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In the past, there has been a number of different approaches to dealing with young offenders. Two main models which contended for legislative implementation internationally in the 1950s and 1960s were the "crime control" model and the "welfare" approach. The "crime control" approach advocates a tough response to offenders, particularly the use of custodial penalties for severe and persistent offenders. The "welfare" approach emphasises "causes" and, hence, the need to "treat" basic social and personal problems, often by removing the children and young people from "bad" environments to institutions. In practice therefore, the two approaches were often very similar: both led to young people being placed in institutions, either for "their own good" or for punishment. Until recently, the result was that large numbers of children were placed in institutions in New Zealand either because of parental neglect or because of their problem behaviour. Problem behaviour included a wide range: from criminal offences, to status offences such as absconding from care or to merely "not being under proper control". In other words, difficulties in parental management were often attributed to the child, who was effectively punished by institutionalisation for an indeterminate period—perhaps the rest of their childhood. Recently, it has become apparent in New Zealand, as elsewhere, that the institutionalisation of large numbers of children and young people is damaging to them, ineffective in preventing delinquency, and quite unjust. Thus the new approach follows international trends in emphasising:

- Justice

Under this model there is an emphasis on accountability for offences. The severity of the punishment is related to the crime and due process is seen as important. The main method of achieving
accountability in the current New Zealand system is through a family group conference (FGC) which, if it agrees, has the power to decide, or, in court cases, recommend to the court on appropriate penalties. The new Youth Court's role is limited, except when there is a lack of agreement at the FGC or when the charges are denied or in the most serious cases. At the same time there is an emphasis on due process and the protection of rights to ensure that injustices do not occur. The legislation sets out in detail the procedures to be followed by police in stopping, questioning and arresting young people. This includes informing them fully of their rights in a language and manner that the young person can understand. Young people are also entitled to consult with a barrister or solicitor and a parent or other adult before questioning and to have the barrister or solicitor and a parent or other adult present during questioning. Evidence from answers to questions when a parent or other adult is not present is not normally admissible. A youth advocate is appointed by the court whenever a young person appears before it and legal advice may be available in other cases. Another related feature has been recognised as important if young people are to be accountable. That is, that time frames should be realistic so that the young offender can associate the punishment with the offence, repay his or her debt quickly, leave the past behind and then proceed with his or her life.

- Diversion, decarceration and destigmatisation

Related to the notion of a justice model is an emphasis on frugality of penalties, avoiding processes that label and stigmatise, and avoiding the use of institutions unless they are required for public protection. Such trends have been reinforced by research that has shown that the involvement of young people in the criminal justice system and in institutions has resulted in labelling and stigmatisation and, through association with other offenders, the acquisition of “criminal” membership and skills. In the New Zealand system there is increased use of police "diversion" through warnings and the use of informal sanctions. The FGC is also a new method of diversion. At the same time, the scale of penalties available to the Youth Court has been modified: now the most severe options available are "supervision with activity" in the local community for a maximum of two months to be followed by six months supervision, "supervision with residence" to be followed by six months supervision or transfer to the District or High Court (where a custodial option is seen as potentially necessary).

- Victim involvement, mediation, reparation and reconciliation

World-wide there has been a trend to increasing involvement of victims in criminal justice processes by better provision for their needs through the opportunity to obtain reparation and, through mediation, to allow for their involvement in outcomes and the
opportunity for reconciliation. The potential benefit of mediation for offenders is that it enables them to understand the consequences of their offences and to express remorse (compare John Braithwaite's (1988) concept of "reintegrative shaming"). In New Zealand, traditional Maori practice involved the victims, the offender and the families of the victim and the offender, firstly, in acknowledging guilt and expressing remorse and secondly, in finding ways to restore the social balance so that the victim could be compensated by the group and the offender could be reintegrated into the group. Pressures to allow Maori to return to their own system of justice and the increasing attention to victims in New Zealand has led to victim involvement becoming an integral part of the new system for dealing with young offenders. Unlike practice in other jurisdictions, the involvement of victims has not been limited to merely minor offences and first offenders. All offences committed by juveniles, excepting only murder and manslaughter, now have an FGC which the victim is entitled to attend and which occurs before the court proceeds to deal with the case. At the same time, New Zealand has affirmed some aspects of the "welfare" model by including goals of enhancing well-being and strengthening families, while rejecting the notion that the recognition of "welfare" needs should stand in place of accountability or lead to removal from the family and the community as so often occurred in the past. Elements of a crime control approach are still to be seen in the provisions for transfer of serious offences to a higher jurisdiction for a custodial sentence. In addition, the Children Young Persons and their Families Act 1989 contains two important new elements:

