united and analysed in totality. Thus the "juvenile property experiment" really consists of three ways to test the concept of conferencing: Juvenile Property-Security (JPS), Juvenile Property--Personal victim (JPP), and Juvenile Property Combined.

The following information relates exclusively to the cases in these sub-experiments.

## 2. Research Design and Methods

### a. **Eligibility Criteria:**

Offences being sent to this experiment consist of burglary, theft, criminal damage, shoplifting, fraud, car theft, vehicle breakins, possession of stolen property or attempts at any of these. Besides the offence being a property matter and the offender (or at least one of the co-offenders) being under the age of 18, the following criteria must be satisfied:

- the offender has made full admissions of responsibility for the offence
- a sergeant has approved the case being sent to RISE
- there is no reason to believe the offender would object to a conference if the case is assigned to a conference
- the offender does not have any outstanding warrants or bonds requiring them to go to court
- the offender lives in the ACT region
- the police officer referring the case agrees to accept the RISE recommendation for all co-offenders in the case regardless of whether it is court or conference

### b. **Recruitment of Cases:**

Cases are sent to RISE from officers throughout the AFP ACT Region. This includes uniform patrol officers from each of the four Canberra police stations and its' special 'City Beat' office in the centre of the city, and also from the Traffic Division and the Crime Branch. Just prior to the commencement of data collection, almost every constable and sergeant in the Region underwent a day-long information and training session with RISE staff and were provided with guidance on case eligibility and the procedure for referring matters into RISE.

### c. **Referring Cases into RISE:**

When police officers have a matter that they believe is RISE-eligible, they ring a 24 hour mobile phone number which is permanently in the custody of one or other member of the research team (91 per cent of calls are received outside business hours). Officers are then asked a series of ten screening questions to verify the eligibility of the case. Case details are entered into a log, an envelope containing the random assignment (court or conference) is opened and the officer informed of the recommended disposition immediately.

### d. **Observation of Treatment:**

RISE staff obtain dates of court and conference appearances for all experimental subjects. Staff observe all these appearances and complete systematic observation instruments to record what happens.

### e. **Offender and Victim Interviews:**

Upon the disposition of the case, whether by court or conference, letters are sent to offenders and victims asking for their agreement to be interviewed. This is followed up with a phone call from the interviewer (of whom ten are employed by RISE on a contract basis) to arrange a time and place for the interview. Eligible supporters of offenders and victims are interviewed at the same time.

Respondents will be contacted again for a second wave of interviewing exactly two years after the date of random assignment to treatment (this process began on 1 July 1997).

The exception to this procedure is for victims of offences classified as JPS, because the only identifiable victim in these cases is the security officer who apprehended the offender. It was decided not to interview these people as they would shed little light on the experience of victims of crime generally, given that the basis of their employment is specifically to apprehend shoplifters.

### f. **Pipeline:**

The generalisability of the experiment to all similar cases is a critical factor in using the study for making policy decisions. In order to assess the external validity of the study, RISE compares the characteristics of cases referred to RISE to the characteristics of RISE-eligible cases not referred to RISE, the combination of which constitutes the "pipeline" of all possible cases police encounter each week that could go into RISE. These data are tracked through a weekly "pipeline" study. This study involves collecting information each week for the life of the experiment on the number and characteristics of all RISE-eligible cases recorded on the police Incident Database.

### 3. Sample Characteristics

a. **Pipeline analysis:**

Over the first two years of RISE, 43 percent of all eligible Juvenile Property cases (both JPS and JPP) have been sent to RISE (this figure may change when more data are available). The combined rate reflects 37 percent of eligible cases referred for JPP and 51 percent for JPS.

b. **Cases and Individuals:**

As would be expected from what is known of juvenile offending patterns, many of the cases entering the Juvenile Property Experiment have co-offenders. RISE is a case-based study in which all co-offenders in the same matter are dealt with the same way. Analysis will be undertaken at both individual and case-based levels. On average there are 1.3 offenders and 1.3 victims per case.

**Table A: Number of Offenders in each JPP case assigned up to 20 June 1997**

Number of Offenders	Frequency	Percent
1	63	75.9
2	13	15.7
3	7	8.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table B: Number of Offenders in each JPS case assigned up to 20 June 1997**

Number of Offenders	Frequency	Percent
1	55	76.4
2	16	22.2
4	1	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table C: Offenders in all Juvenile Property cases assigned up to 20 June 1997**

Number of Offenders	Frequency	Percent
1	118	76.1
2	29	18.7
3	7	4.5
4	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table D: N of Victims in each JPP case assigned up to 20 June 1997**

Number of Victims	Frequency	Percent
0	8	9.6
1	47	56.7
2	5	6.0
3	1	1.2
4	1	1.2
Unknown*	21	25.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*21 cases are yet to be treated so no details yet available on N of victims involved  
For JPS there are a total of 72 victims to date. There are no multiple-victim cases for JPS.

c. **Completion/Response Rates:**

Observations:

Every effort is made to ensure that each appearance in court and conference by RISE subjects is observed and coded by a member of the RISE team. For court subjects, there are difficulties in the way the magistrates courts are managed which militate against achieving this goal. In addition, the explicit permission of juveniles and their parents must be obtained for a RISE

observer to sit in the courtroom while their case is dealt with. Likewise, administrative difficulties have meant that the RISE team has not always been notified by police of forthcoming conferences.

In the current **observation** dataset there are 66 JPP cases and 62 JPS cases, making a total of 128 cases in the combined Juvenile Property Experiment where at least one observable appearance has occurred. Each case can include one or more "treatment events," such as multiple court appearances or a court appearance after a conference fails to reach a restitution agreement. RISE measures its success in observing court and conference treatments as a percentage of all treatment events.

#### Case-based data:

In JPP, 110 treatment events have taken place in these 66 cases and a RISE observer was present at 93 (85 per cent). The observation rate for the court cases (83 per cent) is not significantly different from the observation rate for the conference cases (89 percent).

In JPS, 78 treatment events have taken place in these 62 cases and an observer was present at 61 (78 percent). The observation rate for the court cases (80 percent) is not significantly different from the observation rate for the conference cases (76 percent).

In the combined Juvenile Property Experiment, 188 treatment events have taken place in these 128 cases and an observer was present at 154 (82 percent). The observation rate for the court cases (82 percent) is the same as the observation rate for the conference cases (82 percent).

It is worth noting that in only 66 percent of all Juvenile Property events attended in court did anything substantive occur that was recordable by the observer (the remainder were mentions and adjournments). This compares with 85 percent of cases dealt with by conference: most of the remaining 15 percent of conference events were postponed because either the victim or the offender did not attend on the first scheduled occasion.

#### Offender-based data:

Table 1 describes the observation completion rates for individual offender-treatments. In JPP, there were 138 offender-treatments to be observed. Of these, observers were present at 119 (86 percent). This consisted of 84 percent of the court offender-treatments and 90 percent of conference offender-treatments.

In JPS, there were 95 offender-treatments to be observed. Of these, observers were present for 76 (80 percent). This consisted of 81 percent of the court offender-treatments and 79 percent of conference offender-treatments.

In the combined Juvenile Property Experiment, there were 233 offender-treatments to be observed. Of these, observations were recorded for 195 (84 percent). This consisted of 83 percent of the court offender-treatments and 84 percent of conference offender-treatments.

#### Interviews:

The interview response rate for Juvenile Property offenders is calculated using the average time to completion of interviews, which is approximately two months. This average is the minimum time period allowed for completion of interviews in the following analysis, which includes all offenders treated by court or conference prior to 22 April 1997. Table 2 shows the offender response rates to the first wave of interviewing (known as Year 0).

In JPP, 81 offenders had been treated by this cut-off date, of whom 65 (80 percent) have been interviewed to date. The response rate of those treated by court is 73 percent and of those treated by conference is 89 percent.

In JPS, 76 offenders had been treated by this cut-off date, of whom 62 (81 percent) have been interviewed to date. The response rate of those treated by court is 76 percent and of those treated by conference is 86 percent.

