

Chapter 5

Offender Reactions to Court and Conference

While Chapter 4 shows how the research team's observers rated what happened to participants in court and conference, this Chapter shows what offenders said themselves to the research team's interviewers about the way they reacted to court and conference. These responses were elicited in interviews conducted at least six weeks after their treatment was finalised. A great deal of effort went into contacting offenders and seeking their consent to be interviewed. The actual response rate varied by experiment and by disposal as follows:

Experiment	Court	Conference
Drink driving	74.6%	86.7%
Juvenile Personal Property	65.6%	62.9%
Juvenile Shoplifting	68.2%	68.8%
Youth Violence	62.7%	67.7%

Drink Driving

On almost all measures of *emotional intensity* conference offenders perceived their experience to be more intense than the court offenders. A majority of both groups felt awkward and embarrassed but significantly more of the conference offenders were worried about what others thought of them, felt ashamed about being criticised and felt bad because others knew about the offence (even though the court was open to the public and the offence was reported in the daily newspaper, whereas the conference was attended only by the offender's supporters).

Offenders were asked about several dimensions of *procedural justice*: awareness of the process, consistency/fairness of the process, correctability of the process, the amount of control they felt they had over the process, impartiality in the way the process was administered, ethicality of the process and the amount of respect with which they were treated. On almost all of the elements making up each of these dimensions conference offenders felt they experienced more procedural justice than did the court offenders. The only questions on which there was no significant difference were those about being pushed into things they did not agree with or being made to confess to things they did not do, which very few offenders agreed had happened. In addition, a very high proportion of both groups agreed they had been treated politely.

Offenders were also asked about several dimensions of *restorative justice*, *retributive justice* and *reintegrative shaming*; conference offenders felt there was more of almost every element of each of these than the court offenders did. On stigmatic shaming however there was little difference between the groups, with about a quarter of offenders in both feeling they had been stigmatised by their treatment. However, significantly more of the conference group felt *forgiven* for their actions and were significantly less likely to be *angry* about their treatment. There was little difference between the groups on the dimension of defiance with few in either group feeling this way, but a significantly higher number of conference offenders said they had increased *respect for the police, the law and the justice system* because of their treatment.

There were mixed results around perceptions of *informal social control* and *deterrence*, but conference offenders significantly more often said that they learned that there are people who care about them, that their experience brought their family closer together and that they would have problems with their friends and family if they reoffended; they also more often said that another conference would be a problem if they reoffended, that during the treatment they had felt ashamed of themselves, that they felt humiliated and had lost honour among their friends. They also more often said that the treatment they had received would help prevent their reoffending and help them to obey the law.

Juvenile Personal Property

On no measures of *emotional intensity* was there any significant difference between the conference and the court offenders, with about half of both groups feeling awkward, embarrassed, worried about what others thought of them, ashamed about being criticised and feeling bad because others knew about the offence.

Offenders were asked about several dimensions of *procedural justice*: awareness of the process, consistency/fairness of the process, correctability of the process, the amount of control they felt they had over the process, impartiality in the way the process was administered, ethicality of the process and the amount of respect with which they were treated. On almost none of the elements making up each of these dimensions conference offenders was there a significant difference between the groups in the amount of procedural justice they experienced and both groups reported very high levels on most of them.

Offenders were also asked about several dimensions of *restorative justice*, *retributive justice* and *reintegrative shaming* and again there was almost no significant difference between the court and conference offenders except on measures concerning repaying both victims and society. Otherwise a majority of both groups said that their outcomes were not too harsh and that they experienced a good deal of restorativeness in their treatment. On *stigmatic shaming* about a third of both groups of offenders said they had been stigmatised by their treatment while about half of both felt *forgiven* for their actions. There was a difference between them however on feelings of anger: about a quarter of the court group said the treatment made them feel angry compared with less than half that proportion in the conference group. There was little difference between the groups on the dimension of defiance with almost none in either group saying they felt this way, and no significant difference on measures concerning the legitimacy of the criminal justice system.

Likewise there was no significant difference between the groups around perceptions of *informal social control* and *deterrence*, though the conference group more often said that another conference would be a problem if they reoffended and that the treatment they had received would help prevent their reoffending.

Juvenile Shoplifting

On measures of *emotional intensity*, the two groups were similar with about half of both feeling awkward, embarrassed, worried about what others thought of them, ashamed about being criticised and feeling bad because others knew about the offence.

Significantly more of the conference group, however, said they worried about what others thought of them and felt sad or depressed during the treatment.

Offenders were asked about several dimensions of *procedural justice*: awareness of the process, consistency/fairness of the process, correctability of the process, the amount of control they felt they had over the process, impartiality in the way the process was administered, ethicality of the process and the amount of respect with which they were treated. On several of the elements making up each of these dimensions significantly more of the conference offenders said they experienced more procedural justice, especially on measures relating to control over the process, though both groups reported high levels on most of them.

Offenders were also asked about several dimensions of *restorative justice*, *retributive justice* and *reintegrative shaming* and again there were few significant differences between the court and conference offenders except on measures concerning repaying both victims and society and on indicators of perceived reintegrative shaming which consistently tended to be higher in the conference group. The great majority of both groups said that their outcomes were not too harsh. On *stigmatic shaming* around a quarter of both groups of offenders said they had been stigmatised by their treatment while about half of both felt *forgiven* for their actions. There was no significant difference between them on feelings of anger or defiance with few in either group saying they felt this way, but there was a difference on perceptions of legitimacy with significantly more of the conference group saying that they had increased respect for the police and the justice system.