- **Family participation**
  
  His approach emphasises that families and young people should participate in all parts of the decision-making process and be party to agreed outcomes. This is to be achieved partly through the FGC but also through the nature of the Youth Court, where families and young people are entitled to make submissions and to be party to decisions. The origins for this lie both in the notions of empowerment and control through participation that have been emerging in the psychological research on treatment effectiveness, and also in the traditional Maori hui (meeting) in which decisions are taken collectively by all those involved including, depending on the seriousness of matters, extended family (whanau), clan (hapu) and tribe (iwi).

- **Cultural appropriateness**
  
  Procedures and services are to be appropriate to the culture of the families and young people including FGCs, the Youth Court and arrangements that are made for accountability and enhancing well-being. The political determination to redress the history of Pakeha
(people of European origin) domination of a country which was founded in a bi-cultural treaty has come about both in response to Maori demands and in response to increasing recognition of the injustice and damage to Maori during the last 150 years of New Zealand history.

**Objectives of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989**

An unusual feature of the new approach is that the legislation sets out the goals of the system as a set of general objectives and principles in respect to children and young people and as a set of specific principles in relation to youth justice. The important features embedded in these objectives and principles are set out below. In addition, there are other principles relating to the importance of the protection of children and young people and of keeping them with their families and in their communities wherever possible.

*The Goals of Youth Justice in New Zealand*

- **Achieving justice**
  - Accountability: emphasising the importance of young people paying an appropriate penalty for their crime and making good the wrong they have done to others
  - Reducing time frames: making time frames realistic given the age of the child or young person
  - Due process: emphasising the protection of young people's rights
  - Diversion: keeping young people out of courts and preventing the use of labels that make it difficult for young people to put early offending behind them

- **Responding to needs**
  - Enhancing well-being and strengthening families: making available services that will assist the young person and their family

- **Providing for participation**
  - Family involvement: involving families and young people in making the decisions for themselves and taking charge of their lives
  - Victim involvement: involving victims in the decisions about outcomes
  - Consensus decision making: arriving at decisions which are agreed to by the family, the young person, police and victims

- **Being culturally appropriate**
  - Culturally appropriate process: allowing families to choose their own procedures and the time and place of meetings
• Culturally appropriate ways of providing services: developing and funding a range of services to suit different cultural needs and wishes, operated by people sensitive to that culture

• Culturally appropriate penalties: encouraging the creation of penalties which reflect different cultural responses.

The family group conference

At the heart of the New Zealand system lies the family group conference. Figure 1 accurately depicts it as the central decision making forum for the more serious cases in the youth justice system, including those that appear in the Youth Court.

Figure 1

Youth Justice: Pathways through the System
It is also a principal mechanism for diversion from the courts. It is the way in which young people, families and victims can participate in the decisions. And it is the way in which each culture can, potentially, adapt the justice process to fit its own spirit, philosophy and procedures—for Maori, to their own kaupapa. The FGC is a meeting at a time and place chosen by the family and attended by the young person, the family (including the wider family), the victim, the police, the youth advocate (young person's lawyer) and any other people whom the family wishes to have present. It is arranged by a Youth Justice Coordinator (YJC) who acts as facilitator and mediator between family and the police, although the YJC can invite others to act as facilitator (especially if this is culturally important). Usually, after the introductions and greetings, the police describe the offence and the young person admits or denies involvement. If there is no denial, the conference proceeds with the victim describing the impact on him or her of the offence. Views are then shared about how matters can be set to rights. The family deliberates privately before the meeting reconvenes with the professionals and the victim to see if all are agreed on the recommendations and plans advanced by the family.

