

Chapter 4

What Happened in Court and Conference: Observations and Records

Drink Driving

There was no significant difference between the two groups in the length of time it took for their cases to be finalised, both averaging around 55 days, though significantly more of the court cases – about half - were resolved within 30 days. However the very different character of the two treatments is apparent when we look at the average duration of the treatment: in court the case took around seven minutes while the conferences took almost an hour and a half. Each conference offender was accompanied on average by five supporters while the court offenders often was unaccompanied by any supporter.

On all measures of *observed emotional intensity*, the conferences were significantly more powerful than the court cases. The conferences were observed to be significantly more procedurally just and to contain significantly more observable restorative elements than the court cases.

Outcomes from court and conference were significantly different from each other along the lines of available sanctions in each disposal. In court these included official reprimands, fines, community service, license suspension or cancellation and imprisonment; in a conference they included community service, donations to charity or other outcomes tailored to the circumstances of the offender. The majority of court offenders were ordered to pay a fine and had their license suspended; the majority of conference offenders undertook to do community service and donate to charity. In determining the outcomes, observers in the court cases rated punishment and the prevention of future offending as the prevailing values and in the conference cases they rated reparation to the community and prevention of future offending.

On all measures of *observed restorative justice*, *observed reintegrative shaming* and *observed procedural justice*, the conferences were significantly higher than the court cases. Likewise on almost every measure of *observed stigmatic shaming*, conferences rated significantly higher than court. On measures of *defiance*, conferenced offenders were rated significantly higher than those who went to court. Conferenced offenders also were rated higher on the extent of their *apology* and remorse and the extent to which they were forgiven. Conferences provided an opportunity significantly more often than court for the *discussion of drug/alcohol or other problems*.

Juvenile Personal Property

The court cases were finalised significantly more quickly than the conference cases – in fact in less than half the time. Usually there was at least one adjournment in the court cases but still more than half of them were resolved in less than 60 days. With the conference cases only half were resolved within 90 days and on average they took 106 days. However, the conferences were far more intense: whereas the court appearances averaged about 15 minutes the conferences averaged an hour and a half. The conference offenders on average had more than double the number of supporters with them than the court offenders; they usually had a victim present as well, which rarely occurred in court.

On almost all measures of *observed emotional intensity*, the conferences were significantly more powerful than the court cases. The conferences were observed to be significantly more procedurally just and to contain significantly more observable restorative elements than the court cases.

Outcomes from court and conference were significantly different from each other along the lines of available sanctions in each disposal. In court these included official reprimands, fines, community service, license suspension or cancellation and imprisonment; in a conference they included community service donations to charity or other specified outcomes. In the majority of court cases offenders had their charges formally dismissed and given 'good behaviour bond': this meant that they did not sustain a conviction so long as they did not appear before the court again. They were also sometimes ordered to make reparations to the victim. In the conference cases offenders were most often asked to do community service, to apologise, to make reparations to the victim or some other tailor-made option. When looking at the outcomes, observers in the court cases rated the prevention of future offending as the most important prevailing value; this was important in conference cases also, as was reparation to the victim and to the community.

On all measures of *observed restorative justice*, *observed reintegrative shaming* and *observed procedural justice*, the conferences were significantly higher than the court cases. Likewise on almost every measure of *observed stigmatic shaming*, conferences rated significantly higher than court. On measures of *defiance* results were mixed: there was no difference between the groups on the simple measure of observed defiance but in conferences offenders were significantly more sullen and unresponsive. Conferenced offenders apologised significantly more often but were not different from court offenders in the extent to which they accepted they had done wrong or the extent of their remorse; they were however significantly more often forgiven. Conferences provided an opportunity significantly more often than court for the *discussion of drug/alcohol problems*.

Juvenile Shoplifting

It took nearly twice as long to finalise the conference cases as the court cases: while two-thirds of the court cases were resolved within 30 days, 90 days had elapsed before two-thirds of the conference cases were finalised. However, once more the conferences were far more intense, averaging an hour and a quarter compared with ten minutes for the court cases. On average the conference offenders had more than twice as many supporters present as the court offenders.

On almost all measures of *observed emotional intensity*, the conferences were significantly more powerful than the court cases. The conferences were observed to be significantly more procedurally just and to contain significantly more observable restorative elements than the court cases.

Outcomes from court and conference were significantly different from each other along the lines of available sanctions in each disposal. In court these included official reprimands, fines, community service, license suspension or cancellation and imprisonment; in a conference they included community service donations to charity or other specified outcomes. In the majority of court cases offenders had their charges formally dismissed via a 'good behaviour bond' and only rarely was there any penalty

imposed; in the conference cases offenders were most often asked to do community service, to apologise and to make reparations to the victim or some other tailor-made option. In looking at the outcomes, observers in the court cases rated the prevention of future offending as the most important prevailing value; this was important in conference cases also, as was restoration of the offender and reparation to the victim and to the community.

On all measures of *observed restorative justice*, *observed reintegrative shaming* and *observed procedural justice*, the conferences were significantly higher than the court cases. Likewise on almost every measure of *observed stigmatic shaming*, conferences rated significantly higher than court. On measures of *defiance* results were mixed: there was no difference between the groups on the simple measure of observed defiance but in conferences offenders were significantly more often inclined to hold others responsible for the offence. Conferenced offenders apologised significantly more often but were not different from court offenders in the extent to which they accepted they had done wrong or the extent of their remorse; they were however significantly more often forgiven.