In the combined Juvenile Property Experiment, 157 offenders had been treated by this cut-off date, of whom 127 (81 percent) have been interviewed to date. The response rate of those treated by court is 74 percent and of those treated by conference is 88 percent.

By the standards of modern survey research in general, and of criminological experiments in particular, these offender interview rates are very high. Previous experiments in the US found it impossible to locate and interview offenders after they had been assigned to different treatments in the US. The fact that the interview completion rates under such adverse circumstances are higher than those of surveys conducted under far less sensitive conditions is a major accomplishment of RISE to date, and an important part of its scientific integrity.

While the high interview success rates allows the research to generalise to the full sample of treated offenders, it is worth noting the reasons why the completion rates are not even higher than they are. Two factors militate against success in interviewing all offenders. Some offenders simply refused to be interviewed, while others proved impossible to locate. The differential success rates in interviewing court and conference offenders appear to be an artefact of the way the two dispositions are conducted. In a conference the police facilitator introduces the RISE observer to the participants and seeks their consent to him/her attending (in every case this consent has been given). In court, the observer must approach the offender and parents to obtain this consent without benefit of specific endorsement by the court; unlike the conferences, the court creates no link which might provide a basis for approaching these respondents later for interview.

Victims have proven both easier to contact and usually are keen to be interviewed. As of 20 June 1997, 60 interviews with victims of Juvenile Property (Personal) offences had been completed. This represents a response rate of 93 per cent of victims whose cases went to conference and 94 per cent of victims whose cases went to court (as a proportion of all police-identified victims). Of the four cases not successfully interviewed, only one was a refusal and three could not be located.

**Table E - Response Rate for Victim Interviews.**

	Victims			Cases		
	Identified*	Interviewed	%	Identified*	Interviewed	%
JPP DC	30	28	93	24	22	92
JPP Court	35	33	94	31	29	94

\* *Identified* is defined as victims identified by the police. In all cases with multiple victims, all victims were interviewed.

**d. Offence Characteristics:**

The offence categories coming into the Juvenile Property Experiment are shoplifting, other theft, burglary, criminal damage, and receiving/possession of stolen property. Table 3 shows the types of offences committed by individual offenders in the Juvenile Property Experiment.

In JPP, the largest number of offences related to general theft, followed by shop theft. The latter is distinguished from the category of shop theft which makes up the entire JPS sub-experiment because these offences were committed in small retail premises where the person making the apprehension was usually the shop owner or manager or a member of the sales staff. The next largest category of offence in JPP was vandalism/criminal damage, followed by burglary. There is one misassigned offender in this sub-experiment, an arson matter which should have been assigned to the violence experiment.

In JPS, as already noted, all matters relate to shoplifting from large stores employing security staff to deter theft. There is one misassignment in this sub-experiment as well, a case of vandalism/criminal damage involving two offenders.

There is no significant difference in either of JPP or JPS, nor in the Juvenile Property Experiment as a whole, between the distribution of offence types assigned to court and to conference.

**e. Offender Characteristics:**

**Gender**

Table 4 shows the gender of offenders in the current interview sample. Across the whole Juvenile Property Experiment 117 offenders have been interviewed to date, of whom 79 percent were male and 21 percent female. There was a slightly higher proportion of males in JPP (87 percent) and a slightly higher proportion of females in JPS (31 percent). There was no significant difference between males and females in their assignment to court and conference, either at the sub-experiment level or for the whole experiment.

**Age**

Table 5 shows the ages of offenders in the current interview sample. Across the Juvenile Property Experiment 44 percent of offenders were in the 16-17 age group while the average age of all offenders was 15.65 years.

In JPP, almost equal numbers of offenders were aged 14-15 and 16-17. Four offenders were aged over 18: two of these were co-offenders in an offence involving a juvenile (the eligibility criteria state that a case is accept to RISE if at least one of the co-offenders is under 18 years), while the other two were co-offenders in a case that ought not to have been accepted because they did not meet the age criteria.

In JPS, more than half of offenders were aged 16-17 years. This is probably a result of the practice of department stores to warn first-time offenders rather than call the police, and the practice of police to caution offenders the first time they come to their notice. Consequently, these shoplifters may be a little older than shoplifters generally, as they would all have been apprehended previously.

There were no significant differences between age groups in their assignment to court and conference found for JPP, JPS or the combined Juvenile Property Experiment.

**Employment status**

Table 6 shows the employment/education status of all offenders over the six months prior to the interview. Across the whole Juvenile Property Experiment, two thirds of these respondents were engaged in full-time employment or full-time study. One third were thus 'marginal' to mainstream social institutions.

There is a slight difference between the two sub-experiment groups: only a little over half (57 percent) of the JPS respondents were in full time work or study, compared with three quarters of the JPP respondents. This also shows that 84 percent of offenders were native-born Australians in the combined Juvenile Property Experiment, with almost identical proportions in JPP and JPS.

There was no significant difference between Australian-born/non-Australian-born nor between employment/education groups in their assignment to court and conference, either at the sub-experiment level or for the whole experiment.

**Prior offending**

Table 7 shows the average numbers of offences disclosed by interviewed Juvenile Property

offenders for the twelve months preceding their interview (i.e. frequency of offending).

It is clear that RISE is dealing with active offenders. Across the whole experiment, offenders self-reported an average of 42 offences for this time period - almost one offence a week. The majority of these offences were 'Other theft', which includes shoplifting, followed by vandalism and non-weapon violence: this pattern was the same for offenders in each of the sub-experiments. It appears that JPS offenders tend to admit a slightly higher number of prior thefts, and a slightly lower number of other property offences compared with JPP offenders. For both groups, there was relatively little self-reported violent offending and very little indeed involving a weapon.

There was no significant difference between court and conference offenders in their self-reported offending patterns, either at the sub-experiment level or for the whole experiment.

Table 8 shows the percentages of Juvenile Property offenders disclosing **any** offending for the twelve months preceding their interview (i.e. prevalence of offending). Overall, 93 percent of interviewed offenders disclosed at least one offence prior to the one for which they were apprehended, and offenders assigned to court disclosed somewhat more than those assigned to conference (most of these were JPS offenders reporting thefts). Over half of Juvenile Property offenders also disclosed an episode of non-weapon violence during the previous twelve months, but otherwise the prevalence pattern of offending was similar to the frequency pattern.

**f. Victim Characteristics:**

Only victims of personal property offences have been interviewed. However, exceptions relating to victim characteristics include the victim of one case misassigned to the JPS sub-experiment.

**Gender**

Table 9 shows the gender of victims in the current interview sample. For cases assigned to court, 38 percent of victims were female, compared with 52 percent where the case was assigned to conference. This difference was not significant.

**Age**

Table 10 shows that the average age of all victims is about 35 years. Only two victims were aged under 18 years and both their cases were assigned to court.

**Victim employment status**

In 75 percent of cases assigned to court the victims were in full-time or part-time work, compared with 96.4 per cent where the case was assigned to conference. This difference was not significant (Table 11).

**Offence types**

The following shows the offences experienced by interviewed victims of JPP offenders (as noted above, JPS offences are all shoplifting matters). All the shop theft victims in JPP were shop proprietors, shop managers or sales staff who had apprehended their offenders themselves.

**Table F: Offence Types by Victims**

Offence	All victims	Assigned to court	Assigned to conf.
Shop theft	15	7	8
Other theft	24	10	14
Burglary	10	7	3
Vandalism	6	4	2
Receive/possess	1	1	0
Car theft	4	3	1
Total	60	32	28

There were additional victims in the JPP dataset who have not been interviewed:

- 2 victims could not be found
- 1 victim refused to be interviewed
- 1 victim had no recollection of attending the conference
- 4 cases had no victim identified by the police
- 2 cases were misassigned and should have been JPS
- 1 case involved a corporate victim - vandalism to an ACT government building - where no personal victim was identified.

## 4. Court vs Conference: Treatment Characteristics

### a. Treatment completion and crossover:

#### Treated/Untreated cases

Table 12 shows the treatment status of all offenders in the Juvenile Property Experiment at 20 June 1997.