Evaluating the system

From 1990 to 1992 Allison Morris and I have been involved as principal researchers in a project evaluating the translation of the objectives and principles of the Act into practice in five areas of New Zealand. The sample included almost 700 young people who came to the attention of the police. FGCs were arranged for over 200 and seventy appeared in the Youth Court. The research followed the experiences of these young people. It included interviewing police, attending FGCs, interviewing YJCs, youth advocates, families, young people and victims. The research covered all those who came to notice in a three-month period in five different districts. Maori and Pakeha and one Pacific Island interviewer were involved. As much as was possible, each interviewed families and young people of a similar ethnic group. This paper presents an overview of the results (reported more fully by Maxwell & Morris 1992; 1993) that relate to the success of the Act in meeting its principal objectives. It refers first to those objectives which are dominant trends in current juvenile justice policy in most jurisdictions: enhancing the well-being of juveniles who offend, holding juvenile offenders accountable for their offences, protecting juveniles' rights, and diversion. Then it turns to the innovatory features in the New Zealand system: participation by young persons and their families, victims' involvement, consensus decision-making and cultural appropriateness. Finally, it comments on the way in which potentially contradictory and conflicting objectives have been resolved in practice.

Accountability

Most juveniles referred to FGCs or to the Youth Court agreed to perform tasks which were intended to make them accountable for their actions.
"Active penalties" (that is, community work, financial penalties, reparation and the like) were agreed to by 83 per cent of those involved in non-court referred FGCs and by 89 per cent of those involved in court referred FGCs. If "apologies" are also added, the figures become 95 per cent and 94 per cent respectively. Nominal dispositions were rare, as were solely welfare-oriented outcomes. More importantly, the vast majority of FGC plans were completed either fully—58 per cent, or in part—29 per cent. However, on occasions, FGCs were observed in which young persons were not made accountable for their actions. Particularly with respect to those under fourteen, and possibly with respect to some girls, minor offenders and first offenders, the question could be raised as to whether or not the FGC referral might have been motivated by a desire to intervene where the perceived problem was one of a "welfare" or "parenting" nature. FGCs were not always held within the statutory three-week time frames for non-court cases and two weeks for court cases. However, most were held within a week afterwards. On the other hand, there were such long delays in the Youth Court before many cases were finalised that any accountability must have had a fairly remote connection with the original act.

**Due process**

The research recorded evidence of breaches of statutory safeguards by front line police officers and their continuing resistance to these safeguards. Some youth advocates failed adequately to advise their clients (or even to attend court-ordered FGCs). Pressures, both explicit and implicit, are placed on young people to admit their guilt (Wundersitz et al. 1991) and the costs of denying the offence seemed considerable, both in terms of long delays and the resulting anxiety. Broadly speaking, practice as yet fails to meet expectations in this area.

**Diversion**

There is no doubt that diversion from both courts and institutions were primary aims of the new Act. Both forms of diversion have been achieved. In 1986, sixty-seven per 1,000 young people appeared before the court. Now the figure is sixteen per 1,000. Figures for residential custody are now half of previous figures and penal custody figures are down by 70 per cent. Furthermore, the use of remands in institutions and institutional placements of young people for other reasons has been dramatically reduced. In 1981 there were 4,500 institutional places for children and young people. By 1986, this was reduced to about 3,000, and in 1992, the number is seventy-six. The research data confirm these general trends. Only 10 per cent of young offenders were arrested and this compares with at least a third and possibly even 45 per cent before the Act. Warnings, with or without informal sanctions by the police, now account for 62 per cent. The remaining 28 per cent were referred directly for an FGC. Of the 10 per cent of the sample who appeared in the Youth Court, only about half of these were subject to any type of court order and less than a fifth of these were subject to any kind of residential or custodial order. This means that, overall, only 5 per cent of the juveniles in
the sample were subject to court orders and less than 2 per cent were subject to residential or custodial orders. On the other hand, if FGC outcomes are regarded as diversionary (in the sense that they avoid a court appearance), it is clear that they were not limited by tariff considerations and often seemed moderately severe to the researchers. Nominal dispositions, for example, were rarely made in contrast to the position prior to the Act (in 1988, more than a third of the dispositions made by the judges in the Children and Young Persons Court could be described in this way). Of course, the dispositions resulting from FGCs are "agreed" to by the families and young persons involved. Whether or not this agreement was "real", "coerced" or "constructed" by the professionals is open to debate. Analysis of the observational data reveals examples of each.

