



## Victims & Offenders

An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice

ISSN: 1556-4886 (Print) 1556-4991 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uvao20>

# Four Challenges in the Future of Restorative Justice

William R. Wood & Masahiro Suzuki

To cite this article: William R. Wood & Masahiro Suzuki (2016): Four Challenges in the Future of Restorative Justice, *Victims & Offenders*

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2016.1145610>



Published online: 18 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Four Challenges in the Future of Restorative Justice

William R. Wood and Masahiro Suzuki

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Southport, Australia

**Abstract:** Restorative justice (RJ) emerged in the late 1970s as an alternative to conventional youth and criminal justice practices. Since this time, RJ has experienced rapid growth in theory and practice. At the same time, much of this growth has come from expansion in lower-end criminal justice responses to crime, and in the increasing use of the term “restorative” for a widening host of practices and interventions. RJ has also faced problems related to its increasing institutionalization, resulting in divergence from earlier aims and goals. In this article, we set forth what we see as the four biggest challenges facing the future of RJ, namely problems related to definition, institutionalization, displacement, and relevance of RJ practices. We follow with discussion of possible future directions of RJ.

**Keywords:** international, offenders, restorative justice, victims

## INTRODUCTION

That restorative justice (RJ) has a future seems fairly certain after almost 40 years of development, growth, and institutionalization in virtually all Western countries and in a large number of other states around the world. Far from being a radical prescription for the ills of the criminal justice system, however, as practiced today RJ functions less as an alternative to criminal justice practices than as an alternative sanction within them (Dünkel, Horsfield, & Păroșanu, 2015; Shapland, 2003; Zernova, 2006). The earlier visions and promises of many RJ advocates have given way to a more instrumental and institutional variety of RJ practices. Following trends in criminological research and crime policy, RJ research has become decidedly more “evidence-driven” (Sherman & Strang, 2007; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2007). RJ practices have also increasingly become administered from the “top down” (Crawford & Newburn, 2002; Dzur, 2003) and facilitated by police or justice professionals (O’Mahony & Doak, 2009; Richards, 2010). The goals of RJ as reflected in most

---

Address correspondence to William R. Wood, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Southport QLD 4221, Australia. E-mail: [w.wood@griffith.edu.au](mailto:w.wood@griffith.edu.au)

of the current literature are no longer those of criminal justice transformation as much as they are goals of program improvement and efficacy, development of theory, and discussion of policy and implementation.

RJ has not changed the world in terms of what Thorburn (2005) has called its “impossible dreams,” but neither has it failed as have so many other “good ideas” of criminal justice reform or crime control. Fifty years from now, the idea that something good can potentially come out of an offender, a victim, and other parties sitting down together to discuss harms caused, accountability, and ways to make amends will still seem like a good idea to many people. Yet at the same time, it is not at all clear what RJ will look like 50—or even 20—years from now. Primarily, it is impossible to know what larger trends in criminal justice will emerge. However, RJ’s past growth and development, as well as its current practices, suggest trajectories in the future that will likely bring it into increasing conflict with many of its core aims (at least historically), as well as present problems—if perhaps less in terms of its growth, then more in terms of quality of practice and its functions in criminal justice systems.

In this paper we address what we see as the most immediate challenges facing RJ in the near future, particularly within its use in Anglophone countries.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, we see four significant problems or challenges—definition, institutionalization, displacement, and relevance. Each of these overlap, but each also poses what we see as distinct conceptual, theoretical, and/or practical (i.e., applied) challenges or problems. Following analysis of these problems, we conclude with a discussion of likely directions or possible redress for each of these challenges or problems.

## PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION

The problem of the definition of RJ is, as Daly (2016, this issue) notes, a “vexed problem.” Daly gives several reasons why this is the case, but we wish to focus on one particular aspect we see as the most problematic for the future of RJ. Since its inception, RJ has grown significantly in terms of its use, but it has also become increasingly hybridized and diffuse. Beyond the numerous variations in conferencing, the term “restorative” is now applied to a variety of practices—community reparation boards, surrogate victim (or offender) meetings, community service, and so on. It is also now used in myriad settings such as schools, prisons, and workplaces, and in contexts including not only criminal justice but transitional justice (i.e., truth and reconciliation commissions), institutional responses to abuse, and so on.

Thus, while the use of restorative conferencing has grown, so has the definition of “restorative justice” continued to expand and to be applied to a widening host of practices beyond conferencing or other types of face-to-face meetings between victims, offenders, and other parties. It is this expansion we

wish to focus on. Debates about proper definitions of RJ are not new,<sup>2</sup> but many of these debates have focused on the “purist” versus “maximalist” positions (c.f. Dünkel et al., 2015), where purists have argued that RJ is a “process” that involves key stakeholders to address the aftermath of crime (Marshall, 1999; McCold, 2000), while maximalists have argued that RJ is an “option” that encourages outcomes to repair harms caused by crime (Bazemore & Walgrave, 1999; Walgrave, 2008).

Yet these debates are almost 20 years old. In this time, the use of what people call “restorative justice” has clearly exceeded the purist position in representing something more than conferencing or other meetings between victims, offenders, and other parties. On the other hand, neither has RJ emerged into a more “fully-fledged” systematic response to crime as set forth in the maximalist positions of those such as Walgrave (1995). Rather, what is apparent is that the term “restorative” has continued to expand and to be applied to a growing number of already existing and new innovative programs, a problem we see in terms of the growing plasticity of the concept of RJ itself. Below, we give three examples of this plasticity, which we see as emblematic of the increasing hybridity of RJ that is expanding so much as to make the term potentially meaningless.

The first example is the use of RJ in prison settings. Since the late 1990s numerous “restorative” prison programs have been implemented within English-speaking countries. With few exceptions, however, such programs do not include the use of conferencing between victims and offenders. Rather, such programs tend to be oriented on RJ “principles” toward goals of offender empathy and remorse (Liebmann, 2007; Lovell, Helfgott, & Lawrence, 2002), resolution of conflicts within the prison (Edgar & Newell, 2006; Swanson, 2010), and use of prison work for the making of amends to the community (Gavrielides, 2011; Gray & Wright, 2011). Some programs such as the Sycamore Tree Project do include surrogate victims in their curriculum (Prison Fellowship Australia, n.d.), but by and large what is called “restorative justice” within prisons is something very different than that outside of prisons. Dhami et al. (2009, p. 434) note, for example, that RJ should be “used to improve prisoners’ experiences of imprisonment which may result in an increase in prisons’ utility in terms of their efforts to reduce crime via these alternative strategies.” Hurley (2009, p. 17) argues that the movement into the use of RJ in prison settings represents an emerging view within RJ that “embraces the concept of offender-oriented restorative justice,” a view that “reflects the needs of offenders and victims along with emphasizing the fact that the offender must make amends, change, and engage in rehabilitative efforts.”

It is not difficult to see the “language” of RJ in these goals. At the same time, it is also not difficult to see these goals as embedded in either crime reduction strategies or correctionalism, not (as we have learned over so many years from RJ literature) the goal of the restoration of harms. Indeed, the notion

of an “offender-oriented” RJ—without the inclusion of a victim as a *subject*, and not merely an *object* of offender rehabilitation or change—reflects an almost total reversal of many earlier RJ critiques of state criminal justice practices as “offender focused.” To suggest that conferencing—a practice that involves primary stakeholders toward the goals of victim redress and offender accountability—and prison rehabilitation or compliance programs can both be subsumed under the banner of “restorative justice” severely conflates the distinct aims and practices of each.