Youth Violence

Conference cases were finalised more quickly than the court cases, which were characterised by multiple adjournments, though both treatments took on average longer than 100 days. Fewer than a half of the court cases were resolved within 90 days compared with two-thirds of the conference cases. As with the other experiments, the conferences were more intense, averaging about one and a half hours compared with about half an hour for the court cases. On average the conference offenders had twice as many supporters present as the court offenders and in two-thirds of cases the victim was present, which almost never happened in the court cases.

It took nearly twice as long to finalise the conference cases as the court cases: while two-thirds of the court cases were resolved within 30 days, 90 days had elapsed before two-thirds of the conference cases were finalised. However, once more the conferences were far more intense, averaging an hour and a quarter compared with ten minutes for the court cases. On average the conference offenders had more than twice as many supporters present as the court offenders.

On almost all measures of *observed emotional intensity*, the conferences were significantly more powerful than the court cases. The conferences were observed to be significantly more procedurally just and to contain significantly more observable restorative elements than the court cases.

Outcomes from court and conference were significantly different from each other along the lines of available sanctions in each disposal. In court these included official reprimands, fines, community service, license suspension or cancellation and imprisonment; in a conference they included community service donations to charity or other specified outcomes. In the majority of court cases offenders had their charges formally dismissed via a 'good behaviour bond'; they were also sometimes ordered to pay a fine, do community service, make reparations or apologise and to the victim. In the conference cases offenders were most often asked to do community service, to apologise and to make reparations to the victim or some other tailor-made option. In determining the outcomes, observers in the court cases rated punishment and the

prevention of future offending as the most important prevailing value; prevention was important in conference cases also, as was restoration of the offender and reparation to the victim and to the community.

On all measures of *observed restorative justice*, *observed reintegrative shaming* and *observed procedural justice*, the conferences were significantly higher than the court cases. Likewise on almost every measure of *observed stigmatic shaming*, conferences rated significantly higher than court. On measures of *defiance* results were mixed: there was no difference between the groups on the simple measure of observed defiance but in conferences offenders were significantly more often inclined to hold others responsible for the offence and to be sullen and unresponsive. Conferenced offenders apologised significantly more often but were not different from court offenders in the extent to which they accepted they had done wrong or the extent of their remorse; they were however significantly more often forgiven. Although there was no difference between the groups in how often the offender's life problems were discussed, when they were raised they were significantly better addressed in conferences than in court.

Table 4.1: Drink Driving, Time and Effort Expended in Getting Offenders to Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Average days until initial treatment	447	30.6	429	52.0	.000
Average days until final treatment	434	54.3	426	59.7	.251
Average number of treatment events	434	1.5	426	1.2	.000
Average number of observed events	395	1.1	383	1.0	.006
Percent resolved within 30 days	434	48.2%	426	34.0%	.000
Percent resolved within 60 days	434	72.6%	426	71.6%	.748
Percent resolved within 90 days	434	84.1%	426	85.7%	.518
Percent resolved within a single treatment	434	67.3%	426	89.4%	.000

Table 4.2: Youth Violence, Observed Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Emotional power of act description (1-8)	39	2.41	51	4.94	.000
Emotional responsiveness of offender (1-8)	39	2.18	51	3.20	.001
Emotional engagement of offender (1-8)	39	3.46	52	4.65	.005
Degree of offender discomfort (1-8)	39	3.23	52	3.79	.172
Frequency of shouting at offender (1-8)	39	1.00	52	1.33	.028
Percent with any violence or threats	40	0.0%	52	1.9%	.383
Percent of offenders who cried at treatment	39	2.6%	52	3.9%	.738

Table 4.3: Juvenile Personal Property, Time and Effort Expended in Getting Offenders to Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Average days until initial treatment	113	45.2	106	106.6	.000

Average days until final treatment	113	70.1	107	119.5	.000
Average number of treatment events	114	1.84	107	1.32	.001
Average number of observed events	114	1.53	107	1.16	.026
Percent resolved within 30 days	113	36.3%	107	16.8%	.001
Percent resolved within 60 days	113	52.2%	107	30.8%	.001
Percent resolved within 90 days	113	66.4%	107	49.5%	.011
Percent resolved within a single treatment	114	57.9%	107	81.3%	.000

Table 4.4: Juvenile Personal Property, Duration of Observed Treatment events, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average duration of initial treatment	82	15.8	85	91.7	.000
Average duration of final treatment	82	16.5	85	91.0	.000
Average duration of longest observation	82	16.8	85	91.7	.000
Average duration of all observations	82	19.9	85	91.9	.000

Table 4.5: Juvenile Shoplifting, Time and Effort Expended in Getting Offenders to Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average days until initial treatment	62	29.0	68	69.6	.000
Average days until final treatment	62	41.1	68	77.2	.001
Average number of treatment events	62	1.34	69	1.17	.139
Average number of observed events	62	1.03	69	1.01	.879
Percent resolved within 30 days	62	62.9%	68	23.5%	.000
Percent resolved within 60 days	62	72.6%	68	52.9%	.020
Percent resolved within 90 days	62	82.3%	68	66.2%	.036
Percent resolved within a single treatment	62	79.0%	69	87.0%	.234