*Enhancing well-being and strengthening families*

The starting point in the new New Zealand system is to separate out youth justice and care and protection issues: separate coordinators, separate procedures and separate courts. Young persons' needs and behaviour are not so easily separable, however, and an emphasis on one can mean the neglect of the other. It is perhaps self-evident, therefore, that if outcomes stress accountability they can only enhance the young person's development in an indirect sense (by accepting responsibility for his or her actions). The legislation precludes referral into the youth justice system on welfare grounds yet seems to expect or encourage discussion within the FGC of welfare issues at the same time that it expects or encourages resolutions to be determined by accountability. Thus, contradictory expectations exist side by side. The research showed that welfare issues were, not surprisingly, a secondary consideration: cases were recorded in which the needs of families and young persons were ignored at FGCs and where no "welfare" type follow-up was provided. The legislation also encouraged the strengthening and support of families. If what was envisaged was the provision of resources to families in need by social services and the like, this did not occur. We observed situations in which families were clearly asking for but not receiving help. We also observed, however, situations in which families were strengthened and supported by the involvement of their whanau or extended family; and on occasion services were provided within iwi (tribes). This happened in the main without sufficient state funding. Overall, the provision of adequate and accessible services to the young people and families was poor.

*Participation by young people and their families*

One of the major failings of the new system must be its failure to engage young people in the decision-making process. Only about a third felt involved in the FGC process and less than a fifth (16 per cent) felt that they had been a party to the decision at the FGC. The level of perceived involvement in the court process was even lower. In this respect the objectives of the Act are not being met. There are a number of possible reasons for this continued lack of involvement by young persons. It may be that both families and professionals do not allow them to become involved; or
it may be that the young persons themselves do not feel able to become involved. Many jurisdictions have tried a range of different ways to increase the involvement of young people in the decision-making process and they have been no more successful than attempts in New Zealand. Indeed, arguably, even these very low figures for young persons’ involvement in the New Zealand system reflect some progress. It may be that many young people have very little to say, at least in the presence of adults who are unknown to them, and that, therefore, they cannot be expected to participate more actively, whatever the forum. Many families do not encourage, or even actively discourage, the participation of young people in decisions about their own future. The problem may, thus, lie not in the system's response to young persons, but in the expectations of the wider society. The involvement of parents in FGCs, on the other hand, was considerable. In contrast to young persons, more than two-thirds of the parents said that they felt involved in the decision-making process and about two-thirds also felt they had been a party to the decision. These results contrast dramatically with the failure effectively to involve parents in "panels" or "boards" in other jurisdictions. Thus, holding parents responsible for their children's offending has been given a new and constructive (in both senses) meaning.

Victims' involvement

Victims simply by their presence participate more in this system than traditionally. However, only around a half of the FGCs in the sample had victims or victims' representatives present. Also, an unexpectedly high proportion of victims (around a quarter) said that they felt worse as a result of attending the FGC and an unexpectedly low number of victims (about a half overall) said that they were satisfied with the outcomes. In part, these results may be due to the inadequate preparation of victims (and other participants) about what to expect at the FGC and unrealistic expectations about likely or "appropriate" outcomes, especially with respect to reparation. Arguably, this could be remedied through better briefing. But such views also raise a more fundamental issue: the extent to which victims' interests can be addressed in a forum set up primarily to divert young people from the court. Victims' pressure groups have long been suspicious of programs which they feel "use" victims for the benefit of the offender. There must be some basis for this with respect to the current organisation of FGCs. Such a criticism could be met by clarifying the objectives of FGCs and by meeting specific victims' needs in a different way—for example, through improved procedures for compensation and through the provision of adequate support both within FGCs and more generally.