There was no significant difference between the groups around perceptions of *informal social control* and *deterrence*, though the conference group more often said that another conference would be a problem if they reoffended.

Youth Violence

On measures of *emotional intensity*, the two groups were similar with about half of both feeling awkward, embarrassed, worried about what others thought of them, ashamed about being criticised and feeling bad because others knew about the offence.

Offenders were asked about several dimensions of *procedural justice*: awareness of the process, consistency/fairness of the process, correctability of the process, the amount of control they felt they had over the process, impartiality in the way the process was administered, ethicality of the process and the amount of respect with which they were treated. On several of the elements making up each of these dimensions significantly more of the conference offenders said they experienced more procedural justice, especially on measures relating to consistency, control over the process and trust in the police, though both groups reported high levels on most of them.

Offenders were also asked about several dimensions of *restorative justice*, *retributive justice* and *reintegrative shaming*. Conference offenders had significantly higher measures of perceived restorative justice but otherwise there were few significant differences between the court and conference offenders except on measures concerning repaying both victims and society and on indicators of perceived reintegrative shaming, which consistently tended to be higher in the conference group. The great majority of both groups said that their outcomes were not too harsh. On *stigmatic shaming* around

a third of both groups of offenders said they had been stigmatised by their treatment while about two thirds of both felt *forgiven* for their actions. Although few in either group felt defiant, except in relation to their victims, there was a significant difference between them on feelings of anger with a much higher proportion of court offenders saying that they experienced feelings of bitterness and vengeance towards their victims. There was also a significant difference on perceptions of legitimacy with significantly more of the conference group saying that they had increased respect for the police and the justice system.

Likewise there was no significant difference between the groups around perceptions of *informal social control* and *deterrence*, though the conference group more often said that another conference would be a problem if they reoffended.

EMOTIONAL INTENSITY (Tables 5-1 – 5.4)

Table 5-1: Drink Driving – Perceived Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Worried about what others thought of me	33	39.9 %	39	49.7 %	.008
Felt bad because everyone knew of offence	6		0		
Felt ashamed because of being criticized	33	21.4 %	39	38.2 %	.000
Felt awkward and aware of myself	6		0		
Embarrassed by being center of attention	33	54.5 %	39	63.8 %	.010
Felt so exposed, I wished I could disappear	6		0		
Felt sad of depressed during treatment	33	28.6 %	39	19.0 %	.003
	6		0		
	30	27.1 %	34	32.2 %	.153
	3		8		

Table 5-2: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Worried about what others thought of me	80	40.0 %	80	43.8 %	.633
Felt bad because everyone knew of offence	80	50.0 %	80	52.5 %	.754
Felt ashamed because of being criticized	80	33.8 %	80	38.8 %	.514
Felt awkward and aware of myself	80	52.5 %	80	56.3 %	.636
Embarrassed by being center of attention	80	46.3 %	80	55.0 %	.271
Felt so exposed, I wished I could disappear	80	33.8 %	80	33.8 %	.999
Felt sad of depressed during treatment	79	38.0 %	72	52.8 %	.069

Table 5-3: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Worried about what others thought of me	45	26.7 %	53	52.8 %	.008
Felt bad because everyone knew of offence	45	40.0 %	53	39.6 %	.970

Felt ashamed because of being criticized	45	22.2	%	53	35.8	%	.139
Felt awkward and aware of myself	45	42.2	%	53	58.5	%	.111
Embarrassed by being center of attention	45	42.2	%	53	50.9	%	.394
Felt so exposed, I wished I could disappear	45	28.9	%	52	34.6	%	.551
Felt sad of depressed during treatment	40	22.5	%	49	49.0	%	.009

Table 5-4: Youth Violence – Perceived Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Worried about what others thought of me	36	27.8	%	42	35.7	%	.461
Felt bad because everyone knew of offence	37	32.4	%	42	45.2	%	.249
Felt ashamed because of being criticized	37	32.4	%	42	21.4	%	.279
Felt awkward and aware of myself	37	51.4	%	42	52.4	%	.928
Embarrassed by being center of attention	37	40.5	%	42	42.9	%	.838
Felt so exposed, I wished I could disappear	37	40.5	%	42	33.3	%	.513
Felt sad of depressed during treatment	35	37.1	%	40	40.0	%	.803

PERCEIVED PROCEDURAL JUSTICE (Tables 5-5 – 5-34)

Table 5-5: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Awareness of Process), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Understood what was going on at treatment	33	74.1	%	39	97.4	%	.000
	6			1			
Understood what my rights were	34	63.0	%	39	92.9	%	.000
	1			6			

Table 5-6: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Awareness of Process), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Understood what was going on at treatment	81	75.3	%	81	90.1	%	.013
Understood what my rights were	88	78.4	%	90	85.6	%	.218

Table 5-7: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Awareness of Process), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Understood what was going on at treatment	45	62.2	%	53	94.3	%	.000
Understood what my rights were	46	76.1	%	57	93.0	%	.022

Table 5-8: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Awareness of Process), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Understood what was going on at treatment	37	54.1	%	42	88.1	%	.001
Understood what my rights were	37	51.4	%	43	79.1	%	.010

Table 5-9: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Consistency; Fairness), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
--	-------	--	--	------------	--	--