Table 4.6: Juvenile Shoplifting, Duration of Observed Treatment events, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average duration of initial treatment	47	10.3	55	72.3	.000
Average duration of final treatment	47	10.3	55	72.3	.000
Average duration of longest observation	47	10.3	55	72.3	.000
Average duration of all observations	47	10.5	55	72.3	.000

Table 4.7: Youth Violence, Time and Effort Expended in Getting Offenders to Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average days until initial treatment	57	57.1	56	68.4	.292

Average days until final treatment	57	117.0	56	103.7	.513
Average number of treatment events	57	2.40	57	1.32	.000
Average number of observed events	57	1.77	57	1.19	.003
Percent resolved within 30 days	57	31.6%	56	21.4%	.225
Percent resolved within 60 days	57	42.1%	56	48.2%	.518
Percent resolved within 90 days	57	47.4%	56	66.1%	.045
Percent resolved within a single treatment	57	43.9%	57	78.9%	.000

Table 4.8: Youth Violence, Duration of Observed Treatment events, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average duration of initial treatment	40	27.4	52	88.5	.000
Average duration of final treatment	40	27.3	52	88.4	.000
Average duration of longest observation	40	31.4	52	88.8	.000
Average duration of all observations	40	39.4	52	89.7	.002

Table 4.9: Drink Driving, Number of other persons participating in treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average total count of other participants	342	3.0	395	7.3	.000
Average from offenders' immediate family	342	0.3	395	1.3	.000
Average from offenders' entire family	342	0.3	395	1.7	.000
Average total of all offender supporters	342	0.5	395	5.1	.000
Average number of community reps	342	0.0	395	0.8	.000
Average total of harmed- party participants	342	0.0	395	0.8	.000

Table 4.10: Drink Driving, Percent encountering other persons at treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with offenders' immediate family	342	23.7%	395	67.8%	.000
Percent with any offenders' family	342	24.9%	395	70.9%	.000
Percent with any offender supporters	342	39.2%	395	95.2%	.000
Percent with a community representative	342	0.6%	395	67.6%	.000
Percent with harmed- party participants	342	0.6%	395	67.6%	.000

Table 4.11: Juvenile Personal Property, Number of other persons participating in treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average total count of other participants	89	5.03	91	8.18	.000
Average number of offender parents	89	1.07	91	1.24	.124

Average from offenders' immediate family	89	1.17	91	1.57	.006
Average from offenders' entire family	89	1.27	91	1.96	.000
Average total of all offender supporters	89	2.07	91	4.52	.000
Average number of victims	89	.06	91	.70	.000
Average number of victim supporters	89	.02	91	.59	.000
Average total of harmed- party participants	89	.18	91	1.53	.000

Table 4.12: Juvenile Personal Property, Percent encountering other persons at treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with offender parents present	89	78.7%	91	78.0%	.919
Percent with offenders' immediate family	89	78.7%	91	79.1%	.939
Percent with any offenders' family	89	78.7%	91	83.5%	.407
Percent with any offender supporters	89	86.5%	91	86.7%	.954
Percent with victim present	89	4.5%	91	48.4%	.000
Percent with victim supporters present	89	1.1%	91	36.3%	.000
Percent with harmed- party participants	89	11.2%	91	65.9%	.000

Table 4.13: Juvenile Shoplifting, Number of other persons participating in treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average total count of other participants	46	4.37	58	7.76	.000
Average number of offender parents	46	1.07	58	1.36	.034
Average from offenders' immediate family	46	1.20	58	2.02	.000
Average from offenders' entire family	46	1.26	58	2.36	.000
Average total of all offender supporters	46	1.61	58	5.00	.000
Average number of victims	46	.04	58	.57	.000
Average number of victim supporters	46	.00	58	.12	.034
Average total of harmed- party participants	46	.07	58	1.17	.000

Table 4.14: Juvenile Shoplifting, Percent encountering other persons at treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with offender parents present	46	84.8%	58	84.5%	.967
Percent with offenders' immediate family	46	87.0%	58	87.9%	.883
Percent with any offenders' family	46	87.0%	58	87.9%	.883
Percent with any offender supporters	46	89.1%	58	91.4%	.703
Percent with victim present	46	4.4%	58	48.3%	.000
Percent with victim supporters present	46	0.0%	58	8.6%	.024
Percent with harmed- party participants	46	6.5%	58	67.0%	.000

Table 4.15: Youth Violence, Number of other persons participating in treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Average total count of other participants	37	5.41	45	7.91	.000
Average number of offender parents	37	1.03	45	.91	.486
Average from offenders' immediate family	37	1.16	45	1.56	.086
Average from offenders' entire family	37	1.27	45	2.07	.005
Average total of all offender supporters	37	2.03	45	3.91	.000
Average number of victims	37	.03	45	.64	.000
Average number of victim supporters	37	.03	45	1.33	.000
Average total of harmed- party participants	37	.08	45	2.33	.000

Table 4.16: Youth Violence, Percent encountering other persons at treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with offender parents present	37	75.7	45	66.7	.378
Percent with offenders' immediate family	37	81.1	45	80.0	.904
Percent with any offenders' family	37	81.1	45	82.2	.896
Percent with any offender supporters	37	91.9	45	91.1	.901
Percent with victim present	37	2.7	45	60.0	.000
Percent with victim supporters present	37	2.7	45	53.3	.000
Percent with harmed- party participants	37	8.1	45	73.3	.000