Consensus decision-making

Agreed outcomes should satisfy participants more than enforced outcomes and most FGC outcomes are "agreed" outcomes: 95 per cent in the sample and 94 per cent nationally (Maxwell & Robertson 1991). Thus, in these terms, participants at FGCs should be highly satisfied. And indeed the results showed high figures for satisfaction in most cases: 91 per cent of the police, 86
per cent of the YJC, 85 per cent of the parents and 84 per cent of the young people. Victim satisfaction, in contrast, was only 48 per cent and yet those victims who were present were supposedly parties to an "agreed" outcome. In some sense, then, it appears that victim agreement is being "coerced". Second, it is difficult to know whether families and young persons "truly" agreed or felt "truly" satisfied. The qualitative data from the research would suggest that, on many occasions they did, but that on other occasions they were and felt coerced to agree to decisions in essence made by the professionals.

Cultural appropriateness

New Zealand has attempted to create a youth justice system which is culturally appropriate. There is a range of ways in which the success of this objective might be determined: participation by whanau (whanau participated in well over a half of cases involving Maori), the venue of FGCs (marae were rarely used) and participants' depictions of the process as culturally appropriate (views varied on this). A key issue here is the extent to which Western systems of criminal justice can accommodate elements of an indigenous approach. To be effectively responsive to indigenous needs there probably has to be a different process, a different type of spirit and underlying philosophy and, potentially, different outcomes from those traditionally available in criminal justice contexts. In each of these respects, the practice showed both limitations and successes.

The FGC is an attempt to give a prominent place to a different and culturally appropriate process, but that process often failed to respond to the spirit of Maori or to enable outcomes to be reached which were in accordance with Maori philosophies and values. At times, FGCs can and do transcend tokenism and embody a Maori kaupapa. But not often. Also, money for iwi services and iwi authorities has not yet been allocated in sufficient amounts for a truly cultural approach to be taken. The Youth Court in particular found it difficult to accommodate Maori process and etiquette. We observed a number of situations where whanau wanted to be involved in the resolution of cases affecting their kin and yet providing time for receiving their submissions and, more importantly, giving real weight to them, seemed problematic to the court. And there has been only a limited tolerance of the notion that the outcome should stress the restoration of social imbalance by the reintegration of the offender into the social group. This collectively redresses the issue of reparation to the offender.

In short, our view and that of the Maori and Pacific Island participants, is that the process (and hence spirit and outcomes) remained Pakeha and unresponsive to cultural differences. However, it is also our view, and that of many of the Maori and Pacific Island participants, that there is at least the potential for FGCs to be more able to cope with cultural diversity than other types of tribunals. This is best summed up in the words of the Maori researchers involved in the project:

We feel that the Act for the most part is an excellent piece of legislation which promises exciting possibilities for the future. When the processes outlined in the Act were observed, Maori families were indeed
empowered and able to take an active part in decisions concerning their young people. It is not difficult to see the beneficial influences that the Act may eventually exert on wider Maori, Polynesian and Pakeha society. Maori society could gain immensely from legislation that acknowledges and strengthens the hapu and tribal structures and their place in decisions regarding the well-being of young people and [from legislation] that provides them with an opportunity to contribute to any reparation and to support those offended against. The same scenario would apply to Pacific Island peoples. Pakeha society would also benefit from a process which acknowledges the family and gives redress to victims.

Resolving conflicting and contradictory objectives

There are four main areas of considerable potential conflict in the New Zealand system:

- reconciling offenders' needs and victims' interests;
- reconciling accountability and "welfare" goals;
- providing for family and victim participation in decisions while maintaining tariff equity;
- empowering families and young people within a system whose primary goal is control.

The primary arena for meeting offenders' needs is the FGC; this demonstrates both welfare and diversion goals. It is also the primary arena for protecting victims' interests; this reflects the goal of mediation and possibly crime control. Research suggests that when reparation and diversion are sought within the one forum, then the victim almost invariably loses out. For example, Marshall and Merry (1990) argue that whatever aims are subscribed to in practice, in reality diversion becomes the overriding objective and all other goals become subordinate to it. Thus, the offenders' interests are promoted and the victims' neglected. This has occurred in the New Zealand system of youth justice too. Tension has been created by expecting diverse interests to be met in a single forum without one or the other being compromised. Practical steps could be taken which might at least alleviate the imbalance in favour of offenders to some extent but the fundamental difficulty may not be able to be eradicated. We believe that it will inevitably be impossible to meet victims' needs in a forum designed for offender accountability, and that the only solution is to develop services that respond to victims outside the criminal justice system.