The 155 Juvenile Property cases involve 201 offenders. Of these, 169 of them (84 percent) have experienced at least one 'treatment event' at 20 June: that is, their treatment, either in court or conference, has been initiated, while 162 (81 percent) have had their final treatment as well. There is no significant difference between JPP and JPS offenders, nor between court and conference offenders regarding their treatment status.

#### Crossover cases

Table 13 shows offender treatment integrity as of 20 June 1997. 'Crossover' refers to those cases where the treatment delivered was different from the treatment assigned. The more frequently this occurs, the less reliable the findings of a randomised trial. The excellent relations between the research team and the ACT Region police at every level is demonstrated by the very high level of compliance by police with the treatment recommended by RISE via the opening of an envelope containing the random assignment.

As far as is known, on no occasion have the police ignored the assignment. However, there have been seven cases where for operational reasons - usually due to the non-cooperation of the offender - it has not been possible to deliver the final treatment as assigned. As would be expected, all but one of these had been cases assigned to conference. Overall, treatment delivered was the assigned treatment for 96 percent of offenders in the Juvenile Property Experiment.

### b. The Speed of Justice: Time to Initial Treatment

While initial court appearances occur somewhat more quickly than conferences, diversionary conferences more often reach final resolution of the case at the initial "treatment event."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the time to conference has dropped substantially in the second year of the project since the reorganisation of the Diversionary Conferencing (DC) Unit in April of 1996. Since that time, the scheduling of conferences has been the responsibility of the central DC unit, and not of the field personnel effecting the apprehensions. The following preliminary findings therefore reflect more difference between the speed of court and conference initial appearances than is likely to be found in the final sample. Based on current projections, the timing differences should shrink to a relatively small number of days.

Taking all cases treated to date, the average time from random assignment to **initial** court appearance for the Combined

Juvenile Property Experiments is 29 days, compared to 60 days for conference. The time to initial court appearance for the JPP experiment is 25 days, compared to 72 days for the first conference scheduled. For JPS, the averages are 34 days for court and 48 for conference.

The average time from random assignment to **final** treatment shows smaller differences between court and conference. The average number of days to final court appearance for the JPP experiment is 56 days, compared to 78 days for the final conference. For JPS, the averages are 47 days for court

---

<sup>1</sup> This statement will be modified with further data collection as both AFP and the courts track compliance with the sanction imposed and the 'final' treatment, since failure to pay fines, perform community service, or otherwise perform the tasks ordered can result in further court action or prosecution of conference cases. Monitoring these actions will require at least three years of surveillance after the 'final' treatment of each case.

and 58 for conference. For the Combined Juvenile Property Experiments, the average days to final treatment are 52 days for court and 66 days for conference.

The smaller difference in speed to final treatment reflects the greater number appearances per case for the JPP court cases (but not for JPS) than for conference cases. The average number of appearances to final treatment for the JPP court cases is 60 percent higher (1.85) than for conferences (1.16), while for JPS the averages are almost identical for court (1.29) and conference (1.21).

c. **Observations:**

Time of treatment

Table 14 shows the duration of average observed treatment events in minute and the average numbers of observed and non-observed treatment events. It reveals strikingly the much longer duration of the conference process compared with court - five to six times longer, with court cases averaging around 12 minutes, compared with nearly seventy minutes on average for each Juvenile Property conference. The also shows that court cases more often involve more than one substantive appearance (not including mentions and other brief events in the courtroom) compared with conferences, which are nearly always one-time events.

Persons present at the treatment -

Table 15 displays the numbers and categories of people present at the final treatment, as reported by offenders in their interview. (The interview is the best measure available for this information in relation to court, as it is often impossible in the courtroom for the RISE observer to be certain about the role of each person present.) The most noticeable difference displayed here is the differing number of offender supporters present for court and conference - across all Juvenile Property offenders the average is 4.7 for conference and 1.7 for court. In fact for all categories (except 'Other persons' which in court includes all court personnel and prosecution officers) there are many more people present at the conference than in court. This means that RISE is successfully testing the theory that formal social control can be made more effective by mobilising a higher level of informal social control by intimates of the offender.

Stigmatic shaming measures

These measures are calculated from the scores of the RISE observation team for four of the questions coded at the end of each observation of each offender. They are designed to measure various facets of stigmatic shaming and to test the hypothesis that conferences will have less stigmatic condemnation of offenders as persons than court does. Contrary to our prediction, very little stigmatic shaming was observed in either court or conference. On a scale of 1 to 8, both court and conferences showed an average of level '2' for stigma.

Table 16 shows that when the scores for these four stigmatic shaming measures are added together, there is little difference between court and conference, though a slightly higher score was reported in conferences. This finding reflects the greater presence of almost everything measurable in conferences, given the much greater duration of conferences compared to court. This difference is found in JPS but not JPP. JPS cases often had store security personnel present who condemned the juveniles as persons. The fact that these personnel have stopped attending conferences will allow RISE to measure further the effects of such shaming.

Reintegrative shaming measures

Table 17 compares court and conference offenders on several measures of reintegrative shaming. Again, these measures are calculated from the scores given by the RISE observation team on five questions designed to measure various facets of reintegrative shaming. For each of these questions there is a significant difference between court and conference, with far higher scores given to the conference cases.

## Distribution of Penalties

Table 18 shows the distribution of penalties imposed by court order and conference agreement. The penalties are not easily classified as harsher or softer in court or conference. While conference offenders are more likely to be required to perform community service than court offenders, they are also more likely to have some form of monetary penalty imposed--usually in the form of a donation to charity.

Table 19 compares the average degree of severity of the penalties imposed in court and conference. Here again, the evidence is mixed. Conferenced offenders are required to perform an average of 15 hours of community service, compared to an average of two hours for offenders sent to court. But all the monetary penalties were slightly smaller for conference cases than for court.

## 5. Victim Perceptions

Victims preferred court to conference on many dimensions, most of which reflect the far greater effort to involve victims in the conference process than is made to involve them in court. These include notification of the offender's treatment date, actual presence during the treatment, apologies and restitution.

### Timely notification

All interviewed victims were asked whether they were informed in good time about when their case was to be dealt with. Table 20 shows that whereas 75 percent of victims (21 of 28) whose cases went to conference answered 'yes' to this question, only 9 percent of court victims (3 of 32) said yes. In fact, the great majority of court victims never hear anything about the disposition of their case: very few of the court case interviewees even knew that their case had gone to court.

### Treatment attendance

Table 20 also shows that none of the court group victims attended the court for their case, compared with 82 per cent of conference group victims. The reason for non-attendance was most often to do with administrative difficulties rather than victims' refusal to attend.

### Restitution and Apologies

Victims were asked whether they were awarded material restitution and/or an apology from their offender through the court or conference process. Table 20 shows that only one court victim received anything via court, compared with 79 percent of victims whose cases were assigned to conference (22 of 28).

The general measures of how victims felt about the way their cases were dealt with showed little difference between court and conference cases, including feelings of anger and bitterness (which were generally quite infrequent). A slight difference in wording of a question, however, shows much greater victim satisfaction with conferences (20 out of 28, or 71 percent) than with court (14 out of 30, or 47 percent): "Are you pleased your case was dealt with in this way?" (percent agreement).

Victim perceptions of the offenders' likelihood of reoffending were also much better after court than after conference. When asked if the offender was likely to commit another crime against the victim, only 2 of 28 conference group victims said yes, compared to 8 of 32 court group victims. The effects were similar when victims were asked if the offender would commit future crimes against other victims: 12 of 28 conference group victims, compared to 22 of 32 court group victims, said yes.

Conference group victims were also less likely to be fearful of crime in general after they attended the conference. The measure of fear was twice as high among court group victims as among the conference group victims.

Because no victims whose cases were assigned to court actually attended the court case, it was not possible to determine the effect of their court case on them. Data are available, however, on the way **conference** victims felt before and after the disposition of their cases.

Conferences had no effect on victim fear of their offenders, which was almost entirely absent even before the conference. Conferences did have an effect, however, on how angry the victims felt towards their offenders. Thirteen victims said they felt 'quite' or 'very' angry before the conference, compared with 8 who were 'quite' angry afterwards (none was 'very' angry).