The second example we give is the increasing rebranding of community service as “restorative” or as a means of repairing harms to the community. Such rebranding has occurred within prisons, but also within community corrections, where in many cases there appears to have been little change to programs that involve the use of offenders for menial work, often in stigmatizing settings or conditions (Elliott, 2007). As used within the prison setting, there are numerous examples of prison work being cited as an example of RJ (c.f. Gavrielides, 2011; Liebmann, 2007; Lovell et al., 2002), but very few examples of such work being performed in ways that are distinct from other forms of prison work. In the case of the Inside Out Trust program in the United Kingdom, for example, an evaluation of the program found that the Trust “developed prison projects based on restorative justice principles” in several U.K. prisons between 1994 and 2007, including “activities as repairing bicycles, refurbishing wheelchairs, upgrading computers and producing Braille and large print books for charities, both in the UK and in poorer countries” (Gray & Wright, 2011, p. i). However, little of this work was conducted outside of prison workshops. Nor did this work in any way involve victim input or redress. Rather, the label “restorative” was applied because prisoners apparently found the work meaningful, and the outcomes of such work were oriented toward social benefits for others. While these may be important goals, there is nothing to distinguish them as “restorative” per se in that prison work itself has been widely lauded as reintegrative for offenders and as having social benefits for communities for over two centuries.

Similar problems extend to the use of community service as “restorative” outside of prisons. As a community sanction, service work has been readily subsumed into successive social logics of punishment—first in the early 1970s as an alternative to incarceration, then as a means of offender reintegration in the late 1970s, as an intermediate punitive sanction in the 1980s and early 1990s, and increasingly as a “restorative sanction” since that time. Again, there are few examples in the literature of program redesign or reorientation of community service as “restorative” (c.f. Wood, 2012) and far more that suggest such programs have been merely rebranded as “restorative” for having purported means by which offenders can “make amends” to the community.

The final example we give is the recent implementation of the Australian Defence Forces (ADF) “Restorative Engagement Program” as a means of

redress for victims of harassment and abuse.<sup>3</sup> This program allows for victims (and a support person of their choice) to meet with an ADF representative in a facilitated conference to offer an account of harms caused to them and explain the impacts of these harms. It also allows for the ADF representative to acknowledge harms for allegations deemed “plausible” by the task force (Australian Defence Forces, 2014). According to the ADF (2014, p. 2, emphasis in the original), “The Framework is underpinned by the best practice principles and values of restorative practice and mediation. These principles and values include ‘do no further harm,’ confidentiality, and privacy.” Such goals, broadly defined, are in line with much RJ literature, but what is missing is the offender, the ability of victims to address offenders, and the goal of offender accountability that is generally recognized as central to RJ practices (Braithwaite & Roche, 2001; Zehr, 2002).

It is not yet clear whether this program is helpful for victims. However, the larger point is not whether this or other “restorative” programs or practices are useful or effective for their particular aims. Rather, our question is this: *What is the common thread that ties them together?* What are the identifiable shared aims, goals, processes, and outcomes? The three examples we have discussed—RJ prison programs, “restorative” community service, and the ADF “restorative engagement program”—all have distinctly different goals. The first tends to be largely oriented toward offender rehabilitation, compliance, and reintegration; the second toward the making of amends with the community; and the third toward victim redress.

All of these fit nicely within more traditional RJ aims, but only in piecemeal. In this respect, the obvious question becomes *what makes such programs restorative?* If the goals of RJ prison programs largely regard offender empathy, compliance, and reintegration, what makes such programs distinct from other similar “nonrestorative” programs—for example, programs that use the concept of thinking errors to address cognitive distortions, including distortions about the reality of harms caused to others? Or again, what exactly is being “restored” in the ADF “restorative engagement program” where victims can hear an apology from an ADF representative but never have the chance to directly address the offender or have voice in offender accountability? How is such a program distinct from “nonrestorative” institutional responses to abuse—where institutions admit harms and even perhaps make amends, but those who directly caused the harms are absent from the process (and often from accountability)?

It is our contention that as the scope of RJ continues to include more and more “restorative goals” or “outcomes,” many of these (including those we have discussed) can just as easily be subsumed into different “nonrestorative” frameworks with little or no difference in practice. This is not a comment on the quality or effectiveness of such programs, but rather on the increasing

plasticity of the concept itself in application. In terms of the problem of definition, the future of RJ as we see it depends significantly on whether a focus on *interactions* between parties who have caused harm and those who have been harmed remain central to such a definition, or whether RJ continues to expand into piecemeal programs and outcomes where the difference between “restorative” and other types of programs becomes increasingly blurred.

## PROBLEMS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

RJ originated in response to critiques of traditional criminal justice systems (Chiste, 2013; Daly, 2013). These included critiques of justice practices as “retributive” (Zehr, 1990); as lacking meaningful redress for victims (Barnett, 1977; Eglash, 1977); and as being “offender focused” without a meaningful way of allowing offenders to admit harms, make amends, and successfully reintegrate into their communities (Braithwaite, 1989; Christie, 1977). As such, much of the early focus of RJ was on developing practices that offered an alternative to formal criminal justice practices. Yet in the almost 40 years since, this has not happened. On the contrary, most RJ programs have been institutionalized within conventional criminal justice systems, often coupled with diversionary practices or as an alternative sanction within them (Shapland, 2003; Zernova, 2006).

The institutionalization has occurred for numerous reasons. Primarily, as Daly and Proietti-Scifoni (2011) have noted, RJ approaches such as conferencing tend to be a viable option only after an offender has been adjudicated. Daly (2006) notes that RJ generally lacks any “fact-finding” mechanisms, and thus is dependent upon the criminal justice system for this function. Also, while many early RJ programs in the United States were developed outside of formal criminal or youth justice systems, the need for sustained funding and growth has made them more dependent upon alignment with or inclusion in these systems (Jantzi, 2004). In the case of Australia and New Zealand, RJ was implemented as part of state youth justice practices (Joudo-Larsen, 2014; Maxwell, 2013). Also, as RJ practices have developed over time, they have frequently become more attuned to victim and offender needs that cannot be met immediately through conferencing—victim support services, for example, or offender treatment and “wrap-around programs” (Acorn, 2004; Daly, 2002). Finally, most RJ programs are dependent upon youth or criminal justice systems for ensuring compliance with conferencing agreements (Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2008; Urban, Markway, & Crockett, 2011). Today, there are very few RJ programs that do not in some way work within or depend on youth and criminal justice systems.

