University of HUDDERSFIELD
Inspiring tomorrow's professionals

Restorative Justice: What are Restorative Justice Strategies for Community Interventions?

Tracey Reynolds

A thesis submitted for the Degree of MSc (by Research)

The University of Huddersfield

September 2019

Copyright statement

Abstract

With the rise of a victim focussed agenda, what is noted to be an influential development in recent years, within the Criminal Justice System (CJS), is the use of Restorative Justice (RJ) (Dignan & Maguire, 2005).

The study had two interrelated aims:

1. To explore ways in which communities could be strengthened with the use of Restorative Justice (RJ), whilst also investigating.

2. If community RJ improves the life chances/ well-being, of individual members of the public. (Dignan & Maguire, 2005).

To meet the aims, the study investigated what level of RJ Strategies are currently in practice to build, or restore, understandings of different cultures and beliefs, within communities, with an aim of providing harmony and peace among residents.

The aims were addressed by examining differences of opinion between individual members of society who have partaken in the RJ process as, either a victim of crime or an offender, together with the opinions of individuals representing institutions such as South Yorkshire Police and RJ services. Interviews were conducted using ten participants, four represented institutions who deliver RJ, three had been a victim of crime and three were ex-offenders, who had been RJ service users (Participant table included in Appendix 8)

The researcher chose thematic analysis to transcribe collected data and concludes that the findings support much existing data around the use of RJ. However, the study found that although RJ is a contemporary way of thinking, and many strategies are in place to strengthen Communities and improve life chances, limitations and some concerns exist. Public awareness and Education were two of the four themes found within this study which could prove problematic within the field of RJ. Findings revealed, there is a lack of understanding of RJ from the public. Education proved to be of concern both from an academic education, which links in with offending behaviour, together with a lack of education on RJ services.

The two other themes, which arose during transcript, were Life chances and Victim focus, the latter echoes existing data, however, limitations around victim recruitment of services were found to

be problematic. Results showed a positive change in lifestyle choices from individuals who participated in RJ services.

Contents

Chapter 1

Chapter 2 - Review of existing literature

Chapter 3 – Research Methodology

Chapter 4 - Findings

Chapter 5 – Conclusion

Chapter 6 - Bibliography

Appendices

Acknowledgements

I wish to convey my heartfelt appreciation to my friends and family who have fully supported and encouraged me wholeheartedly during my studies. I especially wish to thank my mum, Christine Monteux and my partner Peter Voss who have offered me encouragement throughout. Moreover, I would like to give an extra big thankyou to my children Chloe, Shannon, Laura and Rickie for their patience, and understanding, when I had targets to meet.

I give great thanks to my personal tutor Dr Jamie Halsall, and second personal tutor Dr Carla Reeves for all their help and support while writing my thesis. I thank both Jamie and Carla for their advice and constructive criticism while pushing me to meet deadlines. I feel I could not have completed my thesis without the valuable help and support of all the above named.

In addition, this thesis would not have taken place without the help of all participants to who I express deep gratitude.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 - Thesis Aims and Objectives

The study had two interrelated aims:

1.This study aimed to explore ways in which communities could be strengthened with the use of Restorative Justice (RJ), whilst also investigating.

2. If indeed, community RJ improves the life chances/ well-being, of individual members of the public.

It is vital to acquire a good understanding of RJ, as a positive progression within the Criminal Justice System (CJS), as this theory is noted to be increasingly more practiced in contemporary society (Daly, 2002). RJ addresses juvenile as well as adult matters, while also within some civil matters which include: the welfare of families and child protection. In addition, RJ practices are proving more popular in mainstream schools, and increasingly within workplace settings, with an aim of resolving non-criminal disputes (Daly, 2002). Furthermore, the study aimed to discover what RJ strategies are in place in which RJ can improve life chances. By the term life chances the study relates to positive changes individuals can make to improve their wellbeing. This could be a combination of things one can do for themselves, along with opportunities society can offer individuals, together with opportunities for individuals to gain access to resources. In the case of offender's, life chances are also referred to as a positive effect on rehabilitation to enable a life without re-offending.

The aims were achieved by examining contemporary debates on communities in the United Kingdom whilst assessing, to what degree, RJ influences community involvement, which could lead to greater life chances. It is noted that the participants, within this study, resided in the county of South Yorkshire, with all participants, who were either ex-offenders, or victims, residing in the town of Barnsley, which research suggests is known for many deprived areas (Research and Business Intelligence, 2015). Overall, Barnsley is ranked the 39th most deprived area in England, out of 326 local authorities, (where 1 is the most deprived), (Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015).

Therefore, to meet the aims of the study, it was vital to include existing literature based around deprivation, within these communities, in order to explore access, together with limitations to RJ services, which will be provided in 2.2.1- South Yorkshire town of Barnsley.

The Ministry of Justice (2018), outlines that there are weaknesses, within the CJS, in the ability to reduce reoffending rates, which show a 0.1 percentage point's increase, from July 2016 to September 2016. Over time, the rate has fluctuated between 29% and 32%. (Ministry of Justice, 2018). Moreover, the Offender management statistics (2018) show that the prison population rose by 77% in the last three decades (Ministry of Justice, 2018). Furthermore, studies show that crime has huge impacts on victims which can be not only physically, but also mentally, or both. A recent Office for National Statistics (ONS), reported by Victim Support, (2017), show that 81% of victims, who suffered violence, had reported being affected emotionally by their experience.

The aims of the study were addressed by examining the differing opinions of individual members of society, who have partaken in the RJ process as, either a victim of crime, or an offender, together with the opinions of individuals representing institutions such as South Yorkshire Police and RJ services. Semi-structured interviews were used as the researcher felt it was the most appropriate for the subject matter of social sciences. This method is noted to be the basis of qualitative research which provides clear instructions for the researcher, whilst providing reliable comparable data (Cohen, & Crabtree, 2006).

Moreover, this approach was the most appropriate to this study as it is noted to be the best suited to social reality when explaining the experiences lived by people, whilst exploring attitudes, behaviours and experiences of the social world, which links closely to RJ within communities, (Dawson, 2009). Semi-structured interviews were relevant to the subject matter of RJ practices, together with community cohesion, as this way provided participants the opportunity to explore issues they felt were important.

Interviews were conducted using ten participants, four represented institutions who deliver RJ services, and three had been a victim of crime, while three were ex-offenders, who had been RJ service users (Participant table included in Appendix 8). These opinions were analysed and compared to existing literature with an aim of providing a full understanding of how RJ can influence community involvement. This was achieved by assessing what interventions are in place within deprived areas, as well as what strategies can be improved, within RJ, as a future way forward.