Conferences also increased victim sympathy toward offenders: 7 of the 28 conference group victims felt 'a little sympathetic' or 'very sympathetic' before the conference, compared with 12 afterwards.

Conferences had some effect as well on victim sympathy for the offenders' family and supporters: 16 of the 28 conference group victims felt 'a little sympathetic' or 'very sympathetic' before the conference, compared with 18 afterwards.

In general, victims who attended a conference expressed satisfaction with the way their cases were dealt with. Twenty one of the 23 victims who attended a conference felt they had been treated with respect and that the police had been fair during the conference. Almost all victims attending conferences felt that the conference had been 'somewhat fair' or 'very fair' to both themselves and their offenders. All of them said that they had had an opportunity to explain the loss and harm resulting from the offence and that the conference had respected their rights. Nineteen (of 23) said that the conference had helped to solve problems. When asked whether they would attend a conference again if they were a victim again, three said 'probably not' or 'definitely not', compared with 16 who said 'probably' or 'definitely' yes.

## **6. Offender Perceptions**

### **a. Offender Perceptions of Supporters**

Table 21 shows how the court or conference affected how "close" the offenders felt towards their supporters who were present. The pattern is very clear: both court and conference make offenders feel closer to their loved ones, but conferences produce an average of twice as many loved ones present. Thus the total effect of strengthening bonds connecting offenders to their loved ones is twice as great for conference as it is for court treatments.

Table 22 reports other aspects of the offender perceptions of their supporters present at the treatment events. Here again, the patterns do not differ markedly between court and conference. Both kinds of justice appear to have substantial effects on informal bonds to loved ones. But since more loved ones are present at conferences, these measures reflect a greater density of interpersonal relations affected by the justice process in court than in conference.

### **b. Offender Perceptions of Themselves**

Table 23 compares the offenders' perceptions of themselves in court and in conference. Consistent with the observational data on the greater amount of stigma directed at the offenders in conference than in court, every measure of offender self-disapproval is higher for conference than for court. The greatest differences in the Combined Juvenile Property Experiments are found in the measures of worry about what others think of the offender (50 percent for conference compared to 25 percent for court), and feeling ashamed of themselves (75 percent for conference, 50 percent for court).

Whether these differences in self-disapproval will affect repeat offending positively, negatively, or not at all is still a very open question. While the theory of reintegrative shaming hypothesizes less repeat offending where there is less permanent effect of self-disapproval, it may be an important part of the process of rejecting the criminal conduct to create temporary self-rejection of the person who committed the conduct. This may in turn help to strengthen the offender's resolution not to be that kind of person ever again, so they will never have to feel that shame. Exploring these central questions about the dynamics of justice will become possible upon completion of the experiments, when recidivism data become available.

### **c. Offender Perceptions of Their Crimes**

Table 24 compares the offenders' perceptions of their crimes after court and conference experiences. Just as with self-stigma, every measure of act stigma is greater for offenders sent to conference than for those sent to court. The biggest differences in the Combined Juvenile Property Experiments are for feeling bad that they might have hurt someone (73 percent for conference, 38 percent for court), feeling ashamed of what they had done (76 percent for conference, 54 percent for court), and needing to repay society in some way (81 percent for conference, 51 percent for court).

### **d. Offender Perceptions of Police**

Table 25 compares the perceptions offenders have of the law, police and the justice system after treatment by court and by conference. These measures consistently show greater benefits of conference than of court in increasing the perceived respect of the offenders for legal authority. The effects of conferences are twice as great for conferences than for court for respect for the justice system and respect for the police, as well as for the total measures of respect for authority with which interviewed offenders agreed.

### **e. Offender Perceptions of Procedural Justice**

Table 26 compares the perceptions offenders have of the fairness of the procedures they experience in court and conference. While most of these measures favour conferences, the differences in the Combined Juvenile Property Experiments are relatively small. The measures of procedural justice for

JPP show virtually no difference. For JPS, in contrast, the differences clearly favour conferences, with some of the measures of perceived justice twice as high for offenders treated by conference than for those treated by court.

**f. Deterrent Effects on Future Offending**

Tables 27 and 28 compare the perceptions of offenders interviewed after court and conferences. Contrary to some claims that conferences are a "soft" option, they appear to achieve greater self-reported deterrence of future offending than court sanctions. In the Combined Juvenile Property Experiments, there is no less expectation of severe punishment among offenders sent to conferences than among those sent to court; both groups are in the mid-90 percent range.

For measures indicating the compounding of formal punishment by informal social control, offenders sent to conference report far greater effects; fear of family reaction appears to enhance the fear of court penalties. This effect is more pronounced for JPP than for JPS.

For measures indicating estimated odds of getting caught, the offenders sent to conference also seem to be more fearful than those sent to court. This effect is even larger for the JPS experiment than for the JPP offenders.

Finally, when asked if the treatment they had experienced will help to prevent them from breaking the law in the future, 100 percent of the JPP offenders sent to conference said yes, compared to only 74 percent of the JPP offenders sent to court. There was virtually no difference on this measure, however, between JPS offenders sent to court and conference.

Overall, offenders interviewed after conferences endorsed more deterrence measures than those interviewed after court, a moderately large and statistically significant difference.

## 7. Conclusion: Progress and Prospects

The preliminary findings presented in this report suggest three major conclusions:

- The Juvenile Property Experiment has been successfully implemented.
- While the time necessary to acquire cases has been greater than expected, the steady flow of cases suggests that the full sample required by the experimental design can be achieved within the next two years.
- The strong support for the central hypotheses about the different perceptions victims and offenders would acquire from going through court and conference experiences means that there is good reason to predict that conferences will show reductions in repeat offending among the highly active offenders who constitute the experimental sample.

The first conclusion is clearly supported by the evidence presented in the sample characteristics. Cases have been randomly assigned and treated with almost perfect compliance. Observations and interviews have been obtained at very high rates. Substantial amounts of data have been entered into electronic form and cleaned for the complex analyses presented in this report. The experiment is proceeding steadily and surely as planned, if more slowly.

The second conclusion addresses the central issue at hand. While some short-sighted arguments are sometimes made about the need for "speedy" policy research, the major issues in criminal justice are little different today than they were a half century ago. Major progress can only be made from employing the kind of rigorous scientific methods used in this report, and ranked most valuable in the recent assessment of crime prevention evaluations commissioned by the United States Congress. These methods are well known to require long time frames. No major experiment in criminology has been completed in less than four years, and many have taken far longer. Completion of the RISE Juvenile Property Experiments in four years is not at all an unreasonable request to make of a funding agency.

The justification for taking the four years needed to acquire the full sample, plus two years or more to collect repeat offending data, is found in the third conclusion. Many evaluations find that the planned treatment was never implemented, or if implemented was not perceived by offenders as expected. The RISE Juvenile Property Experiments have been implemented as planned, and show strong evidence of major differences by treatment in perceptions of offenders and victims. The experiment provides the first clear opportunity to test rigorously the hypothesis that restorative justice can prevent crime better than retributive justice. Continuing the experiment on its present course allows RISE to make the best possible use of taxpayer funds; failing to do so would squander the opportunity those funds have created to date.