The institutionalization of RJ practices has allowed for its growth and increasing acceptance as a more “mainstream” alternative sanction. Yet the



question of whether RJ ideals can effectively be achieved within youth and criminal justice systems has been one of significant debate and focus in the literature (c.f. Aetsen, Daems & Robert, 2006; Archibald & Llewellyn, 2006; Clairmont & Kim, 2013). Research has demonstrated several significant problems related to the increasing institutionalization of RJ. Perhaps the most frequently cited problem is the risk of RJ goals and “best practice” being co-opted for other institutional or system goals and outcomes (Fattah, 2004; Hudson, 2007). Such co-option may take the form of victims being used to enhance offender rehabilitation or desistance (Hoyle & Young, 2002; Walgrave, 2004; Zehr, 1995). Choi, Gilbert, and Green (2013) examined victims’ perceptions in victim-offender mediations in the United States and found that victims were often marginalized because some of them did not receive preparation for the meeting, were pressured to behave in a certain way (such as to accept apologies), or felt threatened by offenders and their supporters. Similarly, Zernova (2007) also found in interviews with Family Group Conferencing participants in the United Kingdom that a majority of participants felt the process was offender-centered and focused mainly on offender rehabilitation and desistance.<sup>4</sup>

Co-option of RJ may also take the form of program goals such as case processing, growth, and efficiency being given priority over the needs of victims and offenders (Umbreit, 1995). Research on RJ practitioners has found that they are frequently pressured to deliver RJ within a limited timeframe (Gavrielides, 2007; Jones & Creaney, 2015). Consequently, tasks that are necessary to meet the needs of victims and offenders may be compromised in practice. Another problem is the lack of adequate preparation, especially for victims, in terms of achieving restorative goals (Choi, Bazemore, & Gilbert, 2012). In observing victim-offender mediation programs in the United States, Gerkin (2008, p. 242) suggested that without victims possessing an understanding of the goals of RJ to some degree, it was difficult to achieve restorative outcomes because victims had difficulty viewing “the situation through a restorative lens.” Moreover, such lack of preparation can also lead to victim absence. Research on a police cautioning program in Thames Valley demonstrated that some victims refused to participate due to lack of interest, while others did so due to lack of understanding of what was involved in the process (Hill, 2002; Hoyle, 2002). In other words, there may be a relationship between the victim participation rate and level of victim understanding of the process details that should be established through preparation (Zinsstag, 2012).

Aside from the problem of co-option, the institutionalization of RJ has led to the increased inclusion of gatekeepers such as judges or police officers that may not be familiar with (or may even be opposed to) RJ principles. Numerous studies have found cases where gatekeepers either impede the referral process for RJ programs (Campbell et al., 2006; Shapland, Robinson, & Sorsby, 2011) or disrupt conferences (Hoyle, 2008).



Finally, problems in the institutionalization of RJ highlight the power of institutions to legitimize and even implicitly define the term “restorative” through program design and implementation, through the setting of goals and indicators of “success,” and through funding. On a systemic level, the most obvious problem is one set forth by Pavlich (2005), who has noted the apparent paradox between RJ’s alternative conceptualization of “harm” on the one hand and the acceptance of crime as defined by state criminal justice systems on the other. Harm is what the state says it is, and this in turn structures how offenders (and particularly victims) are able to engage with or are excluded from restorative processes—the types and nature of offenses that may be considered appropriate for RJ, the level of expected compliance or amends from offenders and subsequent redress (or even recognition and participation) for victims, and so on.

On a jurisdictional or program level, the power of institutions to define what is “restorative” may or may not be in the best interests of victims or offenders, particularly where program benchmarks and key indicators of success take precedence over best practice. Hoyle’s and Rosenblatt’s (2016, this issue) comparison of RJ programs ten years ago and today in the United Kingdom illustrates a key problem in this respect, namely that while institutionalization may lead to the “growth” of RJ legislation and programs, this does not necessarily translate into the development and implementation of lessons learned or of better practice. On the contrary, it may lead to more entrenched and entangled practices where definitions of “success” (or even redefinitions of RJ) are subsumed into system goals.

## PROBLEMS OF DISPLACEMENT

The third problem we discuss is one we call “displacement.” By this term we mean the degree to which RJ has moved into previously existing informal or diversionary forms of youth and/or criminal justice. The use of RJ in some countries such as the United Kingdom has displaced or been coupled with practices of cautioning young offenders (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016, this issue). In the United States, a large amount of the growth of RJ has come in terms of replacing (or being coupled with) diversionary programs, particularly for youth offenders (Bazemore & Schiff, 2005; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2004). While RJ practices have been implemented, and in some cases legislated, in all Anglophone countries, the growth of RJ has come largely in the “shallow end” of the criminal justice pool in terms of lesser offenses and/or youth offending (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016, this issue; Shapland, 2014)—with the exception of New Zealand and some Australian states, where conferencing is more regularly used for more serious offenses within youth justice systems.

For many such cases there are still legitimate victim needs and possibilities for offender accountability. Yet RJ practices are also used in cases where they are not necessarily needed—where there is no identifiable victim, where victims choose not to participate, or where harms are at best negligible (Doak & O’Mahony, 2006; Hoyle, Young, & Hill, 2002; Karp, 2001). Some research has moreover found that the use of RJ has expanded lower end criminal justice system processes through net widening (Hudson, 2002; Skelton & Frank, 2004).<sup>5</sup>

It is thus not clear how much of RJ’s “growth” reflects the emergence of new programs or practices in lieu of other formal or informal sanctions, and how much this growth reflects the addition or “rebranding” of already existing criminal justice system practices and interventions. It is clearer that the integration of RJ into criminal justice systems has largely been in terms of postadjudicative or diversionary practices (Daly & Proietti-Scifoni, 2011; Shapland, 2003), and in these contexts such “displacement” has more frequently resulted in RJ not as an “alternative” as much as an “addition” to existing practices or sanctions such as fines, community service, diversion or probation orders, and so on (Shapland, 2003; Zernova, 2006). Thus, while RJ practices have in some cases displaced less formal justice practices, they have generally not in turn replaced many of the “informal” requisite conditions attached to cautions, diversion, or community supervision as much as become a part of them.

## PROBLEMS OF RELEVANCE

Maruna (2011, p. 667) has referred to the predominant focus on youth and lower-end offending as the “ghettoization of restorative justice.” We have mentioned this above in terms of the problems of displacement, and Maruna is hardly the only one to question RJ’s continuing relevance in the 21st century, particularly in Anglophone countries where its growth has come largely in relation to youth and/or less serious offenses (Hoyle & Rosenblatt, 2016, this issue; Shapland, 2014). There has been some movement toward its use for more serious violent offenses, but this remains a marginal use of RJ (Miller, 2011; Umbreit, Bradshaw, & Coates, 2003).

The continued relevance of RJ is related as well not only to whether it can move beyond an “alternative punishment” for lesser or youth offenses, but in relation to many of its older alignments with social justice issues—alignments that have generally faded over time as RJ has become more established within the criminal justice system and moved in practice toward program improvement and efficacy, and in research toward empirical verification and development of theory. At its inception, RJ was seen by many people as a promising means of addressing not only problems of victim exclusion

and offender accountability, but also meso and macro social problems as they intersected with criminal justice. These included a focus of many early RJ supporters on prison abolition (Ruggiero, 2011) as well as racial and gender equality within criminal justice practices (Cunneen, 1997; Daly, 2000; Gavrielides, 2014; Stubbs, 2014; Tauri, 2009). In relation to the latter, one of the early leading scholars and pioneers of RJ, Mark Umbreit (1998, Concluding Remarks para. 3) argued almost two decades ago that one major risk facing the RJ movement then was that “concern for the overrepresentation of people of color in our juvenile and criminal justice systems could easily be lost with a hasty and exclusive focus on restorative interventions.”