It was important to examine contemporary debates on the sociology of community in the UK, together with debates about community cohesion to provide a critical examination of any differences in opinions, within existing literature, in relation to RJ as a positive way of moving forward within the CJS, and communities. A full literature review is provided which includes debates on contemporary Community Restorative approaches.

1.2 – Defining Restorative Justice

One of RJs key principles is to look at crime as a disagreement between individual people, rather than a disagreement between an offender and society, while outlining the importance of the offender repairing any harm they caused (Mantle, Fox & Mandeep, 2005). Furthermore, the ethos, as noted by Dr. Theo Gavrielides, (2018:139) states:

> "Restorative Justice is an ethos with practical goals, among which is to restore harm by including affected parties in a (direct or indirect) encounter and a process of understanding through voluntary and honest dialogue. Restorative Justice adopts a fresh approach to conflicts and their control, retaining at the same time certain rehabilitative goals".

RJ aims are to bring people, who have been harmed by crime, or conflict, together with the people who have caused the harm, to explore positive ways of moving forward for all concerned. (The Home Office, 2015). RJ is noted to provide opportunities for victims to be heard while having a say in any resolutions of an offence. In addition, RJ also aims to provide offenders with a chance to make amends for their offending behaviour whilst facing the consequences of their actions, which could be achieved by: an apology, financial payments towards the victim, or unpaid work (Umbreit, 1995).

RJ addresses juvenile as well as adult matters, while also practiced in range of civil matters including child protection along with family welfare. In addition, RJ practices are also proving more popular in mainstream schools, while increasingly more used within the workplace, providing a way to resolve non-criminal disputes (Daly, 2002).

In the 2012-2013 RJ annual action plans, published by The Ministry of Justice, explains their aims are for:

> "Good quality, victim-focused Restorative Justice (RJ) to be available throughout any stage of the CJS in England and Wales." (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016, p1).

The stages can combine with out of court disposals, or engaging in RJ during a prison sentence. Furthermore, to measure success in reaching the Ministry of Justice's vision, an action plan was provided, which has the following three main objectives:

"1. Equal access: which ensures that RJ is available to victims at all stages of the CJS, irrespective of: whether the offender in the case is an adult or a young person;

2. Awareness and understanding: to raise awareness of RJ and its potential benefits and ensure a consistent understanding of what RJ entails and its place in the CJS (messages to reach key target groups including victims, offenders, criminal justice policy developers, leaders and practitioners, the media and the general public); and to work with PCC's (Police Crime Commissioners), NPS (National Probation Service), YJB (Youth Justice Board) and prisons to ensure that local mechanisms are in place so that victims and offenders know how to access RJ and can make informed decisions about participating in RJ.

3. Good Quality: to ensure RJ is safe, competent (in line with the EU directive on victims' rights), focused on the needs of the victim and delivered by a facilitator, trained to recognised standards, so that it only takes place where an assessment by the facilitator indicates that this would be an appropriate course of action for all relevant parties" (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016. p1).

Existing literature claims that RJ provides benefits for victims, by giving them a voice, while providing potential closure, together with benefits to offenders in discouraging reoffending. A recent case study where the victim: Gareth Thomas, chose RJ, rather than pressing charges against his attacker, which may have resulted in his case going through the CJS, spoke up publicly on November 17th, 2018 (Fessler, 2018). Thomas was attacked in his home city of Cardiff, by a 16-year-old boy, in what is being called, by officials, a homophobic hate crime. Thomas requested that he engage in RJ on the same evening pressing charges against the teenager. During the restorative process, Thomas disclosed that the boy apologised for his actions, leaving Thomas wanting to turn his experience into a positive. When asked why he chose RJ Thomas stated:

> "Why I want it to be positive is because I want to say thank you to the police who were involved, and were very helpful, and allowed me to do Restorative Justice with the people who did this, because I thought they could learn more that way than any other way." (Fessler, 2018).

A report by Professor Sherman, (2008) of the University of Sheffield, shows that reconviction rates are cut by an average of 27% following RJ. These finding support independent evaluations of seven Cambridge University-led experiments in RJ, which the report estimates that, costs to the CJS, and victims are saved by £9 for every £1 spent on RJ conferences (Sherman, 2008). Professor Joanna Shapland, who presented the report, on Evidence-Based Policing, to the Cambridge Conference on Evidence-Based Policing stated:

> "While the experiments did not show that offenders receiving restorative justice were more likely to stop offending completely, we found that offenders committed less crime overall because they slowed down their rate of offending and reduced the overall cost of the crimes they committed". (Professor Sherman, 2008. P2).

1.2- Structure of Thesis

To meet the aims of the study, the theoretical approach taken by the researcher was humanistic as it is known for its emphasis of the individual's self-worth (Umbreit, 1997). The term: humanistic, often known as: humanism or humanist, is noted to be Psychology terminology which relates to an approach which studies individuals, allowing the uniqueness of everyone to be addressed (McLeod, 2015), whilst focusing on the human capacity to overcome hardship, pain and despair, which strongly links to the ethos of RJ practices.
RJ Approaches build upon the values/ principles of the humanistic approach as they are known for their broader culture or ethos, identifying relationships with respect, (Umbreit, 1997), which provides the justification for its use within this study. Furthermore, previous RJ studies are known to have often linked humanistic mediation practices, providing support for this theory. It is suggested that this approach offers a journey of peace making, while also notes to be grounded in compassion, common humanity as well as strength. (Umbreit, 1997).
To best comprehend RJ practices, meeting the aims of the study, a detailed review of existing literature surrounding RJ was important. Chapter two outlines the Sociology of Community, together with deprivation in the South Yorkshire town of Barnsley. This chapter includes existing literature around Community Cohesion, followed by the origins of RJ, together with the Key aims/ strategies used within Community Restorative approaches.
After completion of a full literature review, the researcher assessed the research design, along with the methodology, together with the chosen data collection technique, participants, data analysis together with ethical considerations. After data collection, thematic analysis was chosen to transcribe the data into themes, which is explained in chapter four. The overall findings will be explained in chapter five, together with the studies limitations, concluding with suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

Review of existing literature

2.1 – Introduction

It is important to gain a good appreciation of the sociology of community by examining how the concepts have developed overtime. An overview of the definition of community, together with contemporary debates will be included within this chapter. Moreover, to answer the research aims, which ask how RJ practices can improve local communities, it is important to outline issues surrounding community cohesion, which are seen as an important aspect of a community, as it helps people get along together in their local area. In addition, it is also important to include literature surrounding the South Yorkshire town of Barnsley, which includes many deprived areas (Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015), as all participants resided in, or around, this town.