Table 4.17: Drink Driving, Observed Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Emotional power of act description (1-8)	395	1.2	381	3.3	.000
Emotional responsiveness of offender (1-8)	393	2.3	381	3.9	.000
Emotional engagement of offender (1-8)	393	3.6	381	5.2	.000
Degree of offender discomfort (1-8)	394	3.4	381	4.2	.000
Frequency of shouting at offender (1-8)	393	1.0	381	1.0	.025
Percent with any violence or threats	394	0.0%	376	0.0%	-----
Percent of offenders who cried at treatment	393	0.8%	381	12.3%	.000

Table 4.18: Juvenile Personal Property, Observed Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Emotional power of act description (1-8)	80	1.61	86	4.93	.000
Emotional responsiveness of offender (1-8)	80	2.32	86	3.33	.000
Emotional engagement of offender (1-8)	81	4.17	86	4.66	.096
Degree of offender discomfort (1-8)	81	3.91	86	4.80	.003

Frequency of shouting at offender (1-8)	81	1.00	86	1.12	.068
Percent with any violence or threats	82	0.0%	85	4.7%	.045
Percent of offenders who cried at treatment	81	4.9%	86	17.4%	.010

Table 4.19: Juvenile Shoplifting, Observed Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Emotional power of act description (1-8)	48	1.33	57	4.09	.000
Emotional responsiveness of offender (1-8)	48	2.29	57	3.47	.000
Emotional engagement of offender (1-8)	48	4.10	57	4.89	.023
Degree of offender discomfort (1-8)	48	4.10	57	4.74	.055
Frequency of shouting at offender (1-8)	48	1.00	57	1.11	.083
Percent with any violence or threats	48	0.0%	57	3.6%	.159
Percent of offenders who cried at treatment	48	4.2%	57	19.3%	.014

Table 4.20: Youth Violence, Observed Emotional Intensity of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Emotional power of act description (1-8)	39	2.41	51	4.94	
Emotional responsiveness of offender (1-8)	39	2.18	51	3.20	
Emotional engagement of offender (1-8)	39	3.46	52	4.65	
Degree of offender discomfort (1-8)	39	3.23	52	3.79	
Frequency of shouting at offender (1-8)	39	1.00	52	1.33	
Percent with any violence or threats	40	0.0%	52	1.9%	
Percent of offenders who cried at treatment	39	2.6%	52	3.9%	

Table 4.21: Drink Driving – Observed Procedural Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent of time with offender speaking	368	20.4%	359	25.8%	.000
Degree of offender contribution (1-8)	372	3.5	361	4.8	.000
Extent to which offender coerced (1-8)	394	5.6	381	3.0	.000
Extent to which offender dominated (1-8)	394	4.7	381	3.3	.000

Table 4.22: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Procedural Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent of time with offender speaking	81	12.5%	80	19.1%	.000
Degree of offender contribution (1-8)	81	2.52	80	3.19	.002
Extent to which offender coerced (1-8)	79	5.16	85	3.86	.001
Extent to which offender dominated (1-8)	81	4.90	86	3.80	.001

Table 4.23: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Procedural Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent of time with offender speaking	45	16.4%	53	21.7%	.005
Degree of offender contribution (1-8)	45	3.09	53	3.89	.012
Extent to which offender coerced (1-8)	47	6.23	57	3.51	.000
Extent to which offender dominated (1-8)	48	5.12	57	3.70	.000

Table 4.24: Youth Violence – Observed Procedural Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent of time with offender speaking	37	11.2%	50	21.3%	.000
Degree of offender contribution (1-8)	37	2.30	50	3.98	.000
Extent to which offender coerced (1-8)	37	6.14	50	3.44	.000
Extent to which offender dominated (1-8)	37	5.46	52	3.40	.000

Table 4.25: Drink Driving – Observed Restorative Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Consequences of offender's actions (1-8)	395	2.1	380	4.7	.000
Consequences of type of offense (1-8)	371	1.6	380	6.5	.000
Repaying debt to the community (1-8)	371	1.1	380	4.9	.000
Overall discussion of reparation (1-8)	371	1.7	380	4.9	.000

Table 4.26: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Restorative Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Consequences of offender's actions (1-8)	81	3.10	86	6.03	
Consequences of type of offense (1-8)	81	2.54	78	5.06	
Repaying debt to the community (1-8)	81	1.49	85	4.11	
Reparation to victim parties (1-8)	81	2.64	85	5.07	
Overall discussion of reparation (1-8)	81	3.00	85	5.72	

Table 4.27: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Restorative Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

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

Consequences of offender's actions (1-8)	48	2.94	57	5.91	.000
Consequences of type of offense (1-8)	45	1.93	53	5.64	.000
Repaying debt to the community (1-8)	45	1.11	55	3.75	.000
Reparation to victim parties (1-8)	45	1.42	55	4.15	.000
Overall discussion of reparation (1-8)	45	1.73	55	4.87	.000

Table 4.28: Youth Violence – Observed Restorative Justice of Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Consequences of offender's actions (1-8)	39	3.21	51	5.37	.000
Consequences of type of offense (1-8)	37	2.35	50	5.22	.000
Repaying debt to the community (1-8)	37	1.22	52	3.73	.000
Reparation to victim parties (1-8)	37	1.41	52	3.83	.000
Overall discussion of reparation (1-8)	37	1.81	52	4.88	.000

