

Appendix: Justice Study methodology*

The Justice Study methodology consisted of:

- lay and legal populations;
- a longitudinal prospective panel of lay participants;
- quantitative survey with repeat measures and scales;
- qualitative interviewing;
- discourse mapping and analysis.

The Lay Sample of Citizen-Victims

The lay sample comprised persons who had been victims of violence and who were in contact with support services. The selection criteria for the sample were that:

- people were aged 18 years and over;
- people were primary victims in that they had directly experienced the conduct from which the criminal charge arose;
- the incident included some element of violence; and
- the incident from which the charge arose was committed in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) and hence would be resolved in the ACT courts.

The number of lay participants comprising the longitudinal panel commenced with N=33 and ended with N=19 (Table A.1), and their characteristics were diverse (Table A.2).

* Aspects of the methods of the Justice Study were first published in Robyn Holder, 'Untangling the meanings of justice: a longitudinal mixed methods study' (2016), *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, (online), a Sage journal. Reproduced with permission.

Table A.1 Numbers and percentage of lay interviews at three stages

Interview	Total (%)
TIME 1	33 (100)
TIME 2	26 (79)
TIME 3	19 (58)

Table A.2 Demographic characteristics of lay participants (N=33)

Demographics	Domestic assault (female) N=27	Non-domestic assault (male) N=6	Total N=33 (%) ¹
Australian born	23	6	29 (88)
English only spoken	19	5	24 (73)
Aboriginal	0	0	0
Disability	1	2	3 (9)
Children at home	19	2	21 (64)
Home rental	13	5	18 (55)
Employment status			
Full-time	11	2	13 (39)
Part-time	6	2	8 (24)
Other	10	2	12 (36)
Occupation			
Professional, managerial	9	3	12 (36)
Clerical, sales, service	4	1	5 (15)
Tradesperson, labourer, transport, factory	2	2	4 (12)
Missing	12	0	12 (36)
Level of education			
Tertiary	9	2	12 (33)
Secondary	16	3	19 (57)
Other	1	1	2 (6)
Gross annual income			
Under \$25k	10	3	13 (39)
\$25–45k	4	1	5 (15)
\$45–100k	11	2	13 (39)
\$100–250k	1	0	1 (3)
Missing	1	0	1 (3)

Note: ¹ Percentages rounded up or down to the nearest percentage point.

The prospective interview schedule commenced after police had charged an alleged offender. Table A.3 displays this as procedural point 1 (Time 1). The next two procedural points, Time 2 and Time 3, comprised a combination of both retrospective and prospective questions.

Table A.3 Justice study design: procedural interview points and outcome for each

Interview	Procedural interview point	Substantive outcome
Time 1	After police had charged an accused person with an offence and prior to a court hearing	The police arrest and charge decision
Time 2	After the finalization of the matter at court	The decision to prosecute or not, and on what charges The court verdict and sentence (if any)
Time 3	Approximately six to eight months after finalization	Overall justice done

Survey/Interview Design

The Time 1 survey comprised 82 questions, generating 273 variables plus qualitative narrative. Parts dealt with the incident, after effects and the offender; others with the police response, and prospective preferences. A final section asked about civic and social values. Factor analysis of assessment of justice items was used to reduce the data and to identify clusters. Scales relating to various aspects of people's civic identity and orientation were created as:

- a) disinterested justice assessment scales
- b) social value scales
- c) personal and offender assessments
- d) specific justice assessment scales and repeat measures (Table A.4).

The Time 2 instrument was in four parts. Part I dealt with overall feeling about justice and safety; Part II dealt with prosecution; Part III with the court; and Part IV about other support. The Time 3 instrument consisted of some closed questions but was predominately open and semi-structured.

Table A.4 *Items comprising the justice assessment scales (and repeat measures) (N=33)*

Scale	Variables	Reliability Score ^A	Mean inter-item correlation
Outcome acceptance	Agree with decision Accept decision Honest explanation for decision Understand decision Decision fair Decision expected	0.9	0.78
Quality of interpersonal treatment ^D	I was treated with respect I was treated with dignity Fair treatment of me Respect my rights ^B Helpful ^B Treated as victim ^B	0.9	0.6
Influential voice	Opportunity to express views Able to influence decision Views considered before decision Decision deserved Decision wanted	0.84	0.52
Respect offender rights ^D	Treated the violent person with respect Respect offender rights ^B	0.83	0.71

Notes: ^A Cronbach's alpha (rounded).

^B Reverse scored item.

^D Variables comprising these scales in the second survey were scored on a six-point Likert scale where 6 = not applicable. The 6 score was treated as a missing value and recoded using the mean of 1 to 5 for each variable.