To acquire a good understanding of RJ practices, together with an accepted definition, existing literature, centred on RJ, is outlined within this chapter. Considered as a contemporary theory within the CJS, the chapter will explain the origins of RJ, noting that although RJ has been around for many years, it is suggested to be "an old idea with a new name" (Chiste, 2013:34). Furthermore, current practices, such as face to face meetings between victims, along with their offenders. The aims, along with, the values, of RJ will also be outlined.

To conclude this chapter, it is relevant for the use of community restorative approaches to be investigated, as used within communities, RJ approaches are said to help keep many individuals, away from the CJS by aiding them to face disputes in a different, positive way.

2.2 - Sociology of Community

Humans are social beings who require the companionship, as well as, support of others throughout the course of their life, with suggestions that social cooperation has played an essential part as human survival as a species (Bruhn, 2011).

There is considerable existing literature on community studies from a range of disciplines such as Sociology, Criminology and Town planning, indicating that the perception of community needs to be broken down into several different themes. It could be argued that increased emphasis on community collaboration indicates the need for consensus regarding the definition of community (Macqueen, 2001). It is noted that community is often seen as an out-dated concept in comparison to a modern western society, which increasingly emphasises individual freedom together with private, rather than public, worlds.

Furthermore, it is argued that there is no single agreed-upon definition of community; however, community generally implies relationships between groups of people in certain geographical areas, or people who are considered as a unit because of their common interests, social group or nationality (Bruhn, 2011). Moreover, the definition of community, provided by Park, (1967:115), cited in: Halsall, (2014), is as follows:

> "The simplest possible description of a community is this: a collection of people occupying a, more or less, clearly defined area. But a community is more than that, a community is not only a collection of people, but it is a collective of institutions. Not people, but institutions, are final and decisive in distinguishing the community from other social constellations".

In relation to community of place (often known as local community), it is likely that people know each other, either by sight or through mutual connections, which indicates that this could be a much denser network of members (Miller, 2011).

Sociologists are interested in examining how resources are distributed within Society, with suggestions that the declining influence of social class, together with the processes of class reproduction, remain important. In addition, it is noted that opportunities available to people are still influenced largely by their social class positions (Shildrick & Rucell, 2015), which is the rational for this study, as the aims are to investigate to what extent RJ strategies can improve

community cohesion in the Barnsley area of South Yorkshire. Studies suggest that communities have changed over recent decades, often becoming disconnected, with suggestions that communities have, overtime, become less fixed and more flowing (Phillipson, 2012).

The notion of a culture which is both working-class, as well as, community-based, has prompted numerous studies, with the examination of how communities are changing. For example: the pride of the working-class community is noted to have been ground down (Phillipson, 2012). The working-class identity was something which was important to people's community lives, giving a feeling of self-worth and belonging, whilst providing solidarity with others. However, it is suggested that their identity is regarded as one to be left behind, as the old bonds between communities, which arose from shared workplaces, together with social housing, are also noted to have been broken over the past three decades (Phillipson, 2012). Suggestions have been made that communities with low social capital tend to be less trustworthy or cooperative (Handel, 2016). Neighbours do not feel as connected with one another, while also appearing to be more sceptical of each other, also citizens are less active in their schools, churches, and government institutions, sometimes choosing to not participate in them at all (Handel, 2016).

However, in contrast, studies by Social Psychologists, suggest that, when compared to high social class individuals, people who have less give more (Dholakia, 2017). In one paper their studies show that participants, with low social class, were more generous, believing they should give more of their annual income to charity (4.95 percent vs. 2.95 percent). They were also more likely to trust strangers while showing more helping behaviour towards someone in distress. Furthermore, other research has found that higher social class individuals are more unethical (Dholakia, 2017).

It is argued that the sense of community has declined over the past few decades with suggestions raised that segregation in residents is the most distinguished form of inequality in urban areas (Low, 2003). With the rise of gated communities (developments with gates, walls, guards together with other forms of surveillance) studies reveal clear links between the processes of gating and residential segregation (Low, 2003), However, discussions on community' along with the 'sense of community' has raised the question of whether or not the gated increase is due to the decline of community' as suggestions are that: gated communities are places of seclusion, having the same territory, which have led to increased segregation. In addition, studies of housing trends reveal that a building number of people are seeking to escape

the complex modern urban areas in favour of communities where people have social characteristics like their own (Low, 2003), resulting in private spaces becoming the same kind of places.

It is suggested also that gated communities create physical barriers to public access, whilst privatizing what should be city public areas, which consequently lead to the loss of public life whilst creating fragmentation of space within society (Roitman, 2010). Nonetheless, in contrast it is also argued that gated communities are places that encourage a sense of community (Roitman, 2010). For example: Studies claim that it creates a sense of togetherness and tight-knit communities while providing a pleasant private, safe, environment among their residence (Shawish, no date). It is argued however, that living in gated communities could indeed create fear of the unknown quantities of social contact (Atkinson, & Blandy, 2008). In addition, actual crime rates and perceived safety have been found to show no difference between gated communities and none gated. Research has suggested that a sense of community was indeed higher in non-gated communities (Atkinson, & Blandy, 2008).

Community studies conclude that neighbourhoods are still important, especially among those with the least resources, suggesting that spatial concentration of deprived areas is an important aspect of social exclusion (Miller, 2011). Furthermore, literature suggests that local neighbourhood conditions have major, unwelcome, results for schooling or employment prospects, observing that income inequality exerts strong, systematic effects, resulting in fewer opportunities for young people (Child Poverty Action Group, 2017). For example: it is noted that children from low income families often feel segregated from more advantaged children as many misses out on expensive school trips. In addition, many children suffer social exclusion as they cannot afford to invite friends home for tea due to lack of funding (Child Poverty Action Group, 2017). However, it could be argued not everyone living in a deprived neighbourhood will be deprived, noting that, many deprived people live in non-deprived areas, although, a concentration of deprived people in a particular neighbourhood means that area is more likely to be deprived (Race Disparity Unit, 2018).