	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Treatment overall was fair	33	80.7 %		39	94.9 %	.000
	7			1		
Treatment respected my rights	33	87.8 %		39	96.4 %	.000
	6			1		
Offenders with same offence treated the same	33	39.5 %		38	51.3 %	.001
	7			4		
Police were fair leading up to treatment	33	78.0 %		39	92.6 %	.000
	2			1		
Police were fair at treatment	33	60.6 %		39	93.6 %	.000
	0			1		
Police in Canberra enforce the law fairly	34	58.8 %		39	73.4 %	.000
	2			5		

Table 5-10: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Consistency; Fairness), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment overall was fair	82	90.2 %	81	86.4 %	.450
Treatment respected my rights	82	91.5 %	81	87.7 %	.429
Offenders with same offence treated the same	82	45.1 %	81	67.9 %	.003
Police were fair leading up to treatment	81	67.9 %	80	76.3 %	.240
Police were fair at treatment	80	67.5 %	81	77.8 %	.146
Police in Canberra enforce the law fairly	89	57.3 %	91	65.9 %	.236

Table 5-11: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Consistency; Fairness), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment overall was fair	45	82.2 %	53	94.3 %	.070
Treatment respected my rights	45	86.7 %	53	94.3 %	.208
Offenders with same offence treated the same	45	40.0 %	53	64.2 %	.017
Police were fair leading up to treatment	45	71.1 %	54	92.6 %	.007
Police were fair at treatment	44	54.5 %	53	90.6 %	.000
Police in Canberra enforce the law fairly	46	60.9 %	58	70.7 %	.297

Table 5-12: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Consistency; Fairness), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Treatment overall was fair	37	78.4 %	42	85.7 %	.401
Treatment respected my rights	36	86.1 %	42	95.2 %	.180
Offenders with same offence treated the same	37	35.1 %	42	54.8 %	.082
Police were fair leading up to treatment	37	48.6 %	42	81.0 %	.003
Police were fair at treatment	37	51.4 %	42	83.3 %	.002
Police in Canberra enforce the law fairly	37	29.7 %	45	57.8 %	.010

Table 5-13: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Correctability), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
If police had facts wrong, able to correct	33	54.6 %	38	79.6 %	.000
	7		8		
If police treated me unfairly, able to complain	33	52.1 %	39	72.4 %	.000

	6			1		
Felt too intimidated at treatment to speak	33	28.0 %		39	13.6 %	.000
	6			0		

Table 5-14: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Correctability), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
If police had facts wrong, able to correct	81	65.4 %	81	61.7 %	.627
If police treated me unfairly, able to complain	81	56.8 %	81	50.6 %	.434
Felt too intimidated at treatment to speak	80	26.3 %	81	27.2 %	.897

Table 5-15: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Correctability), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
If police had facts wrong, able to correct	45	57.8 %	53	79.2 %	.024
If police treated me unfairly, able to complain	45	57.8 %	53	71.7 %	.156
Felt too intimidated at treatment to speak	45	35.6 %	53	24.5 %	.242

Table 5-16: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Correctability), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
If police had facts wrong, able to correct	37	43.2 %	42	61.9 %	.100
If police treated me unfairly, able to complain	37	43.2 %	42	59.5 %	.152
Felt too intimidated at treatment to speak	37	27.0 %	42	26.2 %	.934

Table 5-17: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Control), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Felt I had some control over the outcome	33	50.3 %	39	78.5 %	.000
	6		1		
Had an opportunity to express my views	33	71.2 %	39	91.3 %	.000
	7		1		
Had enough control over the way things ran	33	38.1 %	39	64.9 %	.000
	6		0		
Treatment took account of what I said	33	56.7 %	39	73.1 %	.000
	5		1		
Felt pushed around by others with power	33	19.6 %	39	9.2 %	.000
	7		1		
Felt pushed into things I didn't agree with	33	11.6 %	39	12.0 %	.852
	7		1		

Table 5-18: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Control), court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Felt I had some control over the outcome	82	62.2 %	81	60.5 %	.825
Had an opportunity to express my views	81	53.1 %	81	69.1 %	.036
Had enough control over the way things ran	81	39.5 %	81	48.1 %	.270
Treatment took account of what I said	80	56.3 %	81	70.4 %	.064
Felt pushed around by others with power	81	32.1 %	80	25.0 %	.322
Felt pushed into things I didn't agree with	81	25.9 %	81	22.2 %	.584

Table 5-19: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Control), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt I had some control over the outcome	45	40.0	%	53	81.1	% .000
Had an opportunity to express my views	45	55.6	%	53	86.8	% .001
Had enough control over the way things ran	45	33.3	%	53	62.3	% .004
Treatment took account of what I said	45	44.4	%	53	69.8	% .011
Felt pushed around by others with power	45	28.9	%	53	22.6	% .485
Felt pushed into things I didn't agree with	45	17.8	%	53	15.1	% .724

Table 5-20: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Control), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt I had some control over the outcome	37	48.6	%	41	70.7	% .049
Had an opportunity to express my views	37	40.5	%	42	73.8	% .003
Had enough control over the way things ran	37	24.3	%	42	52.4	% .010
Treatment took account of what I said	37	43.2	%	42	71.4	% .011
Felt pushed around by others with power	37	54.1	%	42	40.5	% .233
Felt pushed into things I didn't agree with	37	27.0	%	42	21.4	% .567

