

APPENDIX 1A – Selection of Conferences and interviewees

The conferences recorded, transcribed and reproduced in this report were selected entirely randomly - save for one factor: The coordinator in all of these conferences was Terry O'Connell. The decision to record only conferences convened by him was taken on several grounds. Of these, the most important were consistency of manner, practical experience, and a full awareness of the underlying theoretical issues. These were particularly important, since the formats of both the process and the model were still in the early stages of development.

The mode of selection was simple - Terry O'Connell was informed that David Moore would be in town for research purposes only after the review committee had taken its decisions on the week's conferences. Those conferences were convened *en bloc* during late afternoon and early evening. With the consent of participants, conferences were attended and recorded. The researcher was seated at the back of the conference room, which was at district police headquarters. Additional handwritten notes were taken discretely. These conferencing sessions were generally followed by a discussion session between coordinator and researcher (over dinner...).

As stated in the second chapter, the relative proportion of offence types dealt with here does not reflect the proportions in the larger sample, figures for which are provided in the fifth chapter. For example, police interventions (and conferences) for cannabis-related offences are far less frequent than is suggested by this (very) small sample (N=14). Similarly, Break, Enter & Steal offences led to less than one fifth of interventions in the larger sample, but nearly one third in the smaller sample. The relative proportion of property offences, other theft, and assault in the small sample is closer to the proportion in the larger sample. In one sense, however, differences in offence types, and in the number and background of participants, are less important than are the general similarities in outcome from one conference to the next.

The choice of participants to be interviewed was obviously not entirely random, although those interviewed had attended randomly selected conferences. It was considered important to interview at least one victim, one offender, and supporters from both a conference dealing with a property offence, and from a conference dealing with an offence against the person. It was also considered important to talk to professionals who regularly deal with young people, but who had attended a conference in a private capacity. The choice of the latter was easy: Interviews were requested with the first lawyer, social worker and teacher to attend one of the selected conferences.

For the choice of other interviewees, some rationale has already been presented in the third and fourth chapters. To have interviewed all participants in the selected conferences would have been a vast, punishing and unnecessary exercise. Instead, a list was made of people who fitted each of the relevant categories, such as "victim of a property offence", or "supporter of offender in an offence against the person". Interviews were then held with the first people available to be interviewed. All of them had something interesting to say. Their suggestions have been taken into account in the further refinement of the process and model.

APPENDIX 1B - Eligibility Criteria for FGC

The legal eligibility criteria for FGC in the Wagga Wagga program was, that any matter which was eligible for a police caution was also eligible for a FGC. Matters which were summary matters or indictable matters that can be dealt with under Sections 476, 495 and 496 of the Crimes Act 1900 were eligible for a FGC.

Police in Wagga Wagga also considered the following issues when deciding which cases were eligible for FGC:

1. The nature, type and seriousness of the offence/s.
2. The number and age of offenders involved.
3. The prior history of the offender/s.
4. The number of victims.
5. Any compensation/reparation sought.
6. The recommendation of the investigating officer.

(This information was supplied by the Principal Adviser Youth and Juvenile Justice, NSW Police Service)

APPENDIX 1C - Data Tables

Appendix Table 1C- 1									
Age by Time Period (Frequency) - Cases									
Juveniles Apprehended Wagga Wagga Patrol Jan 90 to Oct 93									
Age	Time Period								Total
	Jan- Jun 90	Jul- Dec 90	Jan- Jul 91	Aug- Dec91	Jan - Jun 92	Jul - Dec 92	Jan - Jun 93	Jul- Oct 93	
10		4	3	1	1	4	2	1	16
11	1	1	4	1	3	4	3	3	20
12	3	4	5	8	12	8	10	6	56
13	12	9	18	12	11	12	15	12	101
14	19	25	28	21	19	17	20	8	157
15	41	25	39	19	20	31	29	15	219
16	45	48	38	25	28	20	31	32	267
17	50	39	43	24	24	34	42	27	283
18&over	1		1		2	1		1	6
Total	172	155	179	111	120	131	152	105	1125