**Table 1: Observation completion rates, individual offender-treatments through 20 June 1997**

	Offender-Treatments Eligible for Observation			Offender-Treatments with Observers Present		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	138	88	50	119	74	45
JPS	95	43	52	76	35	41
JP Combined	233	131	102	195	109	86

Observer Attendance Rates as a Percent of Eligible Offender-Treatments			
JPP	86%	84%	90%
(t-test)		(p=.311)	
JPS	80%	81%	79%
(t-test)		(p=.759)	
JP Combined	84%	83%	84%
(t-test)		(p=.821)	

**Table 2: Offender response rates to initial Year 0 interviews**

	Treated Offenders Eligible for Interview			Offenders Interviewed through 20 June 1997			Offenders in the Current Interview Dataset		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	81	44	37	65	32	33	63	32	31
JPS	76	33	43	62	25	37	54	21	33
JP Combined	157	77	80	127	57	70	117	53	64

Response Rates as a Percent of Eligible Offenders						
JPP	80%	73%	89%	78%	73%	84%
(t-test)			(p=.058)			
JPS	82%	76%	86%	71%	64%	77%
(t-test)			(p=.272)			
JP Combined	81%	74%	88%	75%	69%	80%
(t-test)			(p=.033)*			

**Table 3: Types of offences committed by individual offenders when placed into the Juvenile Property experiments**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned court to	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned court to	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned court to	Assigned to conference
Shop theft	22	10	12	89	39	50	111	49	62
Burglary	15	9	6	---	---	---	15	9	6
Vandalism / Criminal damage	20	9	11	2	---	2	22	9	13
Receive / Possess stolen property	4	3	1	---	---	---	4	3	1
General theft	38	19	19	---	---	---	38	19	19
Automobile theft	10	6	4	---	---	---	10	6	4
Arson	1	1	---	---	---	---	1	1	---
TOTAL	110	57	53	91	39	52	201	96	105

**Percents of Offenders Assigned to Treatment Groups Across Individual Offence Categories**

Shop theft	45%	55%	44%	56%	44%	56%
Burglary	60%	40%	---	---	60%	40%
Vandalism / Criminal damage	45%	55%	---	100%	41%	59%
Receive / Possess stolen property	75%	25%	---	---	75%	25%
General theft	50%	50%	---	---	50%	50%
Automobile theft	60%	40%	---	---	60%	40%
Arson	100%	---	---	---	100%	---
TOTAL	52%	48%	43%	57%	48%	52%
Chi-square	3.24		3.24		4.86	
Degrees of Freedom	6		6		6	
Significance	p=.778		p=.778		p=.562	

**Table 4: Gender of offenders in the current interview sample**

Offenders in the Current Interview Dataset				Male Offenders			Female Offenders		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	63	32	31	55	26	29	8	6	2
JPS	54	21	33	37	14	23	17	7	10
JP Combined	117	53	64	92	40	52	25	13	12

Percents of Offenders						
JPP	87%	81%	94%	13%	19%	6%
(t-test)			(p=.147)			
JPS	69%	67%	70%	31%	33%	30%
(t-test)			(p=.821)			
JP Combined	79%	75%	81%	21%	25%	19%
(t-test)			(p=.452)			

**Table 5: Ages of offenders (on the date of entry into RISE) in the current interview sample**

	JPP Experiment			JFS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Under 12	4	2	2	---	---	---	4	2	2
12 through 14	8	4	4	11	3	8	19	7	12
14 through 16	24	14	10	13	5	8	37	19	18
16 through 18	23	12	11	29	13	16	52	25	27
18 and over	4	---	4	1	---	1	5	---	5
TOTAL	63	32	31	54	21	33	117	53	64

**Percents of Offenders Assigned to Treatment Groups Across Individual Age Categories**

Under 12	50%	50%	---	---	50%	50%
12 through 14	50%	50%	27%	73%	37%	63%
14 through 16	58%	42%	38%	62%	51%	49%
16 through 18	52%	48%	45%	55%	48%	52%
18 and over	---	100%	---	100%	---	100%
TOTAL	51%	49%	39%	61%	45%	55%

Chi-square	0.47	1.69	5.43
Degrees of Freedom	4	3	4
Significance	p=.320	p=.639	p=.246

**Average Age of Offenders Assigned to Treatment Groups and Experiments**

Average age	15.55	15.53	15.57	15.78	16.06	15.59	15.65	15.74	15.58
(t-test)		(p=.930)			(p=.277)			(p=.633)	

**Table 6: Native-born Australian offenders and employment status (over the preceding six months) of offenders in the current interview sample**

Offenders in the Current Interview Dataset				Native-Born Australian Offenders			Offenders Engaged in Full-Time Employment or Study		
Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference		Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	63	32	31	52	25	27	47	25	22
JPS	54	21	33	46	17	29	31	11	20
JP Combined	117	53	64	98	42	56	78	36	42

  

Percents of Offenders						
JPP	83%	78%	87%	75%	78%	71%
(t-test)			(p=.355)			(p=.523)
JPS	85%	81%	88%	57%	52%	61%
(t-test)			(p=.514)			(p=.563)
JP Combined	84%	79%	88%	67%	68%	66%
(t-test)			(p=.241)			(p=.795)

**Table 7: Self-reported offending (during the preceding twelve months) by offenders in the current interview sample; average numbers of offences reported (i.e., frequency of offending)**

	<b>JPP Experiment</b>				<b>JPS Experiment</b>				<b>Combined Juvenile Property</b>		
	<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>		<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>		<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>
Burglary	4.57	1.74	7.50		.87	1.71	.33		2.83	1.73	3.75
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.409)	(n=54)			(p=.026)*	(n=115)			(p=.545)
Automobile theft	2.68	4.68	.68		.37	.40	.36		1.62	3.00	.52
(t-test) (n=62)			(p=.159)	(n=53)			(p=.922)	(n=115)			(p=.151)
Other theft	22.56	25.19	19.66		30.87	46.00	20.94		26.42	33.43	20.33
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.664)	(n=53)			(p=.236)	(n=114)			(p=.255)
Vandalism	9.81	5.19	14.58		5.28	1.90	7.50		7.74	3.89	10.98
(t-test) (n=63)			(p=.314)	(n=53)			(p=.237)	(n=116)			(p=.173)
Violence with a weapon	.31	.56	.06		.28	.24	.30		.30	.43	.19
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.199)	(n=54)			(p=.837)	(n=115)			(p=.372)
Non-weapon violence	5.90	7.63	4.23		2.63	4.76	1.27		4.37	6.45	2.70
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.386)	(n=54)			(p=.186)	(n=115)			(p=.137)
All offences combined	44.73	44.28	45.19		39.63	55.00	29.85		42.38	48.53	37.28
(t-test) (n=63)			(p=.968)	(n=54)			(p=.257)	(n=117)			(p=.462)

**Table 8: Self-reported offending (during the preceding twelve months) by offenders in the current interview sample; percents of offenders reporting any offending (i.e., prevalence of offending)**

	<b>JPP Experiment</b>				<b>JPS Experiment</b>				<b>Combined Juvenile Property</b>		
	<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>		<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>		<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>
Burglary	33%	26%	43%		30%	48%	18%		32%	35%	30%
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.156)	(n=54)			(p=.031)*	(n=115)			(p=.616)
Automobile theft	24%	23%	26%		13%	10%	15%		19%	18%	20%
(t-test) (n=62)			(p=.771)	(n=53)			(p=.585)	(n=115)			(p=.719)
Other theft	75%	78%	72%		81%	100%	69%		78%	87%	70%
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.614)	(n=53)			(p=.001)**	(n=114)			(p=.033)*
Vandalism	46%	47%	45%		38%	52%	28%		42%	49%	37%
(t-test) (n=63)			(p=.894)	(n=53)			(p=.086)	(n=116)			(p=.177)
Violence with a weapon	10%	13%	6%		9%	14%	6%		10%	14%	6%
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.378)	(n=54)			(p=.362)	(n=115)			(p=.197)
Non-weapon violence	63%	57%	68%		44%	52%	39%		54%	55%	54%
(t-test) (n=61)			(p=.381)	(n=54)			(p=.363)	(n=115)			(p=.851)
All offences combined	97%	97%	97%		89%	100%	82%		93%	98%	89%
(t-test) (n=63)			(p=.982)	(n=54)			(p=.012)*	(n=117)			(p=.041)*

**Table 9: Gender of victims in the current interview sample**

	Victims in the Current Interview Dataset			Male Victims			Female Victims		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	59	32	27	33	20	13	26	12	14
JPS	1	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	1
JP Combined	60	32	28	33	20	13	27	12	15

		Percents of Victims					
JPP		56%	63%	48%	44%	38%	52%
(t-test)				(p=.278)			
JPS		---	---	---	100%	---	100%
(t-test)				(no test possible)			
JP Combined		55%	63%	46%	45%	38%	54%
(t-test)				(p=.220)			