Table 5-21: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Impartiality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt treated no better or worse than others	31	43.7	%	32	33.3	% .007
	1			4		
All sides had a fair chance to present views	33	71.8	%	39	90.3	% .000
	7			1		
Felt disadvantaged by age, income, sex, etc.	33	19.0	%	39	4.1	% .000
	7			1		

Table 5-22: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Impartiality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt treated no better or worse than others	76	51.3	%	78	43.6	.340
All sides had a fair chance to present views	81	80.2	%	81	81.5	.843
Felt disadvantaged by age, income, sex, etc.	81	18.5	%	81	11.1	.187

Table 23:-Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Impartiality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt treated no better or worse than others	40	45.0	%	44	40.9	% .709
All sides had a fair chance to present views	45	68.9	%	53	92.5	% .004
Felt disadvantaged by age, income, sex, etc.	45	17.8	%	53	9.4	% .240

Table 5-24: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Correctiability), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Felt treated no better or worse than others	32	46.9	%	40	32.5	% .219
All sides had a fair chance to present views	37	51.4	%	42	78.6	% .012

Felt disadvantaged by age, income, sex, etc. 37 37.8 % 42 19.0 % .068

Table 5-25: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Ethicality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt I could trust the police during treatment	34	60.0	%	39	84.6	%	.000
	0			6			
I was made to confess to things I did not do	34	1.8	%	39	0.5	%	.117
	2			6			

Table 5-26: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Ethicality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt I could trust the police during treatment	88	44.3	%	91	52.7	%	.262
I was made to confess to things I did not do	89	16.9	%	91	8.8	%	.108

Table 5-27: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Ethicality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt I could trust the police during treatment	46	54.3	%	58	67.2	%	.186
I was made to confess to things I did not do	46	13.0	%	58	5.2	%	.180

Table 5-28: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Ethicality), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt I could trust the police during treatment	37	13.5	%	45	60.0	%	.000
I was made to confess to things I did not do	37	16.2	%	45	8.9	%	.332

Table 5-29: Drink Driving – Perceived Procedural Justice (Respect), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
People were polite to me at treatment	33	85.8	%	39	88.7	%	.230
	7			1			
I was treated with respect at treatment	33	63.4	%	39	85.6	%	.000
	6			0			
Police were rude when I was apprehended	34	15.9	%	39	6.3	%	.000
	0			6			

Table 5-30: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Procedural Justice (Respect), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
People were polite to me at treatment	81	81.5	%	81	79.0	%	.695
I was treated with respect at treatment	81	59.3	%	81	64.2	%	.521
Police were rude when I was apprehended	88	42.0	%	90	28.9	%	.067

Table 5-31: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Procedural Justice (Respect), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
--	-------	--	--	------------	--	--

	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
People were polite to me at treatment	45	82.2 %		53	86.8 %	.536
I was treated with respect at treatment	45	68.9 %		53	86.8 %	.036
Police were rude when I was apprehended	46	28.3 %		58	19.0 %	.276

Table 5-32: Youth Violence – Perceived Procedural Justice (Respect), court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
People were polite to me at treatment	37	64.9 %		42	78.6 %	.184
I was treated with respect at treatment	37	62.2 %		42	64.3 %	.848
Police were rude when I was apprehended	36	33.3 %		45	26.7 %	.520

PERCEIVED RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE (Tables 5-33 – 5-36)

Table 5-33: Drink Driving – Perceived Retributive Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
The outcome from my treatment was too hard	33	28.5 %		39	15.6 %	.000
	7			0		
The outcome from my treatment was severe	33	40.8 %		39	36.8 %	.277
	6			1		

Table 5-34: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Retributive Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
The outcome from my treatment was too hard	82	13.4 %		81	14.8 %	.799
The outcome from my treatment was severe	82	30.5 %		81	39.5 %	.230

Table 5-35: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Retributive Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
The outcome from my treatment was too hard	44	13.6 %		53	13.2 %	.951
The outcome from my treatment was severe	45	24.4 %		53	24.5 %	.992

Table 5-36: Youth Violence – Perceived Retributive Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
The outcome from my treatment was too hard	37	21.6 %		42	14.3 %	.401
The outcome from my treatment was severe	37	24.3 %		42	28.6 %	.675

PERCEIVED RESTORATIVE JUSTICE (Tables 5-37 – 5-40)

Table 5-37: Drink Driving – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.

The treatment allowed me to repay society	33 7	43.9 %	39 1	82.1 %	.000
Felt good I was able to do something	30 2	31.5 %	34 8	77.0 %	.000

Table 5-38: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
The treatment allowed me to repay society	80	50.0 %	81	71.6 %	.005
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	81	45.7 %	81	70.4 %	.001
Felt good I was able to do something	79	46.8 %	72	51.4 %	.579

Table 5-39: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
The treatment allowed me to repay society	45	35.6 %	53	90.6 %	.000
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	45	35.6 %	53	71.7 %	.000
Felt good I was able to do something	40	42.5 %	49	67.3 %	.019

Table 5-40: Youth Violence – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
The treatment allowed me to repay society	37	24.3 %	42	64.3 %	.000
The treatment allowed me to repay the victim	37	16.2 %	42	64.3 %	.000
Felt good I was able to do something	34	20.6 %	40	45.0 %	.025

PERCEIVED REINTEGRATIVE SHAMING (Tables 5-41 – 5-44)