Missing Cases=40

Appendix Table 1C- 2								
Age by Time Period (Percentages) - Cases								
Juveniles Apprehended Wagga Wagga Patrol Jan 90 to Oct 93								
Age	Time Period							
	Jan- Jun 90	Jul- Dec 90	Jan- Jul 91	Aug- Dec91	Jan - Jun 92	Jul - Dec 92	Jan - Jun 93	Jul- Oct 93
10		2.6	1.7	0.9	0.8	3.1	1.3	1.0
11	0.6	0.6	2.2	0.9	2.5	3.1	2.0	2.9
12	1.7	2.6	2.8	7.2	10.0	6.1	6.6	5.7
13	7.0	5.8	10.1	10.8	9.2	9.2	9.9	11.4
14	11.0	16.1	15.6	18.9	15.8	13.0	13.2	7.6
15	23.8	16.1	21.8	17.1	16.7	23.7	19.1	14.3
16	26.2	31.0	21.2	22.5	23.3	15.3	20.4	30.5
17	29.1	25.2	24.0	21.6	20.0	26.0	27.6	25.7
18&over	0.6	0	0.6	0	1.7	0.8	0.0	1.0
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.9	100.00	100.3	100.1	100.1

Missing Cases=40

Appendix Table 1C- 3	
Number of Months Between 1st & 2nd Apprehension	
Months	Frequency
1	49
2	18
3	18
4	7
5	15
6	9
7	5
8	9
9	11
10	3
11	10
12	3
13	3
14	6
15	3
16	2
17	1
18	1
19	4
20	2
21	0
22	0
23	0
24	2
25+	8

Appendix Table 1C- 4	
Proportion Who have Subsequent Apprehension Wagga Wagga Patrol Jan 90 - Oct 93	
Arrest No:	Percentage
1	23.9%
2	51.3%
3	56.7%
4	69.1%
5	71.1%
6	55.5%
>6	86.4%

Appendix Table 1C- 5			
Percent Reapprehended* - Individuals			
Time Period by Manner Proceeded With			
Time Period	Caution	Court	Total
1	37.2%	39.6%	38.8%
2	20.0%	41.7%	29.9%
3	34.7%	29.7%	33.0%
4	35.7%	42.9%	38.6%
5	27.8%	57.1%	33.8%
6	16.9%	45.5%	21.4%
7	15.1%	46.2%	21.2%
8	3.1%	14.8%	8.5%

*Expressed as a proportion of all individuals dealt with in that particular manner. For example: During the first time period 37.2% of individual juveniles who were cautioned were reapprehended by police in Wagga Wagga during the study period (January 1990 to October 1993). An individual in this analysis is defined as such the first time he/she appears in this data set.

Appendix Table 1C- 6			
Number Reapprehended* - Individuals			
Time Period by Manner Proceeded With			
Time Period	Caution	Court	Total
1	16/43	38/96	54/139
2	12/59	20/48	32/107
3	26/75	11/37	37/112
4	15/42	12/28	27/70
5	15/54	8/14	23/68
6	10/59	5/11	15/70
7	8/53	6/13	14/66
8	1/32	4/27	5/59

Missing cases=2

*The number reapprehended is shown on the left of the slash (/) and the total number of juveniles dealt with in that manner is shown on the right, ie: during the first time period sixteen out of the forty-three juveniles who were cautioned were reapprehended. These are the raw numbers used to calculate the percentages in Table 23.

Appendix Table 1C- 7
Number Reapprehended Within 9
Months* - Individuals
Time Period by Manner Proceeded With

Time Period	Caution	Court	Total
1	6/33	29/87	35/120
2	7/54	15/43	22/97
3	16/65	10/36	26/101
4	12/39	11/27	23/66
5	14/53	7/13	21/66
6	9/58	4/10	13/68
7	8/53	6/13	14/66
8	1/32	4/27	5/59

Missing cases=2

*The number reapprehended is shown on the left of the slash (/) and the total number of juveniles dealt with in that manner is shown on the right, ie: during the first time period six out of the thirty-three juveniles who were cautioned were reapprehended. These are the raw numbers used to calculate the percentages in Table 25.