**Table 10: Ages of victims (on the date of case entry into RISE) in the current interview sample**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Victims	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Victims	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Victims	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Under 18	2	2	---	---	---	---	2	2	---
18 through 30	19	9	10	---	---	---	19	9	10
30 through 40	21	13	8	---	---	---	21	13	8
40 through 50	11	4	7	---	---	---	11	4	7
50 and older	6	4	2	1	---	1	7	4	3
TOTAL	59	32	27	1	---	1	60	32	28

**Percents of Victims Assigned to Treatment Groups Across Individual Age Categories**

Under 18	100%	---	---	---	100%	---
18 through 30	47%	53%	---	---	47%	53%
30 through 40	62%	38%	---	---	62%	38%
40 through 50	36%	64%	---	---	36%	64%
50 and older	67%	33%	---	100%	57%	43%
TOTAL	54%	46%	---	100%	53%	47%

Chi-square	4.34		3.96
Degrees of Freedom	4	(no test possible)	4
Significance	p=.363		p=.412

**Average Age of Victims Assigned to Treatment Groups and Experiments**

Average age	34.68	33.99	35.50	57.68	---	15.59	35.06	33.99	36.29
(t-test)		(p=.620)		(no test possible)				(p=.457)	

**Table 11: Native-born Australian victims and employment status (over the preceding six months) of victims in the current interview sample**

	Victims in the Current Interview Dataset			Native-Born Victims Australian Victims			Engaged in Full-Time Employment or Study		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	59	32	27	48	25	23	45	22	23
JPS	1	---	1	1	---	1	1	---	1
JP Combined	60	32	28	49	25	24	46	22	24

			Percents of Victims		
JPP			81%	78%	85%
(t-test)					(p=.491)
JPS			100%	---	100%
(t-test)					(no test possible)
JP Combined			82%	78%	86%
(t-test)					(p=.452)

			76%	69%	85%
					(p=.136)
			100%	---	100%
					(no test possible)
			77%	69%	86%
					(p=.119)

**Table 12: Offender treatment status as of 20 June 1997**

	Numbers of Offenders in the Juvenile Property Experiments			Offenders who have had At Least One Treatment Event			Offenders who have had their Final Treatment Event		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP	110	57	53	89	47	42	84	46	38
JPS	91	79	52	80	35	45	78	34	44
JP Combined	201	96	105	169	82	87	162	80	82

	Initial Treatment Rates across All Offenders			Final Treatment Rates across All Offenders		
JPP	81%	82%	79%	76%	81%	72%
(t-test)			(p=.673)			(p=.273)
JPS	88%	90%	87%	86%	87%	85%
(t-test)			(p=.642)			(p=.730)
JP Combined	84%	85%	83%	81%	87%	78%
(t-test)			(p=.621)			(p=.348)

	Final Treatment Rates across Offenders who have Commenced Treatment		
JPP	94%	98%	90%
(t-test)			(p=.149)
JPS	98%	97%	98%
(t-test)			(p=.861)
JP Combined	96%	98%	94%
(t-test)			(p=.278)

Numbers of Offenders who have had At Least One Treatment Event				Offenders whose Initial Treatment was As Assigned			Initial Treatment Integrity		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP (t-test)	89	47	42	86	46	40	97%	98%	95% (p=.507)
JPS (t-test)	80	35	45	78	35	43	98%	100%	96% (p=.160)
JP Combined (t-test)	169	82	87	164	81	83	97%	99%	95% (p=.190)

  

Numbers of Offenders who have had their Final Treatment				Offenders whose Final Treatment was As Assigned			Final Treatment Integrity		
	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	Total	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
JPP (t-test)	84	46	38	80	45	35	95%	98%	92% (p=.252)
JPS (t-test)	78	34	44	75	34	41	96%	100%	93% (p=.083)
JP Combined (t-test)	162	80	82	155	79	76	96%	99%	93% (p=.057)

**Table 14: Duration of average observed treatment events in minutes, and average numbers of observed and non-observed treatment events**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Duration across individual offender-treatment observations	38.45	12.73	68.57	42.21	11.39	68.36	40.12	12.19	68.47
(t-test)	(n=76)		(p=.000)**	(n=61)		(p=.000)**	(n=137)		(p=.000)**
Total duration for individual offenders, summed over all observed treatment events	41.15	14.11	70.59	42.21	11.39	68.36	41.64	12.94	69.49
(t-test)	(n=71)		(p=.000)**	(n=61)		(p=.000)**	(n=132)		(p=.000)**
Averaged number of observed treatment events	1.07	1.11	1.03	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.04	1.06	1.01
(t-test)	(n=71)		(p=.273)	(n=62)		(no test possible)			(p=.251)
Averaged number of non-observed treatment events	.54	.81	.24	.15	.24	.06	.35	.56	.15
(t-test)			(p=.013)*			(p=.180)			(p=.004)**
Averaged number of combined observed and non-observed treatment events	1.61	1.92	1.26	1.15	1.24	1.06	1.39	1.62	1.16
(t-test)			(p=.011)*			(p=.180)			(p=.000)**

**Table 15: Number of persons present at final treatment (as reported by offenders at interview)**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Other co-offenders	.35	.25	.45	.41	.14	.58	3.76	.21	.52
(t-test)			(p=.223)			(p=.026)*			(p=.016)*
Offender supporters	3.08	1.78	4.42	3.63	1.48	5.00	3.33	1.66	4.72
(t-test)			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**
Victims	.57	.03	1.13	.44	---	.73	.51	.02	.92
(t-test)			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**
Victim supporters	.48	---	.97	.11	---	.18	.31	---	.56
(t-test)			(p=.000)**			(p=.056)			(p=.000)**
Community Representatives	.17	.03	.32	.31	---	.52	.24	.02	.42
(t-test)			(p=.014)*			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**
Other persons	2.05	2.53	1.55	1.89	3.00	1.18	1.97	2.72	1.36
(t-test)			(p=.004)**			(p=.005)**			(p=.000)**
TOTAL persons present	6.70	4.63	8.84	6.80	4.62	8.18	6.74	4.62	8.50
(t-test)			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**

**Table 16: Measures of stigmatic shaming in observed offender-treatments**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
How much stigmatising shaming was expressed? (t-test)	2.32	2.39	2.23 (p=.644)	2.26	1.79	2.67 (p=.026)*	2.29	2.14	2.44 (p=.259)
To what extent was the offender treated as a criminal? (t-test)	2.68	3.02	2.29 (p=.067)	1.90	1.79	2.00 (p=.573)	2.33	.25	2.15 (p=.195)
How often were stigmatising names and labels used to describe the offender? (t-test)	1.58	1.46	1.71 (p=.363)	1.47	1.10	1.79 (p=.005)**	1.53	1.31	1.75 (p=.021)*
How much disapproval of the offender as a person was expressed? (t-test)	2.22	1.85	2.66 (p=.030)*	2.32	1.66	2.91 (p=.001)**	2.27	1.77	2.78 (p=.000)**
Additive scale of all four stigmatic shaming measures (t-test)	8.80	8.73	8.89 (p=.011)*	7.95	6.34	9.36 (p=.005)**	8.42	7.74	9.12 (p=.078)

N.B. Each of the above items is scored by trained observers on a scale ranging from 1 to 8.