Table 5-41: Drink Driving – Perceived Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
At treatment, I felt my offence was wrong	33 6	83.0 %	39 0	92.8 %	.000
Felt bad that offence could have hurt others	33 6	64.3 %	39 0	87.7 %	.000
Felt good that I was able to face up to offence	30 3	54.8 %	34 8	75.6 %	.000
Felt angry with myself for what I had done	33 6	61.3 %	39 0	71.3 %	.005
Affected by emotions of those hurt in some way	33 3	21.3 %	38 6	46.4 %	.000
At treatment, felt ashamed of what I did	33 4	57.5 %	39 0	76.9 %	.000
I understood what it was like for victims	33 1	25.7 %	38 8	68.0 %	.000
Felt bad that my actions hurt others	33 3	22.5 %	38 6	46.6 %	.000
Others spoke up on my behalf at treatment	33 7	36.2 %	38 8	87.1 %	.000

I was able to make up for what I did	33	36.1	%	38	74.8	%	.000
	5			9			
I was able to clear my conscience	33	27.6	%	39	50.0	%	.000
	7			0			
People said it was not like me to offend	33	28.3	%	39	67.3	%	.000
	2			1			
People said I can put the offence behind me	33	47.3	%	39	54.5	%	.054
	6			1			
People accept me as basically law-abiding	33	61.2	%	39	86.4	%	.000
	5			1			
People noted aspects of me that they like	33	25.0	%	38	62.7	%	.000
	6			9			
I was treated as a trustworthy person	33	52.7	%	38	76.6	%	.000
	6			9			
Those close to me have give more support	32	44.4	%	38	43.5	%	.799
	4			4			

Table 5-42: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.		
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value			
At treatment, I felt my offence was wrong	80	83.8	%	80	82.5	%	.834
Felt bad that offence could have hurt others	80	56.3	%	80	67.5	%	.145
Felt good that I was able to face up to offence	79	53.2	%	72	52.8	%	.962
Felt angry with myself for what I had done	80	60.0	%	80	56.3	%	.633
Affected by emotions of those hurt in some way	80	46.3	%	80	45.0	%	.875
At treatment, felt ashamed of what I did	80	65.0	%	80	66.3	%	.869
I understood what it was like for victims	80	43.8	%	80	65.0	%	.007
Felt bad that my actions hurt others	80	52.5	%	80	62.5	%	.203
Others spoke up on my behalf at treatment	81	75.3	%	81	84.0	%	.174
I was able to make up for what I did	80	58.8	%	81	71.6	%	.088
I was able to clear my conscience	81	58.0	%	81	67.9	%	.195
People said it was not like me to offend	81	40.7	%	79	55.7	%	.059
People said I can put the offence behind me	81	69.1	%	79	62.0	%	.347
People accept me as basically law-abiding	81	44.4	%	79	54.4	%	.209
People noted aspects of me that they like	81	39.5	%	79	53.2	%	.084
I was treated as a trustworthy person	81	37.0	%	79	34.2	%	.708
Those close to me have give more support	81	51.9	%	77	39.0	%	.105

Table 5-43: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.		
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value			
At treatment, I felt my offence was wrong	45	71.1	%	53	90.6	%	.017
Felt bad that offence could have hurt others	45	37.8	%	53	66.0	%	.005
Felt good that I was able to face up to offence	40	52.5	%	49	59.2	%	.533
Felt angry with myself for what I had done	45	51.1	%	53	62.3	%	.271
Affected by emotions of those hurt in some way	45	33.3	%	53	41.5	%	.411
At treatment, felt ashamed of what I did	45	57.8	%	53	75.5	%	.067
I understood what it was like for victims	45	26.7	%	53	56.6	%	.002
Felt bad that my actions hurt others	45	28.9	%	53	52.8	%	.016
Others spoke up on my behalf at treatment	45	68.9	%	53	71.7	%	.764
I was able to make up for what I did	45	42.2	%	53	88.7	%	.000
I was able to clear my conscience	45	44.4	%	53	73.6	%	.003

People said it was not like me to offend	45	33.3	%	53	52.8	%	.052
People said I can put the offence behind me	44	61.4	%	53	69.8	%	.387
People accept me as basically law-abiding	45	51.1	%	53	52.8	%	.867
People noted aspects of me that they like	45	37.8	%	53	50.9	%	.195
I was treated as a trustworthy person	44	36.4	%	53	35.8	%	.959
Those close to me have give more support	45	46.7	%	53	49.1	%	.816

Table 5-44: Youth Violence – Perceived Restorative Justice, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
At treatment, I felt my offence was wrong	35	42.9	%	42	64.3	%	.061
Felt bad that offence could have hurt others	36	44.4	%	42	64.3	%	.081
Felt good that I was able to face up to offence	34	58.8	%	39	51.3	%	.525
Felt angry with myself for what I had done	36	27.8	%	42	40.5	%	.242
Affected by emotions of those hurt in some way	36	38.9	%	42	50.0	%	.332
At treatment, felt ashamed of what I did	36	41.7	%	42	54.8	%	.254
I understood what it was like for victims	37	18.9	%	42	57.1	%	.000
Felt bad that my actions hurt others	37	32.4	%	42	57.1	%	.028
Others spoke up on my behalf at treatment	37	70.3	%	42	78.6	%	.404
I was able to make up for what I did	37	16.7	%	42	66.7	%	.000
I was able to clear my conscience	37	27.0	%	42	76.2	%	.000
People said it was not like me to offend	37	45.9	%	42	52.4	%	.574
People said I can put the offence behind me	37	51.4	%	42	66.7	%	.172
People accept me as basically law-abiding	37	37.8	%	42	54.8	%	.136
People noted aspects of me that they like	37	45.9	%	42	42.9	%	.786
I was treated as a trustworthy person	36	30.6	%	42	54.8	%	.031
Those close to me have give more support	37	40.5	%	42	38.1	%	.827