Table 4.29: Drink Driving, Prevalence of Observed Outcomes Resulting from Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with charges formally dismissed	392	12.8%	381	1.0%	.000
Percent given an official reprimand	390	0.3%	381	0.0%	.318
Percent ordered into imprisonment	390	0.3%	381	0.0%	.318
Percent ordered to pay a fine	390	86.2%	381	3.9%	.000
Percent ordered/agreed to community service	390	2.8%	381	56.7%	.000
Percent with license suspension/cancellation	390	84.6%	381	4.5%	.000
Percent ordered/agreed to counseling program	390	3.1%	381	4.2%	.406
Percent ordered/agreed to donate to charity	390	7.9%	381	44.9%	.000
Percent ordered/agreed to make a victim reparation	390	0.0%	381	0.3%	.318
Percent ordered/agreed some other outcome	390	4.9%	381	85.6%	.000
Percent ordered/agreed to make a formal apology	390	0.0%	381	0.8%	.083

Table 4.30: Juvenile Personal Property, Prevalence of Observed Outcomes Resulting from Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with charges formally dismissed	74	71.6%	85	3.5%	.000
Percent given an official reprimand	74	5.4%	85	0.0%	.045
Percent ordered into imprisonment	74	2.7%	85	0.0%	.159
Percent ordered to pay a fine	74	9.5%	85	2.4%	.064
Percent ordered to community service	74	4.1%	85	45.9%	.000
Percent ordered to counseling program	74	4.1%	85	5.9%	.602
Percent ordered to donate to charity	74	2.7%	85	9.4%	.073
Percent ordered to make a victim reparation	74	35.1%	85	25.9%	.210
Percent ordered some other outcome	74	2.7%	85	42.4%	.000
Percent ordered to make a formal apology	74	5.4%	85	38.8%	.000

Table 4.31: Juvenile Shoplifting, Prevalence of Observed Outcomes Resulting from Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with charges formally dismissed	40	82.5%	56	0.0%	.000
Percent given an official reprimand	40	10.0%	56	0.0%	.000
Percent ordered into imprisonment	40	0.0%	56	0.0%	----
Percent ordered to pay a fine	40	2.5%	56	0.0%	.323
Percent ordered to community service	40	5.0%	56	53.6%	.000
Percent ordered to counseling program	40	5.0%	56	1.8%	.378
Percent ordered to donate to charity	40	0.0%	56	10.7%	.013
Percent ordered to make a victim reparation	40	7.5%	56	26.8%	.010
Percent ordered some other outcome	40	0.0%	56	57.1%	.000
Percent ordered to make a formal apology	40	15.0%	56	44.6%	.001

Table 4.32: Youth Violence, Prevalence of Observed Outcomes Resulting from Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with charges formally dismissed	35	60.0%	50	4.0%	.000
Percent given an official reprimand	35	8.6%	50	0.0%	.083
Percent ordered into imprisonment	35	0.0%	50	0.0%	----
Percent ordered to pay a fine	35	20.0%	50	0.0%	.006
Percent ordered to community service	35	11.4%	50	44.0%	.000
Percent ordered to counseling program	35	8.6%	50	14.0%	.451
Percent ordered to donate to charity	35	2.9%	50	10.0%	.169
Percent ordered to make a victim reparation	35	14.3%	50	18.0%	.654
Percent ordered some other outcome	35	2.9%	50	34.0%	.000
Percent ordered to make a formal apology	35	17.1%	50	68.0%	.000

Table 4.33: Drink Driving – Observer Ratings of Philosophy Used in Determining Outcome, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Reparation to community (1-8)	356	1.4	359	6.1	.000
Restoration of offender (1-8)	357	2.0	353	4.8	.000
Prevention of future offending (1-8)	360	5.9	350	5.6	.069
Punishment (1-8)	365	6.3	352	4.2	.000

Table 4.34: Juvenile Personal Property – Observer Ratings of Philosophy Used in Determining Outcome, court vs. conference

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

	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Reparation to victim (1-8)	77	3.09	80	5.26	.000
Reparation to community (1-8)	77	1.57	78	4.33	.000
Restoration of offender (1-8)	77	3.31	80	4.16	.029
Prevention of future offending (1-8)	77	5.53	80	5.79	.436
Punishment (1-8)	77	2.92	80	3.45	.096

Table 4.35: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observer Ratings of Philosophy Used in Determining Outcome, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Reparation to victim (1-8)	41	1.24	53	4.85	.000
Reparation to community (1-8)	42	1.36	53	4.26	.000
Restoration of offender (1-8)	42	2.71	53	4.79	.000
Prevention of future offending (1-8)	45	5.60	53	5.17	.323
Punishment (1-8)	42	2.71	53	3.30	.115

Table 4.36: Youth Violence – Observer Ratings of Philosophy Used in Determining Outcome, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Reparation to victim (1-8)	35	1.37	47	3.79	.000
Reparation to community (1-8)	35	1.34	47	4.06	.000
Restoration of offender (1-8)	35	2.71	47	3.81	.012
Prevention of future offending (1-8)	35	5.31	47	5.17	.792
Punishment (1-8)	35	4.03	47	3.15	.082