**Table 17: Measures of reintegrative shaming in observed offender-treatments**

	JFP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
How much reintegrative shaming was expressed? (t-test)	3.26	2.10	4.63 (p=.000)**	3.36	2.07	4.53 (p=.000)**	3.31	2.09	4.58 (p=.000)**
How reintegrative was [the treatment] for this offender? (t-test)	3.46	2.49	4.60 (p=.000)**	3.56	2.48	4.52 (p=.000)**	3.51	2.49	4.56 (p=.000)**
To what extent was the offender forgiven for their actions? (t-test)	2.93	2.07	3.94 (p=.001)**	2.92	1.97	3.76 (p=.001)**	2.93	2.03	3.85 (p=.000)**
How clearly was it communicated to the offender that they could put their actions behind them? (t-test)	3.41	2.78	4.14 (p=.030)*	4.89	4.21	5.48 (p=.050)*	4.07	3.37	4.79 (p=.002)**
How much forgiveness of the offender was expressed? (t-test)	2.22	1.80	2.71 (p=.038)*	2.16	2.03	2.27 (p=.507)	2.20	1.90	2.50 (p=.032)*
Additive scale of all live reintegrative shaming measures (t-test)	15.29	11.24	20.03 (p=.000)**	17.05	12.76	20.94 (p=.000)**	16.07	11.87	20.46 (p=.000)**

N.B. Each of the above items is scored by trained observers on a scale ranging from 1 to 8.

**Table 18: Percents of observed offenders awarded specific types of treatment outcomes**

JPP Experiment				JFS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Community service	20%	---	41%	35%	7%	61%	27%	3%	51%
(t-test)	(n=71)		(p=.000)**	(n=62)		(p=.000)**	(n=133)		(p=.000)**
Rehabilitation program	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	---	2%	3%	1%
(t-test)			(p=.953)			(p=.326)			(p=.555)
Formal apology	27%	---	56%	31%	---	58%	29%	---	57%
(t-test)			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**			(p=.000)**
Fine	8%	14%	3%	2%	3%	---	5%	9%	1%
(t-test)			(p=.105)			(p=.326)			(p=.053)
Monetary donation to charity	6%	---	12%	5%	---	9%	5%	---	10%
(t-test)			(p=.044)*			(p=.083)			(p=.007)**
Monetary reparation to victim(s)	25%	22%	29%	18%	7%	27%	22%	15%	28%
(t-test)			(p=.460)			(p=.031)*			(p=.066)
Any form of monetary cost	35%	27%	44%	23%	10%	33%	30%	20%	39%
(t-test)			(p=.138)			(p=.027)*			(p=.015)*

**Table 19: Average degree of severity in treatment outcomes**

JPP Experiment				JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	
Average Amounts Awarded across All Observed Offenders									
Hours of community service	9.49	---	19.82	7.90	5.31	10.18	8.75	2.33	15.07
(t-test)	(n=71)	(p=.092)	(n=62)		(p=.258)	(n=133)		(p=.040)*	
Amount of fine (including court fees)	\$4.45	\$5.16	\$3.68	\$0.33	\$0.69	---	\$2.53	\$3.20	\$1.87
(t-test)		(p=.738)			(p=.326)			(p=.572)	
Amount of donation to charity	\$2.13	---	\$4.44	\$0.90	---	\$1.72	\$1.56	---	\$3.21
(t-test)		(p=.065)			(p=.162)			(p=.022)*	
Amount of reparation to victim(s)	\$59.85	\$40.08	\$81.35	\$47.24	\$86.83	\$12.45	\$53.70	\$60.62	\$47.42
(t-test)		(p=.250)			(p=.398)			(p=.755)	
Combined monetary costs	\$66.42	\$45.24	\$89.47	\$49.03	\$87.52	\$14.16	\$58.39	\$63.82	\$52.95
(t-test)		(p=.225)			(p=.404)			(p=.799)	
Average Amounts Awarded across Only those Offenders Awarded the Treatment Outcome									
Hours of community service	48.14	---	48.14	22.27	77.00	16.80	32.33	77.00	29.71
(t-test)	(n=14)	(no test possible)	(n=22)		(p=.076)	(n=36)		(p=.016)*	
Amount of fine (including court fees)	\$52.67	\$38.00	\$125.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	---	\$48.00	\$35.17	\$125.00
(t-test)	(n=6)	(no test possible)	(n=1)		(no test possible)	(n=7)		(no test possible)	
Amount of donation to charity	\$37.75	---	\$37.75	\$27.50	---	\$27.50	\$34.33	---	\$34.33
(t-test)	(n=4)	(no test possible)	(n=2)		(no test possible)	(n=6)		(no test possible)	
Amount of reparation to victim(s)	\$236.06	\$185.38	\$276.60	\$266.27	\$1259.00	\$45.67	\$247.52	\$400.00	\$167.21
(t-test)	(n=18)	(p=.346)	(n=11)		(p=.508)	(n=29)		(p=.360)	
Combined monetary costs	\$188.64	\$167.40	\$202.80	\$685.34	\$846.00	\$45.30	\$423.48	\$324.00	\$139.80
(t-test)	(n=25)	(p=.654)	(n=13)		(p=.436)	(n=38)		(p=.351)	

**Table 20: Percent of victims notified about treatment, attending treatment, and receiving some form of restitution**

		Combined Juvenile Property		
		All Victims	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Total Juvenile Property victims in the current interview data		60	32	28
Were you informed in good time about when your case was to be dealt with? [Number of victims who answered "Yes"]		24	3	21
Percent		40%	9%	75%
(t-test)				(p=.000)**
Did you attend the court/conference concerning your case? [Number of victims who answered "Yes"]		23	---	23
Percent		38%	---	82%
(t-test)				(p=.000)**
Were you awarded [anything from the offender(s) to compensate you for loss and harm] from the court/conference? [Number of victims who answered "Yes"]		23	1	22
Percent		38%	3%	79%
(t-test)				(p=.000)**

**Table 21: Effects of treatment on how close offenders feel towards those present at treatment**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
Average number of offender supporters present at treatment (t-test)	(n=63)			(n=54)			(n=117)		
	3.08	1.78	4.42 (p=.000)**	3.63	1.48	5.00 (p=.000)**	3.33	1.66	4.72 (p=.000)**
Number of offender supporters whom offenders felt closer to (t-test)									
	.59	.44	.74 (p=.199)	.98	.38	1.36 (p=.012)*	.77	.42	1.06 (p=.005)**
Percent of offender supporters whom offender felt closer to (t-test)	(n=60)			(n=52)			(n=112)		
	26%	28%	24% (p=.702)	26%	24%	27% (p=.794)	26%	26%	25% (p=.920)
Average number of total persons present at treatment (t-test)	(n=63)			(n=54)			(n=117)		
	6.70	4.63	8.84 (p=.000)**	6.80	4.62	8.18 (p=.000)**	6.74	4.62	8.50 (p=.000)**
Number of total persons present whom offenders felt closer to (t-test)									
	.94	.81	1.06 (p=.476)	1.22	.57	1.64 (p=.024)*	1.07	.72	1.36 (p=.030)*
Percent of total persons present whom offender felt closer to (t-test)	(n=62)			(n=53)			(n=115)		
	16%	18%	14% (p=.435)	17%	13%	19% (p=.384)	16%	16%	16% (p=.984)

**Table 22: Percent of offenders who agreed with measures of support by family and friends**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
During the week after the court/conf., did your family and friends give you more support... than they normally give you? (t-test)	74%	71%	77% (p=.569)	64%	43%	78% (p=.012)*	70%	60%	78% (p=.039)*
My family loves me. (t-test)	52%	45%	58% (p=.317)	53%	48%	56% (p=.549)	52%	46%	57% (p=.245)
I love my family. (t-test)	45%	39%	52% (p=.315)	43%	43%	44% (p=.950)	44%	40%	48% (p=.441)
Total number of family/friend support measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	27%	23%	32% (p=.401)	23%	33%	16% (p=.162)	25%	27%	24% (p=.706)
Did you learn from the court/conference that there are people who care about you? (t-test)	42%	45%	38% (p=.578)	47%	38%	53% (p=.292)	44%	42%	46% (p=.704)
During the court/conference did people suggest they loved you regardless of what you did? (t-test)	84%	84%	84% (p=.957)	89%	90%	88% (p=.768)	86%	87%	86% (p=.894)
During the court/conference did people talk about aspects of yourself which they like? (t-test)	87%	81%	94% (p=.145)	89%	86%	91% (p=.581)	88%	83%	92% (p=.143)
During the court/conference were you treated as though you were a bad person? (t-test)	4.52	4.42	4.62 (p=.647)	4.64	4.14	4.97 (p=.121)	4.58	4.31	4.80 (p=.146)