2.2.1- South Yorkshire town of Barnsley

Barnsley, with a population of 245,200, is ranked the 39th most deprived area in England, out of 326 local authorities, (where 1 is the most deprived), (Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Literature suggests that the town is relatively deprived in education, skills & training, employment, health/ disability, together with, income. However, studies suggest that, in comparison to the other local authorities in England, Barnsley is relatively less deprived for living environment, including barriers to housing & services (Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015).
There is no singular definition for area deprivation, although it is noted to be a frequently used concept, however, Anderson et al (1997) suggests that area deprivation:

> "May summarise an area's potential for health risk from ecological concentration of poverty, unemployment, economic disinvestment, and social disorganisation".

Deprived areas are said to derive from disadvantage, which becomes a characteristic of the area. Such disadvantage may take two forms which are; physical disorder (such as noise, abandoned buildings, vandalism and graffiti, filth and disrepair) together with, social disorder, (such as crime, loitering, drinking in public, drug use, conflicts, including, indifference). Either of these disorders are said to lead to unattractiveness in the housing market, which in turn offer, for some people, limited possibilities for withdrawal from the area. This disadvantage could leave people, raised in such areas, with few options to escape from unfavourable conditions that have been found to be associated with health, e.g. poor housing quality, as well as, poor physical quality of the residential environment (Piro, F.N., Næss, O, & Claussen, B. 2007).

Research, published by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), reports that a stunning 1.2 million people across Yorkshire were living in relative poverty between 2015/16 and 2017/18, which is 22% of the population (Lavigueur, N. & Gouk. A. 2019).
Poverty is noted to be a relative concept which applies to people who are considerably poorer than mainstream society (JRF 2016). Many living in poverty have resources well below those of the average individual or family, thus excluding them from ordinary aspects of life which are the norm for the majority (JRF 2016). In addition, opportunities are noted to be severely

limited to people who lack financial resources, as poverty limits them to participate in society or change their lifestyles, while determining their own destiny, which could result in fuel poverty, poor diet, unhealthy lifestyles, low aspirations or dependency. Furthermore, Social mobility is difficult, with suggestions that, most people born into poverty stay there (JRF 2016). However, the Social Mobility Commission (2017) argues that:

> "There is also no direct correlation between the affluence of an area and its ability to sustain high levels of social mobility."

General health risks are noted to be higher amongst areas of poverty, as poverty increases the chances of poor health, which in turn traps communities in poverty (Roberts, 2018). Previous studies show links between poverty and access to services, with suggestions that vulnerable individuals are often worst affected, deprived of the information, money or access to health services that would help them prevent/ treat disease (Roberts, 2018). Health can also be put at risk for people living in poverty when very poor, or vulnerable. People may have to make harsh choices because they cannot see their children go hungry. For example: the cost of medication, along with, transport to medical appointments can be devastating, both for an individual, as well as, their relatives who need to care for them, or help them reach, and pay, for treatment. In the worst cases, the burden of illness may mean that families sell their property, take children out of school to earn a living, or even start begging (Roberts, 2018).

Statistics from the Census, 2011, show a link between deprivation in Barnsley and General Health, suggesting that the health, of Barnsley residents, is generally worse than in the average person in England (Office of National statistics, 2011). Moreover, statistics also show links between poverty and education, showing that Barnsley has a higher level of residents (with either no qualifications, or qualifications equal to 1 or more GCSE at grade D or below), than the national average (Office of National statistics, 2011). However, in contrast, statistics show that between Jan 2018-Dec 2018, 80.4% of Barnsley residents, aged 16 or above, have qualifications of NVQ1 or above. (Office of National Statistics, 2018). Moreover, although poverty has strong links to employment, statistics show that 71.1% of the Barnsley population are in some form of employment. However, it is also noted that the average hourly rate for Barnsley residents is £12.69, compared to a higher rate of £14.36, for other areas of Britain (Office of National Statistics, 2018), which could account for the

poverty in Barnsley. Furthermore, of the 71% in employment, 32.5% only work part time, with the highest proportion (18.2%) working in the social care sector. Statistics also show that many of the Barnsley residents have work in a non-professional sector, which could also account for much of the areas deprivation (Office of National Statistics, 2018).

Many studies have found a correlation between poverty and violence (Atwoodwith, J.2003) with suggestions that children from poor backgrounds are disproportionately selected into the Juvenile Justice System, (Taylor, 2003) with many retaining, there by decision-making that is predicated on, amongst other things, their impoverished status (Taylor, 2006). Literature suggests there is a higher rate of mental health problems among the poor, which can lead to high levels of stress, which in turn, may lead individuals to commit theft, robbery, or other violent acts. Moreover, poverty is linked to poor education which leaves less access to quality schools, jobs, and role models, with suggestions being that many youths spend more time on the street associating with gangs (Taylor, 2006).

Barnsley is said to have poorer mental health outcomes than the national average (Barnsley Clinical Commissioning Group, no date). in many areas, with higher levels of depression, together with, anxiety. In previous years, voluntary organisations were key contributors in providing financial/debt advice, which helped people to resolve their difficulties, thereby reducing the adverse impact on peoples ‘mental health and wellbeing, whilst providing social prescribed services, such as befriending people who were lonely (Barnsley Clinical Commissioning Group, no date). However, these services are no longer provided in Barnsley, on the scale of previous years, which is suggested to have had a negative impact on residents. Moreover, it is acknowledged that although Barnsley’s all-age Mental Health/ Well-being commissioning strategy (2015-2020), state many services are available, there is no existing data which supplies evidence of waiting times or access.

2.3 – Cohesion in Communities

There is considerable debate as to agree a definition of cohesion, although it is noted that a cohesive community is somewhere where people share the same vision. Based upon diversity, becoming more accepted, together with equal opportunities, a cohesive community exists where different groups of people have close contact (Wetherell, Lafleche & Berkely, 2007). However, in contrast it could be argued that shared values, along with, beliefs among some groups of people can be exclusive of others. Therefore, it could be suggested that practitioners may need an outlook accepting that cohesion can differ between neighbourhoods or even from house to house (Muers, 2011). An accepted definition of a cohesive community is one where a common vision is shared, together with a sense of belonging, which is seen as an important aspect of a community as it helps people get along together in their local area, while also helping people to feel safer in their neighbourhood, with the aim of reducing crime areas (Cantle, 2011). Society is said (Cantle, 2011) to be placing greater values on cohesion, realising that local people are empowered and shaped, whilst sustaining neighbourhoods.