But since this time, RJ literature and research has been largely inattentive to problems of race and ethnicity in its own practices, as well as within criminal justice practices more broadly. The exception to this is the focus that has been given to indigenous justice within RJ literature. Some proponents have argued that RJ is rooted in part within indigenous justice practices (Consedine & Bowen, 1999; Pranis, 2005) and/or that it may be more culturally appropriate for indigenous people (MacRae & Zehr, 2004; Maxwell et al., 2004). Yet these claims have been contested both in terms of the notion that RJ is predicated on indigenous justice practices (Blagg, 2001; Daly, 2002; Tauri, 2009, 2014) and that it is more culturally appropriate or effective for indigenous victims or offenders (Cunneen, 1997; Kelly, 2002; Moyle & Tauri, 2016, this issue).

Outside of claims regarding indigenous peoples, RJ research and practitioners have been mostly silent on questions of how restorative programs may or may not be culturally appropriate or relevant for other racial and ethnic minorities (Daly & Stubbs, 2007; Gavrielides, 2014). Scholars have raised concerns over the degree to which RJ may represent a white or Eurocentric view of justice (Cunneen, 2003; Daly, 2002; Tauri, 2014). Daly and Stubbs (2007, p. 157) note “There are few empirical studies of how gender and other social relations (such as class, race, and age) are expressed in RJ practices,” and indeed their focus on gender—particularly where it intersects with race, ethnicity, indigenoussness, and social class—only further complicates the problem of the lack of RJ practice and research into these problems.

Problems of racism, discrimination, and overrepresentation in Western criminal justice systems are endemic. As recent events in the United States and other countries have shown, there is a widespread sense within black, Latino, indigenous, and other communities that the criminal justice system is racist in practice (i.e., policing, sentencing, and so on) and reflects in a larger sense the social stratification and marginalization of racial and ethnic minorities. The Black Lives Matter movement in the United States, which has emerged in part as a result of the continued police shootings of unarmed blacks (but more broadly as a social movement focused on addressing the systematic violence and discrimination towards blacks) speaks to the degree to which

many communities have a deeply internalized sense of marginalization and injustice. While RJ literature and research has not been silent on the *problem* of social marginalization, neither has it (with a few exceptions) looked either empirically or critically at how questions of race, gender, and social class intersect with what have traditionally been seen as “core” RJ values—victimization and victim redress, offender accountability and reintegration, and community empowerment and efficacy.

Pavlich’s (2005) critique of RJ—as on the one hand offering an alternative conceptualization of crime as “harms,” but on the other hand being beholden to state definitions of crime—is probably nowhere more relevant than in the racialized bifurcation of criminal justice. With a few exceptions, RJ theory and research in Western countries has done little in terms of conceptualizing the state as an “offender” in this regard. Yet this is not only a theoretical problem. In their research on community justice, Clear and Karp (1999) argued that community-level justice programs are likely to fail where community dimensions related to structural factors such as segregation, poverty, unemployment, and so on are not taken into account. There is little evidence that RJ practices attempt this or even give attention to this in any widespread sense. It is impossible to know without any focused empirical research on these questions, but our larger point is that given the massive amount of research done on RJ, the relative *lack* of research or focus on these questions strongly suggests it is not a priority.<sup>6</sup>

The question of the continued relevance of RJ is not one of whether or not its practices can remedy structural inequality or systematic discrimination. No criminal justice program or intervention can achieve such a task, and in terms of social reform criminal justice policies are generally poor vehicles for social transformation. The lack of attention to issues of race, gender, and social class within RJ research on its *own* practices is not an indictment of any failure to solve structural problems as much as it is a critical oversight of how social stratification and cultural differences may in turn structure social interactions within restorative processes—in terms of imbalances in social and cultural capital among participants; in terms of cultural differences in rituals of apology, accountability, and amends; and indeed in terms of who may be included or excluded from RJ as an “alternative” justice practice. It is not a coincidence that serious violent crime is socially concentrated along these trajectories, and as we argue below, the continued relevance of RJ depends significantly on whether or not it is able to encapsulate and address these more cogently within its practices.

## DISCUSSION

In this final section we note what we see as possible “futures” of RJ given its recent past and current practices. We also offer what we see as some very tentative prescriptions for the problems we have identified.

First, we see the problem of definition as one that is unlikely to change in the near future. For better, and for worse, RJ has become an appealing “brand” that is being applied to an ever-increasing scope of programs and practices. Given the ideological implosion that is occurring in the United States and elsewhere (particularly with policy makers) of the tough-on-crime policies that have dominated criminal justice over the last quarter century or more, RJ represents an attractive alternative to the vacuum left in the wake of this implosion.

Yet as an “alternative,” RJ is not currently well-poised within Western adversarial criminal justice systems, particularly in Anglophone countries, to fill this vacuum. Primarily, as noted above, most RJ practices are postadjudicative or diversionary—in essence, lacking any agency regarding the identification and investigation of crimes, the arresting of offenders, the adjudication of offenses, and so on. Until it is potentially able to do so (as was envisioned in its earlier development as a more comprehensive alternative to criminal justice practices), it is in our estimation more correct to think of RJ (as Daly has noted in this issue) as a “justice mechanism,” not as any comprehensive alternative to current justice practices. Continuing with this idea, we envision that RJ will continue to “grow,” but not necessarily expand in terms of its functions in criminal justice system practices. Rather, following recent trends, it is more likely that the term “restorative” will continue to be applied to a growing host of already existing and new innovative practices that may have noteworthy goals, but that at the core do not involve meetings between victims, offenders, and other vested parties that come together with the respective aims of redress, accountability, and the making of amends.

While definitions are likely to remain problematic, RJ practitioners and researchers have at the same time produced a significant amount of work on the problems related to the institutionalization of RJ within criminal justice systems. This research paints a picture of significant challenges facing restorative conferencing. It also provides more concrete and realistic avenues through which RJ can continue to grow, at least in terms of the quality of programs and restorative processes. As we discussed above, a number of significant studies on RJ (those beyond the use of satisfaction surveys) have found that victims in particular *do not* find restorative processes as meaningful or “victim-focused” as is frequently set forth in more idealistic accounts of RJ (Choi et al., 2012, 2013; Zernova, 2007). At the same time, these studies tend to suggest that reasons for this are not insurmountable *at* the jurisdictional or program level. In this regard, we see problems of institutionalization as far less vexing than those of definition, particularly where research suggests that smaller changes—such as adequate participant preparation (Gerkin, 2008); efficient and flexible referral processes (Laxminarayan, 2014; Zernova, 2006); rigorous convenor training and competence (Choi & Gilbert, 2010; Rossner, Bruce, & Meher, 2013; Urban et al., 2011); and postconference follow-through

or support with both victims (Maxwell et al., 2004; Morris & Maxwell, 1998; Wagland, Blanch, & Moore, 2013) and offenders (Shearar & Maxwell, 2012; Walgrave, 2011)—may have significant positive impacts for RJ conferences and outcomes. This does not mean that such problems are easily solved; institutional change is notoriously difficult. Rather we mean only that research over the past two decades in particular has set forth a fairly clear agenda on how RJ conferences and outcomes can be more readily improved for victims and offenders within institutional frameworks.