**Table 23: Percent of offenders who agreed with measures of self-disapproval**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
During the court/conference I felt worried about what others thought of me. (t-test)	37%	29%	45% (p=.195)	42%	19%	56% (p=.005)**	39%	25%	51% (p=.004)**
During the court/conference I felt awkward and aware of myself. (t-test)	58%	52%	65% (p=.311)	49%	38%	56% (p=.203)	54%	46%	60% (p=.133)
During the court/conference I felt that I was a failure. (t-test)	27%	26%	29% (p=.780)	23%	10%	31% (p=.046)*	25%	19%	30% (p=.176)
During the court/conference I felt that I had stuffed up at least some of my future opportunities. (t-test)	48%	45%	52% (p=.618)	47%	48%	47% (p=.959)	48%	46%	49% (p=.747)
During the court/conference I felt ashamed of myself (t-test)	68%	58%	77% (p=.107)	58%	38%	72% (p=.017)*	63%	50%	75% (p=.007)**
During the court/conference I felt I had lost respect or honour among my family. (t-test)	51%	47%	55% (p=.531)	43%	33%	50% (p=.235)	47%	41%	52% (p=.237)
During the court/conference I felt I had lost respect or honour among my friends. (t-test)	18%	16%	19% (p=.745)	21%	14%	25% (p=.336)	19%	15%	22% (p=.351)
Total number of self-disapproval measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	3.10	2.77	3.42 (p=.250)	2.83	2.00	3.38 (p=.043)*	2.97	2.45	3.40 (p=.031)*

**Table 24: Percent of offenders who agreed with measures of act-disapproval**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
During the court/conference I felt the offence I committed was wrong. (t-test)	82%	81%	84% (p=.745)	79%	62%	91% (p=.024)*	81%	73%	87% (p=.061)
During the court/conference I felt bad because the offence I committed might have hurt someone. (t-test)	61%	48%	74% (p=.038)*	53%	24%	72% (p=.000)**	57%	38%	73% (p=.000)**
During the court/conference I felt ashamed of what I did. (t-test)	65%	55%	74% (p=.115)	68%	52%	78% (p=.063)	66%	54%	76% (p=.013)*
Do you now feel that the offence you committed was [wrong]? (t-test)	98%	97%	100% (p=.325)	94%	95%	94% (p=.818)	97%	96%	97% (p=.848)
You felt after the court/conference that what you did was just plain stupid. (t-test)	90%	91%	90% (p=.968)	92%	90%	94% (p=.680)	91%	91%	92% (p=.779)
As a result of your offence you needed to repay society in some way. (t-test)	68%	63%	74% (p=.326)	66%	33%	88% (p=.000)**	67%	51%	81% (p=.001)**
Total number of act-disapproval measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	4.67	4.37	4.97 (p=.085)	4.53	3.57	5.16 (p=.002)**	4.61	4.04	5.06 (p=.001)**

**Table 25: Percent of offenders who indicated heightened respect for the law, the police, and the justice system**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
As a result of the court/conference, has your respect for the law [increased]? (t-test)	46%	38%	55% (p=.173)	53%	43%	59% (p=.250)	49%	40%	57% (p=.061)
As a result of the court/conference, has your respect for the justice system [increased]? (t-test)	39%	28%	50% (p=.081)	35%	19%	45% (p=.044)*	49%	25%	48% (p=.010)**
In general, the police in Canberra enforce the law fairly. (t-test)	63%	56%	71% (p=.231)	69%	52%	79% (p=.055)	66%	55%	75% (p=.023)*
As a result of the way your case was handled would you say your respect for the police has [increased]? (t-test)	35%	28%	42% (p=.258)	37%	14%	52% (p=.003)**	36%	23%	47% (p=.005)**
Total number of legal respect measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	1.81	1.50	2.13 (p=.093)	1.92	1.29	2.35 (p=.003)**	1.86	1.42	2.25 (p=.001)**

**Table 26: Percent of offenders who agreed with measures of procedural justice**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment			Combined Juvenile Property		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
How fair did you feel that the court/conference was for you? Would you say that it was [fair]? (t-test)	94%	94%	94% (p= 1.00)	87%	76%	94% (p=.104)	90%	87%	94% (p=.215)
You felt you had enough control over the things were run in the court/conference. (t-test)	45%	42%	48% (p=.617)	47%	29%	59% (p=.026)*	46%	37%	54% (p=.062)
If the court/conference had got the facts wrong you felt able to get this corrected. (t-test)	73%	77%	68% (p=.401)	66%	43%	81% (p=.006)**	70%	63%	75% (p=.204)
You understood what your rights were during the processing of the case. (t-test)	94%	87%	100% (p=.043)*	89%	81%	94% (p=.201)	91%	85%	97% (p=.030)*
You feel that people who have committed the same offence are treated the same way by court/conference. (t-test)	57%	53%	61% (p=.520)	49%	24%	66% (p=.002)**	53%	42%	63% (p=.018)*
People were polite to you in the court/conference. (t-test)	79%	84%	74% (p=.358)	77%	76%	78% (p=.874)	78%	81%	76% (p=.555)
Total number of procedural justice measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	4.42	4.39	4.45 (p=.844)	4.15	3.29	4.72 (p=.003)**	4.30	3.94	4.59 (p=.020)*

**Table 27: Percent of offenders who agreed with statements concerning their future offending (across each individual Juvenile Property experiment)**

	JPP Experiment			JPS Experiment		
	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference	All Offenders	Assigned to court	Assigned to conference
If you were caught for the same offence again how severe do you think your punishment would be? Do you think it would be [tough]? (t-test)	92%	91%	94% (p=.673)	94%	90%	97% (p=.377)
If you were caught for the same offence again and went to court, how much of a problem would it create for your life? Do you think it would create [a problem]? (t-test)	95%	97%	94% (p=.545)	93%	90%	94% (p=.660)
If you were caught for the same offence again and went to a conference, how much of a problem would it create for your life? Do you think it would create [a problem]? (t-test)	67%	50%	84% (p=.004)**	65%	48%	76% (p=.044)*
If you were caught for the same offence again, how much of a problem would it create for you if your family and friends found out? Do you think it would create [a problem]? (t-test)	82%	72%	93% (p=.025)*	80%	71%	85% (p=.268)
If you committed another offence like the one that got you into trouble, how likely is it that you would be caught? Do you think that it would be [likely]? (t-test)	59%	50%	68% (p=.157)	68%	50%	75% (p=.139)
The court/conference will help prevent you from breaking the law in the future. (t-test)	87%	74%	100% (p=.003)**	83%	81%	84% (p=.756)
Total number of deterrence measures agreed to by offender (t-test)	4.80	4.32	5.30 (p=.001)**	4.79	4.30	5.09 (p=.073)

**Table 28: Percent of offenders who agreed with statements concerning their future offending (combined results from both Juvenile Property experiments)**

	<b>Combined Juvenile Property</b>		
	<b>All Offenders</b>	<b>Assigned to court</b>	<b>Assigned to conference</b>
If you were caught for the same offence again how severe do you think your punishment would be? Do you think it would be [tough]?	93%	91%	95%
(t-test)			(p=.330)
If you were caught for the same offence again and went to court, how much of a problem would it create for your life ? Do you think it would create [a problem]?	94%	94%	94%
(t-test)			(p=.894)
If you were caught for the same offence again and went to a conference, how much of a problem would it create for your life? Do you think it would create [a problem]?	66%	49%	80%
(t-test)			(p=.001)**
If you were caught for the same offence again, how much of a problem would it create for you if your family and friends found out? Do you think it would create [a problem]?	81%	72%	89%
(t-test)			(p=.023)*
If you committed another offence like the one that got you into trouble, how likely is it that you would be caught? Do you think that it would be [likely]?	63%	52%	72%
(t-test)			(p=.029)*
The court/conference will help prevent you from breaking the law in the future.	85%	77%	92%
(t-test)			(p=.029)*
Total number of deterrence measures agreed to by offender	4.80	4.31	5.19
(t-test)			(p=.001)**