However, there are many concerns about social cohesion, currently topping the policy agenda, of a number of governmental and non-governmental institutions (Jenson, 1998). Moreover, the importance of support for the policies which promote it, are said to have been influenced by the 2001 riots, in Burnley, Bradford and Oldham, between white and Asian communities (United Kingdom) (Muers, 2011). Following the riots, together with, the responding Cantle and Denham reports, it is noted that the approach of community cohesion gained higher importance. Studies conducted by the Subsequent Cantle Review, reached the conclusion that both institutional, as well as, residential segregation did indeed contribute to the tensions between local communities. The report also identifies the division of communities who live alongside each other (Muers, 2011). In addition, what is known as the 7/7 bombings are said to have brought cohesion to the front of the minds of the public once again, which prompted the government to respond by asking for measures to encourage, as well as, improve cohesive communities, resulting in the establishment of the Commission on Integration (Muers, 2011).

It is noted that the government is helping local councils to work with local communities, together with developers to plan and build better homes. This is achieved by improving the

quality of affordable social housing, together with help for people to become homeowners. However, it is argued that many areas lack community cohesion, providing great emphasis on deprived areas, with many new settlers neglecting to feel a sense of belonging (Beider, 2011). Furthermore, work conducted by The Housing Corporation saw that cohesion is more than just poverty, faith or race. The Community Life Survey (2016-2017), conducted by: The Department of, Digital, Culture and Media & Sport, in 2016/17, show that 42% of adults reported all their friends were of the same ethnic group as themselves, 28% revealed that all their friends were of the same religious group, together with 19% revealing that their friends shared the same level of education as themselves (Christophersen, 2017), which could suggest that people still tend to associate with people who share their beliefs, together with their, norms, including the different forms of social cohesion which may exist in the real world. However, it is assumed that social cohesion is always 'a good thing' which may not invariably be the case, too much cohesion can, arguably, lead to social insularity and backwardness (Banfield, 1958),

Much existing literature describes individuals, who belong to a white working-class community, as being hostile to immigration, as outlined by government secretary, Hazel Blears, edited by: Deborah Summers (2009), stated that:

> "A study of attitudes to immigration was published, finding a widespread sense of resentment, unfairness and disempowerment among white working-class communities in England".

Furthermore, these typical communities are often viewed as being problematic, dysfunctional and occupying annexed council estates (Beider 2011), whilst also being guilty of racial harassment (Beider, 2011). In addition, working-class communities are often seen as being apart from mainstream society, in terms of normalities, while sometimes being labelled as: being problematic (Beider, 2011). However, it is noted that there is a lack of literature offering explanations as to why the working class are perceived this way. It is therefore argued, that as people residing in working-class neighbourhoods are of different age, and genders, that this empirical gap needs to change, by addressing many perceptions, which support discussions of white working-class communities (Beider, 2011). In addition, previous literature criticises community cohesion by providing assumptions of association with a rise in inequality, together with, intolerance (Beider, 2011).

In terms of community cohesion, it has been suggested that schools can contribute largely. It is noted that the duty of Ofsted, (Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills), who inspect and regulate services who care for children and young people, to report on school's contribution to community cohesion is to be removed (Dorridge, 2017). However, the Government states that:

> "Community cohesion will remain within the scope of school inspections. In addition, the duty on schools to promote community cohesion remains in place" (Department for Education, 2011. P1).

Furthermore, it is argued, by the government, that the gap which remains in schools is unacceptable, suggesting that, for different children, the gaps in achievement includes: economically disadvantaged pupils, children from ethnic minority backgrounds, and other vulnerable groups (Department of Education, 2011).

There are two main considerations, set out in the Education Bill (2011), which are noted to underpin Ofsted's reports. Both are said to be relevant to community cohesion, and to ensure that opportunities for pupils are equal, which are: firstly: Ofsted are required to take into consideration cultural, moral, as well as spiritual, developments of students providing schools with the opportunity to show how larger links with the community which encourage the development of students (Department of Education, 2011). Secondly: Ofsted are required to take into consideration how the diverse range of pupil's needs are being met by the school, for instance: girls, boys, and those from different ethnic communities, to enable fewer inequalities while promoting stronger community cohesion (Department of Education, 2011). For example: many children suffer social exclusion strengthening the notion that the fewer opportunities are available for the youths in today's society, providing a greater likelihood of negative neighbourhood pathologies (White, 2003).

2.4 Emergence of Restorative Justice

Historically, injustices involving large-scale wrongdoing often lead to further violence, and in many cases, hatred (Dignan & Maguire, 2005). Many historical sites took different approaches, with some choosing to largely ignore the wrongs, and some sought to punish the wrongdoers, while others defended them. However, most forms of punishment, such as corporal punishment, are noted to be unlawful, which can be seen as seeking revenge rather than resolution (Howard, 1997). Furthermore. During the 1950s an ideology based on "treating" the offender grew, and literature suggests that criminal behaviour was seen more as a sickness which was generally treated by psychological therapy (Howard, 1997).
In addition, it is noted that towards the latter end of the twentieth century, a small, but growing, number of historic sites began to adopt this approach which places present history in a way that seeks to restore, known as Restorative Justice (RJ) (Dignan & Maguire, 2005).

The emergence of RJ, together with the rise of a victim focused agenda, are noted to be extremely influential developments within Criminal Justice Policy in recent years (Dignan & Maguire, 2005). Furthermore. RJ is now recognised to have been a positive development, in the control of crime, for the past ten years (Crawford & Newburn, 2003: 38), although, contemporary theories of RJ have evolved over that past thirty years.
The term RJ, reportedly, was coined by psychologist Dr Albert Eglash, who saw the need for incarcerated people, which hurt others, to be accountable for their behaviour, and saw its rehabilitation value. Eglash presented a paper, in 1975, on restitution in which he stated:

> "For me, Restorative Justice and restitution, like its two alternatives, punishment and treatment, is concerned primarily with offenders. Any benefit to victims is a bonus, gravy, but not the meat and potatoes of the process". (Walker, 2008).

This is argued however, that RJ is victim focussed, and meets the guidelines of the Victims code, stating that RJ gives victims the opportunity to ask questions, receive some answers, and sometimes to have a say in the outcome or resolutions (Ministry of Justice, 2015).
Moreover, in modern society, what is suggested to be the most widely accepted definition was formulated by Tony Marshall, of the RJ consortium, who proposed a working definition (now adopted by the United Nations (Mc Cold, 1998). Which states that:

> "Restorative Justice is a process whereby all the parties with a stake in a particular offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future" (Marshall 1996: 37).