PERCEIVED STIGMATIC SHAMING (Tables 5-45 – 5.48)

Table 5-45: Drink Driving – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt treated as though would reoffend	33	19.3	%	39	16.9	%	.389
	6			1			
People made negative judgments about me	33	14.3	%	39	11.3	%	.224
	6			1			
Treated as though I was a criminal	33	28.3	%	39	18.2	%	.001
	6			1			
People important to me rejected me	33	4.5	%	39	4.6	%	.928
	6			1			
Treated as though I was a bad person	33	18.8	%	39	14.9	%	.165
	6			0			
People will not let me forget what I did	33	32.1	%	39	35.9	%	.287
	6			0			
People not at treatment treat me as a criminal	32	16.6	%	35	12.8	%	.161
	5			2			

Table 5-46: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt treated as though would reoffend	81	30.9	%	80	32.5	%	.825

People made negative judgments about me	81	21.0	%	79	30.4	%	.176
Treated as though I was a criminal	81	46.9	%	79	39.2	%	.330
People important to me rejected me	81	8.6	%	79	10.1	%	.749
Treated as though I was a bad person	81	34.6	%	79	32.9	%	.826
People will not let me forget what I did	81	44.4	%	79	36.7	%	.322
People not at treatment treat me as a criminal	77	36.4	%	70	24.3	%	.112

Table 5-47: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt treated as though would reoffend	44	29.5	%	53	18.9	%	.230
People made negative judgments about me	45	17.8	%	53	13.2	%	.536
Treated as though I was a criminal	44	34.1	%	53	28.3	%	.544
People important to me rejected me	45	6.7	%	53	13.2	%	.280
Treated as though I was a bad person	45	24.4	%	53	28.3	%	.670
People will not let me forget what I did	45	33.3	%	53	26.4	%	.460
People not at treatment treat me as a criminal	41	34.1	%	44	11.4	%	.013

Table 5-48: Youth Violence – Perceived Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
Felt treated as though would reoffend	37	32.4	%	42	31.0	%	.890
People made negative judgments about me	37	37.8	%	42	31.0	%	.526
Treated as though I was a criminal	37	54.1	%	42	38.1	%	.159
People important to me rejected me	37	16.2	%	42	9.5	%	.378
Treated as though I was a bad person	37	29.7	%	42	31.0	%	.908
People will not let me forget what I did	37	35.1	%	42	42.9	%	.489
People not at treatment treat me as a criminal	33	27.3	%	40	27.5	%	.983

PERCEIVED FORGIVENESS (Tables 5-49 – 5-52)

Table 5-49: Drink Driving – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	%	<i>n</i>	Value	%	
People have indicated I was forgiven	33	29.1	%	38	51.3	%	.000
	3			8			
People said they love me despite the offence	33	40.1	%	39	61.5	%	.000
	4			0			
People said that I deserve a second chance	33	33.0	%	38	67.8	%	.000
	6			8			
People accept that I have earned a fresh start	31	81.1	%	33	90.4	%	.001
	7			3			

Table 5-50: 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	81	49.4	%	79	51.9	%	.752
People said they love me despite the offence	81	56.8	%	79	57.0	%	.983
People said that I deserve a second chance	81	60.5	%	79	65.8	%	.488

People accept that I have earned a fresh start 75 93.3 % 72 90.3 % .502

Table 5-51: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	45	44.4 %	53	66.0 %	.032
People said they love me despite the offence	45	53.3 %	53	67.9 %	.142
People said that I deserve a second chance	45	55.6 %	53	77.4 %	.024
People accept that I have earned a fresh start	40	90.0 %	46	95.7 %	.324

Table 5-52: Youth Violence – Perceived Forgiveness, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
People have indicated I was forgiven	37	51.4 %	42	57.1 %	.611
People said they love me despite the offence	37	70.3 %	42	61.9 %	.441
People said that I deserve a second chance	36	58.3 %	41	61.0 %	.816
People accept that I have earned a fresh start	35	88.6 %	35	85.7 %	.726

PERCEIVED ANGER (Tables 5-53 – 5-56)

Table 5-53: 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	33	22.6 %	38	6.9 %	.000
The treatment just made me angry	33	24.9 %	39	7.4 %	.000
I wish I could get back at my accusers	33	2.1 %	38	1.0 %	.261

Table 5-54: 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	82	26.8 %	82	19.5 %	.270
The treatment just made me angry	81	25.9 %	81	12.3 %	.028
I wish I could get back at my accusers	81	13.6 %	81	7.4 %	.202

Table 5-55: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Anger, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Feel bitter about the way I was treated	45	11.1 %	53	20.8 %	.193
The treatment just made me angry	45	28.9 %	53	22.6 %	.485
I wish I could get back at my accusers	45	11.1 %	53	11.3 %	.974

Table 5-56: 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	37	48.6	%	41	34.1	%	.198
The treatment just made me angry	37	45.9	%	42	23.8	%	.041
I wish I could get back at my accusers	37	32.4	%	42	7.1	%	.006

PERCEIVED DEFIANCE (Tables 5-57 – 5-60)