Finally, problems of displacement and relevance are two sides of the same coin. Given RJ's growth in the "shallow end" of criminal justice, often for lesser offenses or youth offenders, its role as a viable crime control policy is limited for the reason that most less-serious youth or first-time offenders tend not to reoffend, regardless of the intervention used. This does not negate the importance of RJ for victims in such cases. However, it does raise the question of why RJ is frequently assumed to be more effective or appropriate for such cases. There is some research that suggests RJ may in fact work well with more serious offenders (Hayes, 2005; Sherman, Strang, & Woods, 2000; Strang, Sherman, Mayo-Wilson, Woods, & Ariel, 2013), and it is used with more frequency for such cases in Germany and other European countries (Dünkel, Grzywa-Holten, & Horsfield, 2015; Zinsstag, Teunkens, & Pali, 2011). Given the significant amount of criminological literature that has consistently found a smaller number of more serious persistent offenders being responsible for a majority of serious offending, it is not clear why there has not been more systematic research into the ability of RJ to potentially reduce such offending.<sup>7</sup> In their systematic review of restorative conferencing, Strang et al. (2013, p. 48) noted that, "banishing RJC to low-seriousness crimes is a wasted opportunity. If governments wish to fund RJ at all, this evidence suggests that the best return on investment will be with violent crimes, and also with offenders convicted after long prior histories of convictions." If this is true (although their review limits the number of studies they consider according to several criteria), the relevance of RJ toward addressing and reducing more serious reoffending should be obvious. At the very least, it raises the question of *why* RJ is not being used or assessed more systematically for more serious offending.<sup>8</sup>

RJ's continued relevance in the 21st century also demands that its practices and theory begin to take seriously problems of social marginalization as they structure criminal justice processes and in turn impact restorative processes. The problem of race (including ethnicity and indigenouness) is paramount, but this intersects in wicked ways with problems of gender and social class. What such redress might look like is beyond the scope of this paper (although it certainly demands significant attention). However, many of the early arguments made by RJ supporters and advocates were predicated on the design of a more just and more effective system of justice—for victims, for offenders, and for communities—and on the premise that the state itself



was in significant ways complicit if not outright responsible for barriers to these goals. Over more than three decades, RJ practices have afforded victims (however imperfectly) more participation, more redress, and more agency than what existed prior—and offenders more opportunity to make amends in meaningful ways. At the same time, this has come with an eschewal of focus on structural drivers of marginalization in favor of a focus on individual harms and redress, where crime is set forth in conferences or meetings not as a social relation but merely as a violation of the social contact that must be redressed.

Yet the first 15 years of the 21st century has seen an explosion of anger and angst around the historical reconfiguration of criminal justice practices as “the new Jim Crow” (Alexander, 2012), as a new “carceral continuum” between the ghetto and the prison (Wacquant, 2001), and as a refined mechanism of colonial oppression and subjugation (Agozino, 2004; Tauri and Porou, 2014). It is thus not surprising that many new social movements are focused on the problem of criminal justice as a primary means of social segregation and social marginalization. Yet RJ research and programs are lagging behind these movements, particularly in the investigation of where restorative practices may in fact be useful in addressing these problems—or alternatively where they may contributing to them. One setting where RJ has made inroads is in its growing use in schools as a potential redress for the school-to-prison pipeline (particularly where such programs replace zero-tolerance policies that criminalize students), although as Schiff (2013) notes there has been little rigorous empirical analysis of the impacts of these programs. There are also examples of RJ programs aimed more directly at the needs of offenders and victims within minority communities, for example the Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth program, which has as one of its core goals the reduction of racial disparity in the criminal and youth justice systems. These are promising avenues where RJ has been able to conceptualize problems of state harm in ways that can be at the very least confronted *within* the scope of restorative practices. But these are exceptions, and if RJ is to remain relevant in terms of its most core goals of meaningful redress for victims, accountability and reintegration for offenders, and community involvement and cohesion in justice practices, it must begin to seriously grapple with the stratified realities of crime and criminal justice—where offending and victimization are more than the sum and effects of individual choices.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

In several ways the problems we define and prescriptions we offer are contradictory. We note the problem of the plasticity of the concept of RJ on the one hand, for example, but we argue that to remain relevant in the 21st century RJ must develop new ways of addressing problems of race, gender, and



social class within its own practices. At the same time, as we make clear, the wide diversity of what is called “restorative justice” today is in many ways disparate, if not contradictory. The primary aim of our paper is not to try to reconcile these disparities, or set a new agenda for RJ. We assume that what is called “restorative justice” will continue to expand, and with it the disparities and even contradictions of theories and practices.

This becomes problematic when the concept itself begins to become everything to everyone. In this vein, scholars such as Daly (2014) and Graham and White (2015) have suggested that a larger encompassing term, “innovative justice,” may be more appropriate as it allows for disparate goals and practices while recognizing these as distinct from or even challenging of conventional justice practices. We agree that the term “restorative justice” is being stretched to its conceptual limits. We do see innovative and potentially effective possibilities for the programs or practices we have discussed (i.e., prison programs, the ADF use of mediation, etc.) and others—each with their own aims and goals, and each with distinct groups of participants. We want to make clear that we do not disparage such innovation, nor do we dismiss it as unimportant because it does not involve a victim, an offender, and other parties in dialogue toward the restoration of and accountability of harms.

Following this, most of our identification of problems and discussion of prescriptions have at their core the implicit assumption that “restorative justice” is in fact distinct from other “innovative” practices that do not involve meetings between victims, offenders, and other vested parties. We do not say this in any attempt to provide a yet better definition of RJ, but on the contrary as a recognition that if RJ is to have any conceptual clarity or difference, then there must be some demarcation between what is and what is not “restorative justice.”

As such, our prediction is this. RJ has a future. We do not know what that is, however. It might be one where the term and its corresponding practices pancake into so many practices and meanings that as RJ continues to “grow,” it becomes ever-thinner in its differences between “nonrestorative” programs, practices, and theories of justice. This is not necessarily a negative to the degree that RJ can function as an impetus for further innovative practices, but it also very well may lead to the gradual dissolution of RJ into nothing more than a meme for victim redress, offender reintegration, or community crime-control. On the other hand, if RJ *is* to be conceptualized as a distinct set of practices involving face-to-face interactions between victims, offenders, and other parties, it must contend with problems of its increasing institutionalization, which we see as perhaps the most immediate means by which RJ can “grow” in terms of better meeting goals of victim needs and redress and offender accountability and reintegration.

The last problem, relevance, is the one that is the murkiest for us. As a viable means of crime control, RJ needs to move beyond its displacement of

other informal or low-intervention justice practices for youth or less-serious offenders into also addressing more serious offenses. For better or worse, RJ has largely taken on the gambit of reducing recidivism as a means of legitimization and relevance. This is in many ways a Faustian bargain insofar as reoffending is related to variables and contexts outside the auspices or purview of RJ practices. Nevertheless, with this gambit RJ must now more convincingly demonstrate this effectiveness or risk being dismissed by policy makers as another failed attempt at crime reduction.

In terms of relevance, RJ must also contend with and be able to speak meaningfully in practice and theory to problems of bifurcated justice, particularly along racial, ethnic, and indigenous lines. In terms of criminal justice reform, the gross inequalities that currently exist will almost certainly continue to dominate public discourse and policy debates in the near future, not only in the United States but also Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. We do not know what role, if any, RJ will have in confronting or addressing these problems. We do suggest, however, that its viability and relevance as an “alternative” justice practice predicated on the recognition and restoration of “harms” will lessen if it continues to ignore the social stratification of justice in a reflexive sense—in its own practices, in ways in which it can possibly confront these problems, and in ways in which it may be unwittingly reproducing these social relations.