Table 4.37: Drink Driving – Observed Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of reintegrative shame (1-8)	395	1.5	377	4.4	.000
Disapproval of the type of offense (1-8)	371	2.3	380	6.0	.000
Disapproval of the offender's actions (1-8)	395	2.6	381	4.9	.000
Support given to offender at treatment (1-8)	394	2.4	381	5.8	.000
Expression of respect for offender (1-8)	394	2.4	381	4.6	.000
Offender treated as someone loved (1-8)	393	1.8	381	5.7	.000
Approval of offender as a person (1-8)	394	2.2	378	4.8	.000
Offender could put offense behind him (1-8)	393	1.5	379	4.1	.000

Table 4.38: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of reintegrative shame (1-8)	82	2.46	86	4.69	.000
Disapproval of the type of offense (1-8)	82	4.05	84	6.12	.000
Disapproval of the offender's actions (1-8)	82	4.16	86	6.20	.000
Support given to offender at treatment (1-8)	82	4.54	86	5.42	.000
Expression of respect for offender (1-8)	82	3.20	86	3.98	.004
Offender treated as someone loved (1-8)	82	4.40	86	5.33	.003
Approval of offender as a person (1-8)	82	3.35	86	4.15	.006
Offender could put offense behind him (1-8)	81	3.65	86	5.09	.000

Table 4.39: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of reintegrative shame (1-8)	48	2.12	56	4.48	.000
Disapproval of the type of offense (1-8)	45	3.00	55	6.38	.000
Disapproval of the offender's actions (1-8)	48	3.50	57	6.11	.000
Support given to offender at treatment (1-8)	48	4.06	57	5.21	.001
Expression of respect for offender (1-8)	48	2.75	57	3.65	.011
Offender treated as someone loved (1-8)	48	3.67	57	5.30	.000
Approval of offender as a person (1-8)	48	2.98	57	3.96	.009
Offender could put offense behind him (1-8)	47	4.02	57	5.75	.000

Table 4.40: Youth Violence – Observed Reintegrative Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of reintegrative shame (1-8)	39	2.51	52	4.42	.000
Disapproval of the type of offense (1-8)	37	3.65	52	6.02	.000
Disapproval of the offender's actions (1-8)	39	4.46	52	6.21	.000
Support given to offender at treatment (1-8)	39	4.23	52	5.19	.020
Expression of respect for offender (1-8)	39	2.79	52	3.40	.086
Offender treated as someone loved (1-8)	39	3.87	52	4.90	.033
Approval of offender as a person (1-8)	39	3.05	52	3.96	.014
Offender could put offense behind him (1-8)	39	3.79	51	5.14	.009

Table 4.41: Drink Driving – Observed Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of stigmatic shame (1-8)	395	1.5	379	1.6	.070

Disapproval of the offender as a person (1-8)	395	1.2	381	2.1	.000
Use of stigmatic names and labels (1-8)	395	1.0	381	1.2	.000
Extent of moral lecturing (1-8)	394	1.5	381	3.1	.000
Offender treated as a criminal (1-8)	394	1.6	381	1.3	.000

Table 4.42: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of stigmatic shame (1-8)	82	1.88	86	1.78	.630
Disapproval of the offender as a person (1-8)	82	1.60	86	2.07	.021
Use of stigmatic names and labels (1-8)	82	1.27	86	1.42	.282
Extent of moral lecturing (1-8)	81	2.99	86	3.56	.033
Offender treated as a criminal (1-8)	82	2.28	86	1.64	.005

Table 4.43: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of stigmatic shame (1-8)	48	1.65	57	2.18	.045
Disapproval of the offender as a person (1-8)	47	1.66	57	2.40	.006
Use of stigmatic names and labels (1-8)	48	1.06	57	1.56	.002
Extent of moral lecturing (1-8)	48	3.00	57	3.63	.084
Offender treated as a criminal (1-8)	48	1.60	57	1.63	.905

Table 4.44: Youth Violence – Observed Stigmatic Shaming, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Expression of stigmatic shame (1-8)	38	1.79	52	2.25	.170
Disapproval of the offender as a person (1-8)	39	1.49	52	2.52	.000
Use of stigmatic names and labels (1-8)	39	1.15	52	1.31	.316
Extent of moral lecturing (1-8)	39	2.64	52	4.06	.003
Offender treated as a criminal (1-8)	39	2.23	52	1.56	.023

Table 4.45: Drink Driving – Observed Offender Defiance, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Extent to which offender is defiant (1-8)	394	1.2	379	1.5	.000
Offender is holding others responsible (1-8)	395	1.4	381	1.4	.739
Offender is sullen and unresponsive (1-8)	347	1.3	344	1.6	.001

Table 4.46: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Offender Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Extent to which offender is defiant (1-8)	81	2.10	85	2.13	.915
Offender is holding others responsible (1-8)	81	1.30	86	1.92	.003
Offender is sullen and unresponsive (1-8)	80	2.00	78	2.76	.008

Table 4.47: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Offender Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Extent to which offender is defiant (1-8)	48	1.83	57	1.79	.886
Offender is holding others responsible (1-8)	48	1.15	57	2.11	.000
Offender is sullen and unresponsive (1-8)	40	2.25	53	2.91	.081

Table 4.48: Youth Violence – Observed Offender Defiance, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Extent to which offender is defiant (1-8)	39	3.15	51	2.86	.521
Offender is holding others responsible (1-8)	39	1.69	52	2.44	.022
Offender is sullen and unresponsive (1-8)	37	1.68	50	2.74	.003