However, Criminologist John Braithwaite, argued that although this definition is widely accepted, it does not stake out a shared core meaning of RJ. Braithwaite also suggested that its main limitation is that it does not tell us who, or what, is to be restored, together with the lack of defining RJs core values (Braithwaite, 2001). It is argued that RJ has been around for many years and is suggested that it is only the name which is new (Chiste, 2013). Existing literature shows that RJ practices were commonly considered as a response to crime until the middle ages when crime was treated as the responsibility of the community (Marshall, 1999)
In previous centuries, cultures such as Aboriginals and Americans are said to have used restorative practices to resolve conflict with the use of sweat lodges, (which were seen as a way of purifying the mind/ body of toxins), pipe ceremonies, (which were used in a religious ceremony to offer prayers, making a ceremonial commitment, or to seal a covenant or treaty), and sentencing circles (which were a community-directed process, designed to develop a general agreeance of alternative sentences which could address any concerns raised by all parties). These processes looked at what events occurred, how it affected the community, and what needed to happen to bring healing to that situation (RSME, 2017).

It is noted that early experiments, conducted by the Americans, created certain principles, using victim/ offender mediation, which have been further developed, over time, which could be a contemporary way of thinking about criminality, social conduct and dispute resolution (Chiste, 2013). Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie (1977) challenged the need for a comprehensive move for ways criminal conflicts were resolved (Lornell & Halvosen, 2015). It was also argued, by Christie, that victims do not have any influence within the modern CJS, suggesting that during a trial, two things happen, which are that firstly: the victims become represented by the courts, secondly, they are represented so thoroughly they often get pushed out of the proceedings (Christie, 1977. Pg3).

Beginning to experiment, practitioners began creating alternative ways of dealing with crime, developing new ideas with experience. During these experiments, practitioners focussed on

what worked, especially in relation to victim satisfaction, along with, the impact on offenders and public acceptability (Marshall, 1999).
It became apparent that while addressing the victim's needs, offenders, together with the community, were dependant of Justice Agencies, who had to give their full attention for any impact to be made. For example: to meet the demands of the public for harsh punishment, attention had to be paid to the needs of the victim, together with community healing. It is noted however, that those working on offender reform found this to be counter-productive (Marshall, 1999).

2.5 - Key aims of Restorative Justice

The key aims of RJ, according to Zehr & Mika, (1998), cited in, (Mantle, Fox & Mandeep, 2005), are: "to give prominence to re-integration, reparation, healing and forgiveness". RJ is viewed as a theory which sees criminal acts as conflicts, not between the offender and communities, but rather between individuals, stressing that reparation by the offender towards the community, or victim, is of great importance. This aim is achieved by bringing all parties, affected by crime or conflict, together to find a positive way to resolve conflicts. (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

Restoratives believe retribution ignores the victim, believing also that RJ cannot achieve the restoration of the victim it seeks, with critics suggesting that if RJ wants to restore the victims of crime, then it cannot eliminate the punishment which restoratives reject (Utah, 2003). It is argued however, that RJ allows punitive outcomes if they do not exceed requirements of the law, nor abuse fundamental human rights. Evidence shows that people become less punitive after engaging in conferences, in which RJ is practised, (Braithwaite 2002. chapter 3).
In addition, RJ processes, are said to produce solutions individually tailored between victims of crime, offenders, and the community when administered correctly. (Braithwaite 2002). RJ processes can be in the way of mediation, between the victim and offender, through either direct contact (IE: face to face meetings), or indirect communication (Letters, telephone calls). Moreover, RJ aims to provide restitution or reparation where agreements between a victim and offender are mutual, although, an offender must have admitted guilt before any kind of communication can take place, as any offenders participating in RJ is seen as an opportunity to take responsibility for what they have done (Collins, 2016). Offenders are given the opportunity to make amends which often leads to them demonstrating remorse. In

addition, after admitting guilt, an offender enables legal representatives to play a vital role in explaining RJ, which then enables offenders to make an informed choice on if they want to take part. Furthermore, victims could be reassured that this is a process that they can participate in with confidence if RJ is supported by prosecutors (Collins, 2016).

2.6 - Restorative Justice Practices

It is hard to deny that, in many ways, the current CJS fails to do justice for many victims and offenders of crime, with many being so ignored within the process of trial and conviction. It is well documented that many offenders come from the most deprived areas of our society and are badly educated (Prison Reform Trust, 2018), often having little understanding of the process of the trial to which they are subjected. It is questioned why young offender's social profiles have many similarities within youth justice systems in an 'advanced' industrial country (Prison Reform Trust, 2018).

Also, it is noted that predominantly youths, mainly found in either: custodial institutions or juvenile detention centres, are over-represented, with profiles suggesting that young men are from: strained familial relations, low educational achievement and income often engaging in poorly paid or casual employment. Studies suggest that it is vulnerable young people who fit the over-represented profiles above, who very often receive more attention than others, from members of the youth justice committee, within the system. (White & Cunneen, ND).

Once convicted an offender often undergoes imprisonment in overcrowding conditions, often away from family members, with little, or no, hope of future employment following release. For these, and a host of reasons, both offenders and victims often feel their treatment by the system, is unjust. In this context RJ is seen as providing an alternative way of doing things (Claes, E, Foqué, R & Peters, T, 2005). RJ allows Victims to be empowered by giving them a voice, by maximising their participation and input in determining outcomes. RJ can be practiced within a range of civil matters, in addition to adult and juvenile cases, such as; family welfare, child protection, schools and the workplace as well as within the community (Daly, 2002).

The November 2014 annual RJ action plans set out the vision for the Ministry of Justice. This vision aims for:

> "Good quality, victim-focused restorative justice to be available at all stages of the CJS in England and Wales" (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016:5).

Furthermore, the aims of RJ are for practices to be commonplace throughout any stage of the CJS, which could be before, after, or during a trial. In addition, it is noted that RJ can also take place alongside a prison sentence. However, the Crown Prosecution Service (no date) state that:

> " Currently it is more common for the RJ process to be used before a case goes to court i.e. as part of a diversionary process".

In contrast, the crime survey for England and Wales provide statistics suggesting that the Proportion of incidents where victims were given the opportunity to meet the offender were only 7.5% between April 2017 and Mach 2018. The survey also notes that 24% of victims stated they would have accepted the RJ process had it been offered (Office for National Statistics, 2018). Which leaves the question of if indeed these services are readily available?

2.7 - Community Restorative approaches

Community restorative approaches incorporate a range of models, for example: community mediation, Street RJ", Circles of Support and Accountability (Circles, 2015). Used within community's RJ approaches are said to help ensure that the CJS can be avoided, by young people, if they were helped to deal with conflicts in constructive ways. Life chances could be improved with early intervention which also are noted to reduce demands on the Police (Bawden, 2014).