## NOTES

1. We limit our discussion to Anglophone countries for two reasons. Primarily, countries such as Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States have adversarial systems of justice, as opposed to many other European countries that do not. RJ thus tends to be used as a postadjudicative practice in these countries, whereas in countries that use inquisitorial systems (i.e., Germany, Sweden, etc.) RJ may more frequently be used prior to or as part of court processes (Dünkel, Grzywa-Holten, and Horsfield, 2015). Also, Anglophone countries are generally those where RJ has had the longest and most comprehensive development and implementation.
2. See for example volume 1, issue 7 of the *Contemporary Justice Review* for a good example of debates between purists and maximalists.
3. See <http://www.defenceabusetaskforce.gov.au/Outcomes/Pages/DefenceAbuseRestorativeEngagementProgram.aspx>
4. For other research on the question of how the institutionalization of RJ may negatively impact victims, see Choi et al. (2012).
5. However, Prichard (2010) found that there was no evidence of net widening in the RJ program in Tasmania, Australia, although there was a significant increase in detention orders.
6. There are a few exceptions. Rodriguez (2005, 2007) and Baffour (2006) have looked at the efficacy of RJ programs for young Latino offenders as well as the role that ethnicity and other structural factors may have in reintegrative processes for young offenders in RJ programs.

7. There is some debate among RJ scholars and practitioners as to whether reducing reoffending should be a primary focus of RJ (c.f. Gavrielides, 2007; Robinson & Shapland, 2008; Zehr, 2002).
8. Here we do wish to note that certain categories of offending such as sexual violence and domestic violence present significant and unique problems for RJ in terms of the dynamics of meetings between victims and offenders.

## REFERENCES

- Acorn, A. E. (2004). *Compulsory compassion: A critique of restorative justice*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Aertsen, I., Daems, T., & Robert, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Institutionalizing restorative justice*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Agozino, B. (2004). Imperialism, crime and criminology: Towards the decolonisation of criminology. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 41, 343–358. doi:10.1023/B:CRIS.0000025766.99876.4c
- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Archibald, B. P., & Llewellyn, J. J. (2006). The challenges of institutionalizing comprehensive restorative justice: Theory and practice in Nova Scotia. *Dalhousie Law Journal*, 29(2), 297–343.
- Australian Defence Forces. (2014). *Restorative engagement program framework*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Baffour, T. D. (2006). Ethnic and gender differences in offending patterns: Examining family group conferencing interventions among at-risk adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 23, 557–578. doi:10.1007/s10560-006-0075-4
- Barnett, R. E. (1977). Restitution: A new paradigm of criminal justice. *Ethics*, 87(4), 279–301. doi:10.1086/292043
- Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (2005). *Juvenile justice reform and restorative justice: Building theory and policy from practice*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Bazemore, G., & Walgrave, L. (1999). Restorative juvenile justice: In search of fundamentals and an outline for systemic reform. In G. Bazemore & L. Walgrave (Eds.), *Restorative juvenile justice: Repairing the harm of youth crime* (pp. 45–74). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Blagg, H. (2001). Restorative visions in Aboriginal Australia. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 44(1), 15–16. doi:10.1080/09627250108552897
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, J., & Roche, D. (2001). Responsibility and restorative justice. In G. Bazemore & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative community justice: Repairing harm and transforming communities* (pp. 63–84). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Campbell, C., Devlin, R., O'Mahony, D., Doak, J., Jackson, J., Corrigan, T., & Mcevoy, K. (2006). *Evaluation of the Northern Ireland youth conference service*. Belfast, Ireland: Northern Ireland Office.
- Chiste, K. B. (2013). The origins of modern restorative justice: Five examples from the English-speaking world. *University of British Columbia Law Review*, 46(1), 33–80.

- Choi, J. J., Bazemore, G., & Gilbert, M. J. (2012). Review of research on victims' experiences in restorative justice: Implications for youth justice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 35–42. doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.08.011
- Choi, J. J., & Gilbert, M. J. (2010). "Joe everyday, people off the street": A qualitative study on mediators' roles and skills in victim-offender mediation. *Contemporary Justice Review, 13*, 207–227. doi:10.1080/10282581003748305
- Choi, J. J., Gilbert, M. J., & Green, D. L. (2013). Patterns of victim marginalization in victim-offender mediation: Some lessons learned. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 59*(1), 113–132. doi:10.1007/s10611-012-9382-1
- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology, 17*, 1–15.
- Clairmont, D., & Kim, E. (2013). Getting past the gatekeepers: The reception of restorative justice in the Nova Scotian criminal justice system. *Dalhousie Law Journal, 36*(2), 359–391.
- Clear, T. R., & Karp, D. R. (1999). *The community justice ideal: Preventing crime and achieving justice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Consedine, J., & Bowen, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Restorative justice: Contemporary themes and practice*. Lyttelton, New Zealand: Ploughshares Publications.
- Crawford, A., & Newburn, T. (2002). Recent developments in restorative justice for young people in England and Wales. *British Journal of Criminology, 42*(3), 476–495. doi:10.1093/bjc/42.3.476
- Cunneen, C. (1997). Community conferencing and the fiction of indigenous control. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 30*(3), 292–311. doi:10.1177/000486589703000306
- Cunneen, C. (2003). Thinking critically about restorative justice. In E. McLaughlin, R. Fergusson, G. Hughes, & L. Westmarland (Eds.), *Restorative justice: Critical issues* (pp. 182–194). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Daly, K. (2000). Restorative justice in diverse and unequal societies. *Law in Context, 17*(1), 167–190.
- Daly, K. (2002). Restorative justice: The real story. *Punishment & Society, 4*, 55–79. doi:10.1177/14624740222228464
- Daly, K. (2006). The limits of restorative justice. In D. Sullivan & L. Tift (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice: A global perspective* (pp. 134–146). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Daly, K. (2013). The punishment debate in restorative justice. In J. Simon & R. Sparks (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of punishment and society* (pp. 356–374). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Daly, K. (2014). Reconceptualising sexual victimization and justice. In I. Vanfraechem, A. Pemberton, & F. M. Ndahinda (Eds.), *Justice for victims: Perspectives on rights, transition and reconciliation* (pp. 378–395). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Daly, K. (2016). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders, 11*(1). doi:10.1080/15564886.2015.1107797
- Daly, K., & Proietti-Scifoni, G. (2011). Reparation and restoration. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of crime and criminal justice* (pp. 207–253). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Daly, K., & Stubbs, J. (2007). Feminist theory, feminist and anti-racist politics, and restorative justice. In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice* (pp. 149–170). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Dhami, M. K., Mantle, G., & Fox, D. (2009). Restorative justice in prisons. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 12(4), 433–448. doi:10.1080/10282580903343027
- Doak, J., & O'Mahony, D. (2006). The vengeful victim? Assessing the attitudes of victims participating in restorative youth conferencing. *International Review of Victimology*, 13, 157–177. doi:10.1177/026975800601300202
- Düinkel, F., Grzywa-Holten, J., & Horsfield, P. (Eds.). (2015). *Restorative justice and mediation in penal matters: A stocktaking of legal issues, implementation strategies and outcomes in 36 European countries*. Mönchengladbach, Germany: Forum Verlag Godesberg.
- Düinkel, F., Grzywa-Holten, J., Horsfield, P., & Păroşanu, A. (2015). Restorative justice and juvenile offenders in Europe: Comparative overview. In F. Düinkel, P. Horsfield, & A. Păroşanu (Eds.), *European research on restorative justice: Vol. 1. Research and selection of the most effective juvenile restorative justice practices in Europe—Snapshots from 28 EU member states* (pp. 175–251). Brussels, Belgium: International Juvenile Justice Observatory.
- Düinkel, F., Horsfield, P., & Păroşanu, A. (2015). Introduction. In F. Düinkel, P. Horsfield, & A. Păroşanu (Eds.), *European research on restorative justice: Vol. 1. Research and selection of the most effective juvenile restorative justice practices in Europe—Snapshots from 28 EU member states* (pp. 3–17). Brussels, Belgium: International Juvenile Justice Observatory.
- Dzur, A. W. (2003). Civic implications of restorative justice theory: Citizen participation and criminal justice policy. *Policy Sciences*, 36(3), 279–306. doi:10.1023/B:OLIC.0000017480.70664.0c
- Edgar, K., & Newell, T. (2006). *Restorative justice in prisons: A guide to making it happen*. Winchester, UK: Waterside Press.
- Eglash, A. (1977). Beyond restitution: Creative restitution. In J. Hudson & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Restitution in criminal justice: A critical assessment of sanctions* (pp. 91–100). Lexington, MA: DC Health and Company.
- Elliott, L. (2007). Security, without care: Challenges for restorative values in prison. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 10(2), 193–208. doi:10.1080/10282580701372079
- Fattah, E. (2004). Gearing justice action to victim satisfaction: Contrasting two justice philosophies—Retribution and redress. In H. Kaptein & M. Malsch (Eds.), *Crime, victims, and justice: Essays on principles and practice* (pp. 16–30). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Gavrielides, T. (2007). *Restorative justice theory and practice: Addressing the discrepancy*. Helsinki, Finland: HEUNI Publications.
- Gavrielides, T. (2011). *Restorative justice and the secure estate: Alternatives for young people in custody*. London, UK: IARS Publications.
- Gavrielides, T. (2014). Bringing race relations into the restorative justice debate: An alternative and personalized vision of “the other.” *Journal of Black Studies*, 45(3), 216–246. doi:10.1177/0021934714526042
- Gerkin, P. M. (2008). Participation in victim-offender mediation: Lessons learned from observations. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34, 226–247. doi:10.1177/0734016808325058