Much the same point can be made with respect to attempting to make offenders accountable while enhancing their well-being. The way in which this conflict is resolved in the New Zealand youth justice system is to stress accountability at the expense of welfare. By far the majority of FGC and court outcomes reflect responses to the young person's offence(s) rather than his or her needs. To the extent that this is what the legislature intended to be the primary focus of FGCs, it can thus be concluded that the system is working well. However, it is not clear from the Act that such a view is justified: there
is no explicit or implicit ordering of objectives, and often the needs of young people and families were not met because of the lack of services.

There is also a real anomaly in a system where access to services is achieved through offending. The conflict could best be resolved by ensuring open access to services for both families and young people depending on their need for such services. This should be separate from any considerations of whether or not there has been offending. In other words, service provision should become even more separate from youth justice.

A third tension is between justice in the form of equality and proportionality of penalties, and a participatory decision-making system. Inevitably, families differ in the types of solutions they see as most appropriate and, to an even greater extent, so do victims. The consequence is inevitably variability in decision-making. To some extent the youth justice team can and, in the research, did provide guidance on an appropriate penalty. But when families and victims had their own ideas, as they often did, youth justice coordinators and police tended to stand back, as indeed they must if the process is to be truly participatory and empowering and the outcomes are to be satisfactory to the principal actors.

Similarly, there is an inevitable conflict between a system which, in essence, is a system of state control and the notion of family empowerment. It is possible to argue that to pretend that families are in control is a mockery and a sham; the reality is that all the decisions are inevitably controlled and managed through the agency of the professionals, who set the rules of the game and who are themselves principal actors. Alternatively, one could argue that, to the extent that it is possible to return power and control over decisions to those who will be most affected by them, the consequences will be less harmful and that justice, in its more abstract sense, is most likely to be served.

What much of this discussion highlights is that at times the various purposes of the FGC are incompatible. This inevitably impacts on practice. One option would be to establish priorities among the principles and objectives. It is this option we see as appropriate in relation to meeting the needs of victims, enhancing the well-being of young people and strengthening families through providing services. Alternatively, the balance among the various tensions can be left to find a resolution in each specific case, as indeed the court arrives at an individualised resolution of a variety of potentially conflicting factors when deciding upon a sentence. It is this latter option we see as appropriate in relation to the tensions between equity of tariffs and participation and between family empowerment and control.

**Conclusion**

There is much that is positive and novel about the New Zealand system of youth justice. It has succeeded in diverting the majority of young offenders from criminal courts and reliance on the use of institutions has been dramatically reduced. Families participate in the processes of decision-making and are taking responsibility for their young people in most instances. Extended families are also becoming involved in the continuing
care of their kin and as an alternative to foster care and institutions. Greater acknowledgment is being given to the customs of different cultural groups and the adoption in some instances of alternative methods of resolution through the use of traditional processes. It has been suggested that the system is not transferable to other jurisdictions because it is derived from Maori practice and particularly suited to Maori needs, yet the research shows that it is equally satisfactory for Pakeha. Nor do we share the view that this is only so because New Zealanders have come to share aspects of Maori culture; rather it can be suggested that the features that make for success are universal.

The new system has not, however, avoided all the difficulties which inevitably arise when attempting to reconcile conflicting objectives; it was unrealistic to expect that it would. Furthermore, implicit in these comments on meeting the principles and objectives in the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 is an awareness of the power of all old, entrenched and dominant systems to resist fundamental re-shaping by the young, new and emerging system. Resistances by those who actually have to implement new legislation at grass roots level are not unusual. In many respects, practice is uneven and idiosyncratic. And there are three areas of considerable concern to us: professionals taking over and thereby both distorting and destroying the FGC process; families being susceptible to this by being denied necessary information on both the process and the possibilities; and the lack of resources and support services which can undermine family decisions (for a fuller discussion, see Maxwell & Morris 1992). However, it is early days. The approach is new and potentially radical. We must wait and see.
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