Table 4.49: Drink Driving – Observed Extent of Offender Apology at Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Offender accepts having done wrong (1-8)	395	6.1	381	6.5	.005
Extent of offender sorrow and remorse (1-8)	394	4.0	381	5.1	.000
Percent of offenders who apologize (1-8)	393	13.0%	378	9.3%	.100

Table 4.50: Drink Driving – Observed Number of Offender Apologies at Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	395	0.14	383	0.11	.223
Handshake	395	0.00	383	0.00	.318
Hug	395	0.00	383	0.01	.158
Pat on the shoulder	395	0.00	383	0.00	.318
Kiss	395	0.00	383	0.00	----
Other	395	0.01	383	0.00	.580

Table 4.51: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Extent of Offender Apology at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Offender accepts having done wrong (1-8)	82	5.91	86	5.76	.580
Extent of offender sorrow and remorse (1-8)	82	4.84	86	5.03	.546
Percent of offenders who apologize (1-8)	81	38.3%	86	60.5%	.004

Table 4.52: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Number of Offender Apologies at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	82	0.39	86	0.99	.000
Handshake	82	0.00	86	0.14	.007
Hug	82	0.00	86	0.06	.132
Pat on the shoulder	82	0.00	86	0.01	.320
Kiss	82	0.00	86	0.03	.320
Other	82	0.07	86	0.00	.057

Table 4.53: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Extent of Offender Apology at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Offender accepts having done wrong (1-8)	48	5.83	57	5.93	.779
Extent of offender sorrow and remorse (1-8)	46	4.72	57	5.23	.187
Percent of offenders who apologize (1-8)	48	20.8%	57	45.6%	.006

Table 4.54: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Number of Offender Apologies at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	48	0.21	57	0.63	.002
Handshake	48	0.00	57	0.04	.159
Hug	48	0.00	57	0.00	----
Pat on the shoulder	48	0.00	57	0.00	----
Kiss	48	0.00	57	0.00	----
Other	48	0.00	57	0.04	.159

Table 4.55: Youth Violence – Observed Extent of Offender Apology at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>	<i>Conference</i>
--	--------------	-------------------

	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Offender accepts having done wrong (1-8)	39	5.15	51	5.80	.142
Extent of offender sorrow and remorse (1-8)	39	4.69	51	5.43	.097
Percent of offenders who apologize (1-8)	39	10.3%	52	65.4%	.000

Table 4.56: Youth Violence – Observed Number of Offender Apologies at Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	40	0.08	52	0.90	.000
Handshake	40	0.00	52	0.40	.000
Hug	40	0.00	52	0.00	----
Pat on the shoulder	40	0.00	52	0.00	----
Kiss	40	0.00	52	0.00	----
Other	40	0.08	52	0.00	.183

Table 4.57: Drink Driving – Observed Extent of Forgiveness Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Amount of forgiveness expressed (1-8)	393	1.1	379	2.5	.000
Degree to which offender forgiven (1-8)	395	1.2	378	3.8	.000
Percent of offenders who receive forgiveness	450	4.2%	450	43.1%	.000

Table 4.58: Drink Driving – Observed Number of Forgiveness Expressions at Treatment, court vs. conference

<i>Form of Expression</i>	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	395	0.01	382	0.21	.000
Handshake	395	0.00	382	0.18	.000
Hug	395	0.00	383	0.07	.002
Pat on the shoulder	395	0.00	383	0.13	.000
Kiss	395	0.00	383	0.02	.012
Other	395	0.04	382	0.50	.000

Table 4.59: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Extent of Forgiveness Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Amount of forgiveness expressed (1-8)	81	1.81	86	2.76	.000
Degree to which offender forgiven (1-8)	80	2.10	86	3.86	.000
Percent of offenders who receive forgiveness	82	43.9%	86	66.3%	.003

Table 4.60: Juvenile Personal Property – Observed Number of Forgiveness Expressions at Treatment, court vs. conference

<i>Form of Expression</i>	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	82	0.13	86	0.31	.021
Handshake	82	0.00	86	0.24	.001
Hug	82	0.00	86	0.13	.033
Pat on the shoulder	82	0.01	86	0.14	.011
Kiss	82	0.00	86	0.00	----
Other	82	0.37	86	0.40	.710

Table 4.61: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Extent of Forgiveness Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Amount of forgiveness expressed (1-8)	47	1.85	57	2.53	.026
Degree to which offender forgiven (1-8)	45	1.91	57	3.95	.000
Percent of offenders who receive forgiveness	48	27.1%	57	59.7%	.001

Table 4.62: Juvenile Shoplifting – Observed Number of Forgiveness Expressions at Treatment, court vs. conference

<i>Form of Expression</i>	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	48	0.06	57	0.25	.032
Handshake	48	0.00	57	0.11	.013
Hug	48	0.00	57	0.04	.361
Pat on the shoulder	48	0.00	57	0.07	.103
Kiss	48	0.00	57	0.00	----
Other	48	0.21	57	0.37	.070

Table 4.63: Youth Violence – Observed Extent of Forgiveness Treatment, court vs. conference

	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Amount of forgiveness expressed (1-8)	39	1.77	49	2.73	.008
Degree to which offender forgiven (1-8)	39	2.26	50	4.10	.000
Percent of offenders who receive forgiveness	40	37.5%	52	63.5%	.013

Table 4.64: Youth Violence – Observed Number of Forgiveness Expressions at Treatment, court vs. conference