- Graham, H., & White, R. (2015). *Innovative justice*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Gray, P., & Wright, S. (2011). Restorative practice in prisons: Assessing the impact of the demise of the inside out trust. *Prison Service Journal*, 194(March) 33–37.
- Hayes, H. (2005). Assessing reoffending in restorative justice conferences. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 38, 77–101. doi:10.1375/acri.38.1.77
- Hill, R. F. A. (2002). Restorative justice and the absent victim: New data from the Thames Valley. *International Review of Victimology*, 9(3), 273–288. doi:10.1177/026975800200900303
- Hoyle, C. (2002). Securing restorative justice for the “non-participating” victim. In C. Hoyle & R. Young (Eds.), *New visions of crime victims* (pp. 97–132). Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.
- Hoyle, C. (2008). Restorative justice, victims and the police. In T. Newburn (Ed.), *Handbook of policing* (2nd ed., pp. 794–823). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Hoyle, C., & Rosenblatt, F. F. (2016). Looking back to the future: Threats to the success of restorative justice in the United Kingdom. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(1). doi:10.1080/15564886.2015.1095830
- Hoyle, C., & Young, R. (2002). Restorative justice: Assessing the prospects and pitfalls. In M. McConville & G. Wilson (Eds.), *The handbook of the criminal justice process* (pp. 525–548). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hoyle, C., Young, R., & Hill, R. (2002). *Proceed with caution: An evaluation of the Thames Valley police initiative in restorative cautioning*. York, UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hudson, B. (2002). Restorative justice and gendered violence: Diversion or effective justice? *British Journal of Criminology*, 42, 616–634. doi:10.1093/bjc/42.3.616
- Hudson, B. (2007). The institutionalization of restorative justice: Justice and the ethics of discourse. In E. Van Der Spuy, S. Parmentier, & A. Dissel (Eds.), *Restorative justice: Politics, policies and prospects* (pp. 56–72). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta and Co. Ltd.
- Hurley, M. H. (2009). Restorative practices in institutional settings and at release: Victim wrap around programs. *Federal Probation*, 73(1), 16–22.
- Jantzi, V. (2004). What is the role of the state in restorative justice programs? In H. Zehr & B. Toews (Eds.), *Critical issues in restorative justice* (pp. 189–202). Boulder, CO: Criminal Justice Press.
- Jones, G., & Creaney, S. (2015). Incentive for insincerity—Presentence restorative justice: In whose interests? *Safer Communities*, 14(3), 126–137. doi:10.1108/SC-05-2015-0018
- Joudo-Larsen, J. (2014). *Restorative justice in the Australian criminal justice system*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Karp, D. R. (2001). Harm and repair: Observing restorative justice in Vermont. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 727–757. doi:10.1080/07418820100095081
- Kelly, L. (2002). Using restorative justice principles to address family violence in aboriginal communities. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative justice and family violence* (pp. 206–222). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Laxminarayan, M. (2014). *Accessibility and initiation of restorative justice*. Leuven, Belgium: European Forum for Restorative Justice.



- Liebmann, M. (2007). *Restorative justice: How it works*. Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lovell, M. L., Helfgott, J. B., & Lawrence, C. F. (2002). Narrative accounts from the citizens, victims, and offenders restoring justice program. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 5, 261–272. doi:10.1080/10282580213088
- MacRae, A., & Zehr, H. (2004). *The little book of family group conferences: New Zealand style*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Marshall, T. F. (1999). *Restorative justice: An overview*. London, UK: Home Office, Research Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Maruna, S. (2011). Lessons for justice reinvestment from restorative justice and the justice model experience: Some tips for an 8-year-old prodigy. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 10, 661–669. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2011.00752.x
- Maxwell, G. (2013). Restorative and diversionary responses to youth offending in New Zealand. In K. S. Van Wormer & L. Walker (Eds.), *Restorative justice today: Practical applications* (pp. 103–112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maxwell, G., Kingi, V., Robertson, J., Morris, A., Cunningham, C., & Lash, B. (2004). *Achieving effective outcomes in youth justice final report*. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Social Development.
- McCold, P. (2000). Toward a holistic vision of restorative juvenile justice: A reply to the maximalist model. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 3, 357–414.
- Miller, S. L. (2011). *After the crime: The power of restorative justice dialogues between victims and violent offenders*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Morris, A., & Maxwell, G. (1998). Restorative justice in New Zealand: Family group conferences as a case study. *Western Criminology Review*, 1. [Online]. Available: <http://www.westerncriminology.org/documents/WCR/v01n1/Morris/Morris.html>
- Moyle, P., & Tauri, J. (2016). Māori, family group conferencing and the mystifications of restorative justice. *Victims & Offenders* 11(1).
- O'Mahony, D., & Doak, J. (2009). Restorative justice and police-led cautioning practice: Tensions in theory and practice. In L. G. Moor, T. Peters, P. Ponsaers, J. Shapland, & B. Van Stokkom (Eds.), *Restorative policing* (pp. 139–158). Antwerpen, Belgium: Cahiers Politiestudies.
- Pavlich, G. C. (2005). *Governing paradoxes of restorative justice*. London, UK: GlassHouse Press.
- Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Prichard, J. (2010). Net-widening and the diversion of young people from court: A longitudinal analysis with implications for restorative justice. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 43, 112–129. doi:10.1375/acri.43.1.112
- Prison Fellowship Australia. (n.d.). *Sycamore tree project*. Retrieved from <http://www.prisonfellowship.org.au/sycamoretree>
- Richards, K. (2010). Police-referred restorative justice for juveniles in Australia. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 398, 1–8.
- Robinson, G., & Shapland, J. (2008). Reducing recidivism: A task for restorative justice? *British Journal of Criminology*, 48(3), 337–358. doi:10.1093/bjc/azn002