APPENDIX 1D - Sample Data Tables

Appendix Table 1D- 1		
Age - Individuals		
Sample		
Age In Years	Freq	Percent
10	2	0.9%
11	10	4.3%
12	13	5.5%
13	18	7.7%
14	35	14.9%
15	46	19.6%
16	47	20.0%
17	64	27.2%
Total	235	100.1%

Missing cases=1

Appendix Table 1D- 2		
Sex Distribution – Individuals		
Sample		
Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	186	78.8%
Female	50	21.2%
Total	236	100.0%

Appendix Table 1D- 3		
Racial Appearance - Individuals		
Sample		
Racial Appearance	Frequency	Percentage
White	200	88.9%
Aboriginal	20	8.9%
Pacific Islander	1	0.4%
East Asian	2	0.9%
Indian	1	0.4%
Middle East	1	0.4%
Mediterranean	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Total	225	99.9%

Missing = 11

Appendix Table 1D- 4		
Occupation – Individuals		
Sample		
Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
RAAF Apprentice	2	0.9%
Trade Apprentice	8	3.4%
Farm Worker	2	0.9%
Retail & Service	2	0.9%
Catering	3	1.3%
Labourer	3	1.3%
Other	2	0.9%
Unemployed	76	32.6%
Student	135	57.9%
Total	233	100.1%

Missing cases = 3

Appendix Table 1D- 5		
First Offence Cases		
Sample		
Offences	Frequency	Percentage
Assault	32	10.5%
Sexual Off	5	1.6%
Robbery	4	1.3%
BES & Unlaw Entry	40	13.1%
Fraud & Misap	2	0.7%
StolenGoods	10	3.3%
MVT	19	6.2%
Other Theft	118	38.6%
Property Dam	24	7.8%
Off Ag Just Proc	11	3.6%
Weapon/Firearm	0	0%
Oth Good Order Off	23	7.5%
Possess Cannabis	11	3.6%
Supply Cannabis	1	0.3%
Grow Cannabis	1	0.3%
Drink Drive	3	1.0%
Other Driving	2	0.7%
Telecom	0	0%
Total	306	100.1%

Appendix Table 1D- 6			
Number of Apprehensions			
Sample - Individuals			
No: Arrests	Frequency	Percentage	Cum Perc
1	174	73.7%	73.7%
2	30	12.7%	86.4%
3	17	7.2%	93.6%
4	8	3.4%	97.0%
5	5	2.1%	99.1%
6	1	0.4%	99.5%
9	1	0.4%	99.9%
Total	236	99.9%	

Appendix Table 1D- 7		
Percentage Reapprehended* Within 9 months -		
Sample - Individuals		
Before / After FGC by Manner Proceeded With		
	Before	After
Caution	33.3%	23.7%
Court	39.1%	41.7%

*Expressed as a proportion of all individuals dealt with in that particular manner. For example: In the 'Before FGC' group 33.3% of individual juveniles who were cautioned were reapprehended by police within 9 months. An individual in this analysis is defined as such the first time he/she appears in this data set.

Appendix Table 1D- 8		
Number Reapprehended* Within 9 months		
Sample - Individuals		
Before / After FGC by Manner Proceeded With		
	Before	After
Caution	20/60	18/76
Court	25/64	15/36

*These are the raw numbers used to calculate the percentages Appendix Table 1D-7. The number reapprehended is shown on the left of the slash (/) and the total number of juveniles proceeded with in that manner is shown on the right, ie: in the 'before FGC' group twenty out of the sixty juveniles who were cautioned were not reapprehended.

APPENDIX 1E - List of ANCO Offence Codes Used

Code No:	Code Name	Description
12	Assault	
13	Sexual Offences	
21	Robbery	
31	Break, Enter & Steal, Unlawful Entry	
32	Fraud & Misappropriation	Mostly cheque offences
33	Stolen Goods	
35	Theft or Illegal Use Motor Vehicle	All illegal use offences
39	Other Theft	Includes Shoplifting
41	Property Damage	
52-54	Offences Against Justice Procedures	Includes hinder & resist police
55	Weapons/Firearm	
59	Other Good Order Offences	Includes liquor licence, offensive conduct, offensive language, trespass.
61	Possess/Use Drugs*	Cannabis offences only
65	Dealing/Supplying Drugs*	Cannabis offences only
66	Grow/Manufacture Drugs*	Cannabis offences only
69	Other Drug Offences	Possess drug implements
71	Drink Drive	
74	Other Driving Offences	Includes categories 72 reckless or (driving licence offences) as they were not distinguished during the recording of the data.
83-88	'Other Federal, State and Territory Legislation'	This code covers many areas, however, as appearing in this data set telegraphs and will be the only one is 'Posts, telecommunications' it referred to as simply 'telecommunications' or 'telecom'in the tables

*These categories relate to all drugs in the ANCO code, however, as the drug offences in this data set exclusively involved cannabis this was added to the offence category name to be more descriptive.