It is noted that Matrix evidence, (2009) provided an independent analysis of the economic RJs economic benefits, which found that the diversion from community orders to a pre-court RJ conferencing scheme, with young offenders, would save society almost £275 million (£7,050 per offender), suggesting that community RJ is cost effective to society. In addition, studies conducted by The Campbell Collaboration (2013) show that on average, RJ Conferences, while having huge benefits for victims, also produce a modest, but high, cost-effective reduction in re-offending. In addition, the seven United Kingdom (UK) experiments found that the cost of

delivering RJ produced eight time more benefit in costs of crimes prevented. However, it was noted, by the Ministry of Justice, that Government spending, due to reductions, resulted in RJ funding being significantly reduced when compared to the previous two years (Restorative Justice Council, 2016).

With the notion that justice belongs to the community, RJ practices allow the members of communities to engage with the justice process by utilising community resources therefor contributing to the strengthening of communities (Restorative Justice Council, 2016). Moreover, community changes are promoted, via the justice process, attempting to prevent similar harms to other people, whilst enabling early intervention to address victim's needs (McLaughlin, 2003).

RJ which is practiced, when an incident takes place within the community, is often referred to as Street RJ (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016). Facilitated by Police Officers, these mediations allow victims, offenders and other stakeholders the chance of a community resolution. Often resulting in a conditional caution, street RJ, allows the victim a voice together with keeping the offender out of the immediate CJS. In this way all parties involved are helped to deal, constructively and positively, with conflicts. Noting also, that early intervention can reduce the demands on the Police Force together with many life chances being improved (Bawden, 2014).

Community mediation is often carried out by Community Justice Panels organising an arranged meeting. Although many forces differ, documents have been produced, by each policing body, which lists potential sanctions offenders can take part in, following a low-level crime which is dealt with out of court (Restorative Justice Council, 2014). Braithwaite (2000) supports such conferences when speaking about re-integrated shaming, which suggests that they are about putting the problem, rather than the person, in the centre of a `healing circle'. Braithwaite suggests the key to crime control is cultural commitments to shaming, which he named `re-integrative shaming`, suggesting that societies that shame potently and judiciously, show lower crime rates (Braithwaite. 1989). Furthermore, Braithwaite argues that individuals who resort to crime are those insulated from shame over their wrongdoing. However, Braithwaite also notes that these ideas are now also acquiring an international influence through the social movement for RJ, as it is proving to be an alternative ritual of social control because it empowers citizens to decide how to run the rituals in a culturally appropriate way to them (Braithwaite, 2000).

In the county of South Yorkshire, (which this study is based around), each district has its own community justice panel and receives its funding from either: The Police and Crime Commissioner, (Dr Alan Billings), South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue, local housing authorities, and local councils. These panels involve Police/ Community Support Officers and trained volunteers who facilitate between victims and offenders. A statement provided by Dr Alan Billings, South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner said:

> "These panels are best placed to deal with local issues as many of the volunteers working on these cases are residents and have a local knowledge of the area and can relate to the issues that people are addressing" (Restorative South Yorkshire, 2018. P2)

For low to medium level crimes, (such as: criminal damage, theft, assault, anti-social behaviour, neighbourhood disputes and noise nuisance) RJ can be delivered within the community (Restoratives, 2018). Community Justice Panels provide a safe and neutral environment for all affected parties to come together and discuss what has happened with an aim of putting things right. A community conference allows all parties the chance to negotiate a way to rectify any harm caused, which could include: a written/verbal apology, a written community justice agreement :(for example: turning music down), or an agreement for the wrongdoer to make amends by unpaid work either to their victim or the wider community (Restoratives, 2018).

It is noted that, for youths, under the age of 18, who are first time offenders, are often dealt with, by some Police forces, specific disposals known as a Youth Restorative Disposal (YRD). The Restorative justice and policing, (2014) point out that the YRD was piloted in eight police forces in 2008-2009, involving taking part in an informal RJ activity directly after a crime has been committed. However, like all out of court disposals, to be considered, a RJ action the YRD must conform to the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guidelines. Furthermore, these disposals are extended to adults within some Police Forces. (Restorative justice and policing, 2014).

An annual report conducted by The Youth Justice Board shows that procedures such as RJ disposals and Triage schemes have contributed to a reduction in the number of under 18's (prior to 8 April 2013) being issued with youth cautions, reprimand or warning, finding a decrease in

youths found guilty in all courts. The report also shows that the number of custodial sentences, per thousand 10 to 17-year-olds, was 0.4 in the year ending March 2016, which represents an 11% decrease compared with the year ending March 2015, and a decrease of 68% compared with the year ending March 2006, when the rate was 1.3 (The Youth Justice Board, 2017).
Circles of Support and Accountability (Circles):

> "Are an innovative and successful community contribution to reducing sex offending, working in close partnership with criminal justice agencies" (Circles, 2015.pg1).

Aiming to build safer communities, Circles provide volunteers who work with sex offenders helping to minimise their alienation, help them reintegrate back into society and so prevent sexual reoffending. During these restorative approach meetings, the sex offender joins a circle of between four and six volunteers where they work together to provide a supportive social network while the offender is made accountable for their actions by taking responsibility for their ongoing risk management (Circles, 2015).
It is noted that while these practices within the community have an aim of restoring peace and harmony, it could be questioned whether appropriate funding is available. Previous literature often suggests that RJ is often the result of a geographical funding problem, where not all areas provide RJ. Moreover, suggestions made, by the Commons Select Committee, are that the reliance of RJ should never be affected by cost saving claims (Commons select committee, 2016). Furthermore, some suggest that there is a need for further investigations on which communities are granted RJ funding, with regards to education (Commons select committee, 2016).

In our contemporary society, Schools are more frequently adapting the use of more reparative discipline practices to control student behaviour, and community-building techniques that are based on RJ principles. Restorative methods which are used to address misbehaviour in schools are not dis-similar to the approaches used in the CJS. Australia first used RJ conferences within schools in 1994, and previous studies have found the process to be effective when used to address misbehaviours (Blood & Thorsborne, 2005)
Within many Schools, student miss-behaviour is often seen as violation of a relationship, which could be, between two pupils, or the offending party and the whole school community. The importance of building and maintaining a positive relationship amongst pupils within the

school community is continually practiced in many schools. Pupils are encouraged to follow the school rules and norms and enable them to repair any harm they have caused. In addition, for any relationship to be repaired the offending student must face the individuals whose trust they violated (Payne, A & Welch, K, 2013).
RJ training providers, Transforming Conflict, (2018) sate that:

> ” the impact of implementing a restorative approach across the schools speaks for itself:”

with studies showing exclusions to be down by 93%. In addition, out of the school referrals, to the Youth Offending Service, are down 78% and anti- social behaviour is down by 48% (Transforming conflict, 2018).