Table 5-57: 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	33	5.1	%	38	5.7	%	.722
	1			3			
Feel glad that I committed the offence	34	3.5	%	39	5.4	%	.229
	0			2			
Now feel the offence was right	33	3.5	%	39	1.8	%	.147
	9			2			
Proud my family knows about the offence	31	0.0	%	36	0.0	%	----
	0			4			
Proud my friends know about the offence	33	1.8	%	38	0.0	%	.014
	4			6			
Proud officials know about the offence	33	0.6	%	39	0.0	%	.158
	8			0			

Table 5-58: 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	81	16.0	%	81	21.0	%	.422
Feel glad that I committed the offence	89	7.9	%	91	9.9	%	.635
Now feel the offence was right	86	0.0	%	88	1.1	%	.320
Proud my family knows about the offence	82	1.2	%	78	0.0	%	.320
Proud my friends know about the offence	80	5.0	%	75	4.0	%	.766
Proud officials know about the offence	82	1.2	%	80	3.8	%	.306

Table 5-59: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		Sig.	
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value		
Feel my accusers were more wrong than me	45	6.7	%	53	17.0	%	.112
Feel glad that I committed the offence	46	15.2	%	56	5.4	%	.114
Now feel the offence was right	45	2.2	%	57	0.0	%	.323
Proud my family knows about the offence	45	0.0	%	53	0.0	%	----
Proud my friends know about the offence	43	9.3	%	51	0.0	%	.044
Proud officials know about the offence	45	6.7	%	53	3.8	%	.522

Table 5-60: 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	37	48.6	%	42	33.3	%	.172
Feel glad that I committed the offence	37	10.8	%	44	13.6	%	.704
Now feel the offence was right	35	28.6	%	45	15.6	%	.175
Proud my family knows about the offence	35	5.7	%	41	2.4	%	.471
Proud my friends know about the offence	35	17.1	%	42	11.9	%	.519
Proud officials know about the offence	37	2.7	%	43	2.3	%	.916

PERCEIVED LEGITIMACY (Tables 5-61 – 5-64)

Table 5-61: Drink Driving – Perceived Legitimacy, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Have increased respect for the justice system	33 6	20.5	%	39 1	65.7	% .000
Have increased respect for the law	33 5	23.0	%	39 1	58.8	% .000
Have increased respect for the police	34 2	23.4	%	39 6	61.6	% .000

Table 5-62: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Legitimacy, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Have increased respect for the justice system	83	26.5	%	80	37.5	% .135
Have increased respect for the law	82	39.0	%	81	40.7	% .824
Have increased respect for the police	89	29.2	%	91	29.7	% .947

Table 5-63: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Legitimacy, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Have increased respect for the justice system	45	24.4	%	51	45.1	% .033
Have increased respect for the law	45	42.2	%	53	56.6	% .159
Have increased respect for the police	46	21.7	%	58	44.8	% .012

Table 5-64: Youth Violence – Perceived Legitimacy, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Have increased respect for the justice system	37	21.6	%	42	42.9	% .043
Have increased respect for the law	37	24.3	%	42	35.7	% .275
Have increased respect for the police	37	8.1	%	45	28.9	% .013

PERCEIVED INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROL (Tables 5-65 – 5-68))

Table 5-65: Drink Driving – Perceived Informal Social Control, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	34 2	60.5	%	39 4	79.2	% .000
I learned there are people who care about me	33 6	36.9	%	39 1	86.7	% .000
I am proud to be a member of my family	33 8	93.2	%	39 0	92.1	% .558
Due to treatment, more proud about family	33 7	27.0	%	39 0	49.5	% .000
Treatment brought my family closer together	33 7	17.2	%	38 9	31.6	% .000
My family loves me	33	95.9	%	39	94.4	% .353

I love my family	8 33	97.9 %	0 39	95.6 %	.077
Treatment increased respect within family	8 33	23.4 %	0 38	44.2 %	.000
	7		9		

Table 5-66: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Informal Social Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	89	80.9 %	90	83.3 %	.673
I learned there are people who care about me	81	75.3 %	79	75.9 %	.925
I am proud to be a member of my family	82	86.6 %	78	84.6 %	.725
Due to treatment, more proud about family	81	39.5 %	78	41.0 %	.846
Treatment brought my family closer together	81	24.7 %	79	20.3 %	.505
My family loves me	82	85.4 %	78	87.2 %	.741
I love my family	82	89.0 %	78	93.6 %	.307
Treatment increased respect within family	81	33.3 %	79	31.6 %	.821

Table 5-67: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Informal Social Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	46	71.7 %	58	79.3 %	.374
I learned there are people who care about me	45	53.3 %	53	79.2 %	.007
I am proud to be a member of my family	45	84.4 %	54	85.2 %	.920
Due to treatment, more proud about family	45	46.7 %	53	45.3 %	.892
Treatment brought my family closer together	45	28.9 %	53	18.9 %	.254
My family loves me	45	88.9 %	54	88.9 %	.999
I love my family	45	88.9 %	54	92.6 %	.528
Treatment increased respect within family	45	28.9 %	53	43.4 %	.138

Table 5-68: Youth Violence – Perceived Informal Social Control, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value	<i>n</i>	Value	
Problem with family/friends if I reoffend	37	67.6 %	45	75.6 %	.429
I learned there are people who care about me	37	64.9 %	42	78.6 %	.184
I am proud to be a member of my family	37	78.4 %	43	83.7 %	.547
Due to treatment, more proud about family	36	33.3 %	42	38.1 %	.667
Treatment brought my family closer together	36	25.0 %	42	9.5 %	.078
My family loves me	37	86.5 %	43	88.4 %	.802
I love my family	37	94.6 %	43	97.7 %	.476
Treatment increased respect within family	36	36.1 %	42	45.2 %	.421