- Rodriguez, N. (2005). Restorative justice, communities, and delinquency: Whom do we reintegrate? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4, 103–130. doi:10.1111/cpp.2005.4.issue-1
- Rodriguez, N. (2007). Restorative justice at work: Examining the impact of restorative justice resolutions on juvenile recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53, 355–379. doi:10.1177/0011128705285983
- Rossner, M., Bruce, J., & Meher, M. (2013). *The process and dynamics of restorative justice: Research on forum sentencing*. Sydney, Australia: University of Western Sydney.
- Ruggiero, V. (2011). An abolitionist view of restorative justice. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 39(2), 100–110. doi:10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2011.03.001
- Schiff, M. (2013, January). *Dignity, disparity and desistance: Effective restorative justice strategies to plug the “school-to-prison pipeline.”* Paper presented at the Center for Civil Rights Remedies National Conference, Washington, DC.
- Shapland, J. (2003). Restorative justice and criminal justice: Just responses to crime? In A. Von Hirsch, J. Roberts, A. E. Bottoms, K. Roach, & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative justice and criminal justice: Competing or reconcilable paradigms?* (pp. 195–218). Portland, OR: Hart Publishing.
- Shapland, J. (2014). Implications of growth: Challenges for restorative justice. *International Review of Victimology*, 20(1), 111–127. doi:10.1177/0269758013510808
- Shapland, J., Robinson, G., & Sorsby, A. (2011). *Restorative justice in practice: Evaluating what works for victims and offenders*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Shearar, A., & Maxwell, G. (2012). Revolution, decline, and renewal: Restorative youth justice in New Zealand. In E. Zinsstag & I. Vangraechem (Eds.), *Conferencing and restorative justice: International practices and perspectives* (pp. 101–116). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2007). *Restorative justice: The evidence*. London, UK: Smith Institute.
- Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., & Woods, D. J. (2000). *Recidivism patterns in the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE)*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Skelton, A., & Frank, C. (2004). How does restorative justice address human rights and due process issues? In H. Zehr & B. Toews (Eds.), *Critical issues in restorative justice* (pp. 203–214). Boulder, CO: Criminal Justice Press.
- Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). *Restorative justice conferencing (RJC) using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on offender recidivism and victim satisfaction—A systematic review*. Oslo, Norway: The Campbell Collaboration.
- Stubbs, J. (2014). Gendered violence and restorative justice. In A. Hayden, L. Gelsthorpe, V. Kingi, & A. Morris (Eds.), *A restorative approach to family violence: Changing track* (pp. 199–210). Surrey, Canada: Ashgate.
- Swanson, C. (2010). *Restorative justice in a prison community: Or everything I didn't learn in kindergarten I learned in prison* (Vol. 47). Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
- Tauri, J. (2009). An indigenous perspective on the standardization of restorative justice in New Zealand and Canada. *Indigenous Policy Journal*, 20(3), 1–24.

- Tauri, J. (2014). An indigenous commentary on the globalization of restorative justice. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 12(2), 35–55.
- Tauri, J., and Porou, N. (2014). Criminal justice as a colonial project in contemporary settler-colonialism. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*, 8(1), 20.
- Thorburn, M. (2005). The impossible dreams and modest reality of restorative justice. *Queen's Law Journal*, 30(2), 863–938.
- Umbreit, M. S. (1995). *Mediating interpersonal conflicts: A pathway to peace*. West Concord, MN: CPI Publishing.
- Umbreit, M. S. (1998). Restorative justice through victim-offender mediation: A multi-site assessment. *Western Criminology Review*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.westerncriminology.org/documents/WCR/v01n01/Umbreit/umbreit.html>
- Umbreit, M. S., Bradshaw, W., & Coates, R. B. (2003). Victims in severe violence in dialogue with the offender: Key principles, practices, outcomes and implications. In E. G. M. Weitekamp & H.-J. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative justice in context: International practice and directions* (pp. 123–144). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2004). Victim-offender mediation: Three decades of practice and research. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22, 279–303. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1541-1508
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2007). Restorative justice dialogue: A multi-dimensional, evidence-based practice theory. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 10, 23–41. doi:10.1080/10282580601157521
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2008). The practice of victim offender mediation: A look at the evidence. In S. G. Shoham, O. Beck, & M. Kett (Eds.), *International handbook of penology and criminal justice* (pp. 691–708). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Urban, L. S., Markway, J., & Crockett, K. (2011). Evaluating victim-offender dialogue (VOD) for serious cases using Umbreit's 2001 handbook: A case study. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 29(1), 3–23. doi:10.1002/crq.21034
- Wacquant, L. (2001). Deadly symbiosis: When ghetto and prison meet and mesh. *Punishment & Society*, 3(1), 95–133. doi:10.1177/14624740122228276
- Wagland, P., Blanch, B., & Moore, E. (2013). Participant satisfaction with youth justice conferencing. *Contemporary Issues in Crime and Justice*, 170, 1–15.
- Walgrave, L. (1995). Restorative justice for juveniles: Just a technique or a fully fledged alternative? *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(3), 228–249. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2311.1995.tb00841.x
- Walgrave, L. (2004). Restoration in youth justice. *Crime & Justice*, 31, 543–597. doi:10.1086/655348
- Walgrave, L. (2008). Restorative justice: An alternative for responding to crime? In S. G. Shoham, O. Beck, & M. Kett (Eds.), *International handbook of penology and criminal justice* (pp. 613–689). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Walgrave, L. (2011). Investigating the potentials of restorative justice practice. *Journal of Law & Policy*, 36, 91–139.
- Wood, W. R. (2012). Correcting community service: From work crews to community work in a juvenile court. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(5), 684–711. doi:10.1080/07418825.2011.576688
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

- Zehr, H. (1995). Justice paradigm shift? Values and visions in the reform process. *Mediation Quarterly*, 12, 207–217. doi:10.1002/crq.3900120303
- Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Zernova, M. (2006). Working under the aegis of the criminal justice system: Implications for restorative justice practice. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 4, 67–79.
- Zernova, M. (2007). *Restorative justice: Ideals and realities*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Zinsstag, E. (2012). Conferencing: A developing practice of restorative justice. In E. Zinsstag & I. Vangraechem (Eds.), *Conferencing and restorative justice: International practices and perspectives* (pp. 11–32). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Zinsstag, E., Teunkens, M., & Pali, B. (2011). *Conferencing: A way forward for restorative justice in Europe*. Leuven, Belgium: European Forum for Restorative Justice.