<i>Form of Expression</i>	<i>Court</i>		<i>Conference</i>		<i>Sig</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Verbal	40	0.12	52	0.37	.019

Handshake	40	0.00	52	0.38	.000
Hug	40	0.05	52	0.02	.531
Pat on the shoulder	40	0.00	52	0.04	.383
Kiss	40	0.00	52	0.00	----
Other	40	0.35	52	0.31	.710

Table 4.65: Drink Driving – Drug/Alcohol Problems and Reaction to Them, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with possible drug/alcohol problem	394	10.4%	381	19.2%	.001
Possibility of problem raised (all offenders)	394	10.9%	381	17.6%	.008
Possibility of problem raised (problem only)	41	78.0%	73	68.5%	.266
Referred to assistance (all offenders)	394	5.6%	379	7.1%	.381
Referred to assistance (problem only)	41	34.2%	72	34.7%	.951

Table 4.66: Juvenile Property Crime – Drug/Alcohol Problems and Reaction to Them, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with possible drug/alcohol problem	82	11.0%	85	7.1%	.379
Possibility of problem raised (all offenders)	82	18.3%	85	7.1%	.030
Possibility of problem raised (problem only)	9	88.9%	6	83.3%	.777
Referred to assistance (all offenders)	77	3.9%	86	3.5%	.891
Referred to assistance (problem only)	9	33.3%	6	33.3%	.999

Table 4.67: Juvenile Shoplifting – Drug/Alcohol Problems and Reaction to Them, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with possible drug/alcohol problem	48	8.3%	57	8.8%	.937
Possibility of problem raised (all offenders)	48	4.2%	57	10.5%	.209
Possibility of problem raised (problem only)	4	50.0%	5	60.0%	.798
Referred to assistance (all offenders)	46	2.2%	57	0.0%	.323
Referred to assistance (problem only)	4	25.0%	5	0.0%	.391

Table 4.68: Youth Violence – Drug/Alcohol Problems and Reaction to Them, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	
Percent with possible drug/alcohol problem	39	20.5%	52	15.4%	.530
Possibility of problem raised (all offenders)	39	18.0%	52	19.2%	.878
Possibility of problem raised (problem only)	8	75.0%	8	87.5%	.554

Referred to assistance (all offenders)	39	7.7%	52	0.0%	.083
Referred to assistance (problem only)	8	37.5%	8	0.0%	.080

Table 4.69: Drink Driving – Other Problems Dealt With at Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Percent with additional problems discussed	393	48.4%	381	56.7%	.020
Percent with financial problems discussed	395	15.7%	383	25.6%	.001
Percent with educational problems discussed	395	1.5%	383	2.3%	.402
Percent with employment problems discussed	395	34.7%	383	27.9%	.042
Percent with health problems discussed	395	2.3%	383	4.7%	.067
Percent with language problems discussed	395	0.2%	383	0.5%	.548
Percent with relationship problems discussed	395	6.8%	383	13.6%	.002
Percent with other problems discussed	395	3.5%	383	11.0%	.000
How well problems were addressed (1-8)	192	5.5	216	5.4	.688

Table 4.70: Juvenile Personal Property – Other Problems Dealt With at Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Percent with additional problems discussed	82	48.8%	86	51.2%	.759
Percent with financial problems discussed	82	9.8%	86	7.0%	.518
Percent with educational problems discussed	82	19.5%	86	23.3%	.557
Percent with employment problems discussed	82	12.2%	86	7.0%	.255
Percent with health problems discussed	82	3.7%	86	3.5%	.953
Percent with language problems discussed	82	1.2%	86	0.0%	.320
Percent with relationship problems discussed	82	19.5%	86	31.4%	.077
Percent with other problems discussed	82	17.1%	86	12.8%	.439
How well problems were addressed (1-8)	40	3.38	44	4.16	.105

Table 4.71: Juvenile Shoplifting – Other Problems Dealt With at Treatment, court vs. conference

	Court		Conference		Sig
	n	Value	n	Value	
Percent with additional problems discussed	48	35.4%	57	56.1%	.034
Percent with financial problems discussed	48	8.3%	57	17.5%	.159
Percent with educational problems discussed	48	18.8%	57	21.1%	.772
Percent with employment problems discussed	48	10.4%	57	12.3%	.768
Percent with health problems discussed	48	2.1%	57	1.8%	.903
Percent with language problems discussed	48	0.0%	57	5.3%	.083
Percent with relationship problems discussed	48	10.4%	57	22.8%	.087
Percent with other problems discussed	48	4.2%	57	10.5%	.209
How well problems were addressed (1-8)	19	3.32	32	4.94	.013

Table 4.72: Youth Violence – Other Problems Dealt With at Treatment, court vs. conference

		<i>Court</i>	<i>Conference</i>		
	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Percent with additional problems discussed	39	38.5%	52	46.2%	.469
Percent with financial problems discussed	40	7.5%	52	5.8%	.742
Percent with educational problems discussed	40	15.0%	52	23.1%	.328
Percent with employment problems discussed	40	5.0%	52	5.7%	.874
Percent with health problems discussed	40	5.0%	52	5.7%	.874
Percent with language problems discussed	40	0.0%	52	0.0%	----
Percent with relationship problems discussed	40	7.5%	52	32.7%	.002
Percent with other problems discussed	40	15.0%	52	7.7%	.288
How well problems were addressed (1-8)	16	2.69	25	4.92	.000