PERCEIVED DETERRENCE (Tables 5.69 – 5-72)

Table 5-69: 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	34	93.5 %	39	95.7 %	.201
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	0		4		
	34	96.5 %	39	96.0 %	.707

	2			6		
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	34	45.9	%	39	82.2	% .000
	0			4		
Newspaper would be a problem if I reoffend	34	60.1	%	39	67.4	% .040
	1			6		
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	34	67.0	%	39	78.4	% .001
	2			3		

Table 5-70: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	89	92.1	%	90	93.3	% .759
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	89	96.6	%	91	93.4	% .322
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	88	51.1	%	91	71.4	% .005
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	89	50.6	%	91	63.7	% .075

Table 5-71: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	46	87.0	%	58	93.1	% .312
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	46	89.1	%	58	96.6	% .161
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	46	50.0	%	58	72.4	% .021
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	45	71.1	%	58	74.1	% .735

Table 5-72: Youth Violence – Perceived Deterrence, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Punishment would be tough if I reoffend	37	83.8	%	45	91.1	% .332
Court would be a problem if I reoffend	36	91.7	%	45	88.9	% .682
Conference would be a problem if I reoffend	37	48.6	%	44	72.7	% .028
Likely to be caught if I reoffend	37	64.9	%	45	66.7	% .866

SELF-PROJECTED COMPLIANCE (Tables 5-73 – 5-76)

Table 5-73: Drink Driving – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	33	80.4	%	39	91.8	% .000
	7			1		
Treatment will help me obey the law	33	82.8	%	38	91.3	% .001
	7			9		

Table 5-74: Juvenile Personal Property – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	81	74.1	%	81	86.4	% .049
Treatment will help me obey the law	81	79.0	%	81	76.5	% .708

Table 5-75: Juvenile Shoplifting – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
--	-------	--	--	------------	--	--

	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	45	80.0 %		53	86.8 %	.370
Treatment will help me obey the law	45	77.8 %		53	86.8 %	.253

Table 5-76: Youth Violence – Self-Projected Compliance, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
Treatment will help prevent reoffending	37	56.8 %		42	73.8 %	.117
Treatment will help me obey the law	37	54.1 %		42	73.8 %	.071

PERCEIVED SELF-STIGMA (Tables 5-77 – 5-80)

Table 5-77: Drink Driving – Perceived Offender Self-Stigma, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
During treatment, I felt I was a failure	33	15.5 %		39	13.1 %	.356
	6			0		
Felt I stuffed up my future opportunities	33	35.1 %		38	19.8 %	.000
	6			9		
During treatment, I felt ashamed of myself	33	42.3 %		39	60.5 %	.000
	6			0		
Felt I had lost honor among my family	33	16.5 %		38	21.1 %	.112
	4			9		
Felt I had lost honor among my friends	33	9.2 %		39	17.4 %	.001
	6			0		
Felt humiliated at treatment	33	30.1 %		39	22.1 %	.015
	6			0		
I felt that my self-respect decreased	33	31.3 %		38	23.4 %	.018
	6			9		

Table 5-78: Juvenile Personal Property – Perceived Offender Self-Stigma, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
During treatment, I felt I was a failure	80	27.5 %		80	30.0 %	.729
Felt I stuffed up my future opportunities	80	53.8 %		80	50.0 %	.638
During treatment, I felt ashamed of myself	79	63.3 %		80	67.5 %	.580
Felt I had lost honor among my family	79	54.4 %		80	52.5 %	.809
Felt I had lost honor among my friends	79	21.5 %		80	23.8 %	.739
Felt humiliated at treatment	80	35.0 %		79	34.2 %	.914
I felt that my self-respect decreased	80	38.8 %		80	27.5 %	.132

Table 5-79: Juvenile Shoplifting – Perceived Offender Self-Stigma, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference		
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value	Sig.
During treatment, I felt I was a failure	45	24.4 %		53	34.0 %	.305
Felt I stuffed up my future opportunities	45	48.9 %		53	41.5 %	.469
During treatment, I felt ashamed of myself	45	46.7 %		53	67.9 %	.035
Felt I had lost honor among my family	45	33.3 %		53	41.5 %	.411
Felt I had lost honor among my friends	45	15.6 %		53	22.6 %	.382
Felt humiliated at treatment	45	28.9 %		53	35.8 %	.469
I felt that my self-respect decreased	45	20.0 %		54	25.9 %	.492

Table 5-80: Youth Violence – Perceived Offender Self-Stigma, court vs. conference

	Court			Conference			Sig.
	<i>n</i>	Value		<i>n</i>	Value		
During treatment, I felt I was a failure	37	21.6	%	42	16.7	%	.581
Felt I stuffed up my future opportunities	36	50.0	%	42	19.0	%	.004
During treatment, I felt ashamed of myself	37	35.1	%	42	40.5	%	.631
Felt I had lost honor among my family	36	25.0	%	42	19.0	%	.532
Felt I had lost honor among my friends	37	13.5	%	42	11.9	%	.833
Felt humiliated at treatment	36	30.6	%	42	31.0	%	.970
I felt that my self-respect decreased	37	32.4	%	41	19.5	%	.201