2.8 – Summary of chapter

Many historical sites have taken different approaches to crime and deviance, with some choosing to largely ignore the wrongs, and some sought to punish the wrongdoers while others defended them. However, it is noted that during the final decades of the twentieth century, a small, but growing number of historic sites have begun to adopt a restorative approach which places present history in a way that seeks to restore, known as Restorative Justice (RJ).

RJ has been around for many years with existing literature suggesting that RJ practices were commonly considered as a response to crime until the middle ages when crime was treated as the responsibility of the community (Marshall, 1999).
With the rise of a victim focussed agenda, what is noted to be an influential development in recent years, within the CJS, is the use of Restorative Justice (RJ) (Dignan & Maguire, 2005). Psychologist DR Albert Eglash, saw the need for incarcerated people that hurt others, to be accountable for their behaviour and saw its rehabilitation value. Although an accurate definition is somewhat disagreed on, in modern society, what is suggested to be the most widely accepted definition was formulated by Tony Marshall, of the RJ consortium. Marshall proposed a working definition (now adopted by the United Nations (Mc Cold, 1998) which states:

> "Restorative Justice is a process whereby all the parties with a stake in an offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future" (Marshall 1996: 37).

The key aims of RJ, according to Zehr & Mika, (1998), cited in, (Mantle, Fox & Mandeep, 2005), are: "to give prominence to re-integration, reparation, healing and forgiveness". RJ is viewed as a theory which sees criminal acts as conflicts not between the offender and communities but rather between individuals, stressing that reparation by the offender towards the community, or victim, is of great importance.

RJ addresses juvenile and adult matters, while also practiced in range of civil matters including child protection and family welfare (Daly, 2002), which allows Victims to be empowered, giving them a voice, by maximising their participation and input in determining outcomes. This is acknowledged in the Restorative Justice Action plan which states the vision is to deliver:

> "Good quality, victim-focused restorative justice to be available at all stages of the CJS in England and Wales" (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016:5).

In contrast, the crime survey for England and Wales provide statistics suggesting that the proportion of incidents where victims were given the opportunity to meet the offender were only 7.5% between April 2017 and Mach 2018. The survey also notes that 24% of victims stated they would have accepted the RJ process had it been offered (Office for National Statistics, 2018). Which leaves the question of if indeed these services are readily available to victims during a trial or within the community?

An accepted definition of community, provided by Park, (1967:115), cited in: Halsall, (2014), is as follows:

> "The simplest possible description of a community is this: a collection of people occupying a clearly defined area. But a community is more than that, a community is not only a collection of people, but it is a collective of institutions. Not people, but institutions, are final and decisive in distinguishing the community from other social constellations".

Communities are made up of humans, who are social beings that require the companionship and support of others throughout the course of their life, with suggestions that social cooperation's have played a vital role as man's survival as a species (Bruhn, 2011). Community studies conclude that neighbourhoods are still important, especially among those with the least resources, with suggestions that the conditions of many local neighbourhoods have huge repercussions for employment prospects and schooling. However, previous studies observe that income inequality puts forth strong effects, resulting in fewer opportunities for young people. Also, it is argued that the sense of community has declined over the past few decades with the rise of gating and the process of residential segregation (Low, 2003).

An important aspect of a community, on the other hand, is community cohesion where people have a shared vision. Based upon a positive acceptance of diversity, together with equal opportunities, a cohesive community is where groups of people engage with broad contact (Wetherell, Lafleche & Berkely, 2007).
It is argued that many areas lack community cohesion, although it is noted that the government is helping local councils to work with local communities, together with developers to plan and build better homes. This is achieved by improving the quality of affordable, social housing together with help for people to become homeowners.

RJ is said to help communities come together to help ensure many youths can avoid becoming part of the CJS if they were helped to deal with conflicts in constructive ways. Life chances could be improved with early intervention which also are noted to reduce extra work loads on the Police (Bawden, 2014) Restorative Community approaches incorporate a range of models, for example: Street RJ", Circles of Support and Accountability and community mediation, (Circles, 2015). These measures are noted, by an independent analysis of the economic benefits of RJ, to produce a life time saving to society of nearly £275 million, suggesting that community RJ is cost effective to society. However, the Ministry of Justice states that current RJ funding has been significantly reduced, due to reductions in Government spending, when compared to the last two years (Restorative Justice Council, 2016).

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The theoretical approach, used within this study, will be outlined within this chapter, together with the justification for the chosen approach of humanism. An explanation of the aims and objectives of this research is provided, together with interview questions used.

To meet the studies aims and address the research question, the research took an interpretive approach to carry out qualitative research. The researcher justified this approach as it is eminent for the subject matter of social sciences and is noted to be the basis of qualitative research, which will be explained. Also included within this chapter is a reflective and detailed account of data collection and analysis. The chapter will conclude with a thorough account of the ethical considerations taken, whilst addressing ethical questions associated due to the sensitive nature of this study.

3.2 Theoretical approach

To address the research question, a Humanistic theoretical approach was taken, as this approach is said to emphasize the personal worth of the individual. In addition, the Humanistic approach is said to be optimistic whilst focusing on the capabilities of humans to overcome pain, hardship, and despair, which strongly links to the ethos of RJ practices. The term: Humanistic, also referred to as humanism and humanist, are noted to be Psychology terms and closely relates to the study of each person allowing the uniqueness of the person to be addressed (McLeod, 2015).

This approach was the most appropriate, within this research, as RJ approaches are noted to build upon the values of humanistic Psychology and can be seen as part of a broader ethos or culture which identifies strong, mutually respectful relationships (Hendry, Hopkins & Steel, 2011).

In addition, Restorative approaches identify community cohesion as solid foundations which effective learning and teaching can flourish. Moreover, restorative approaches theorize that in

these communities, youths can be given decision making responsibilities which can affect their school experiences and learning.

Restorative Approaches which are built upon humanistic Psychology values are:

▪ to allow one's self to grow and flourish

▪ to be empathetic and understanding towards others,

▪ to value others for themselves,

▪ to be optimistic towards one's own development, allowing positive changes (Hendry, Hopkins & Steel, 2011).

In addition, the Humanistic approach is noted to examine the behaviour of humans through an offender's eyes, together with the observer, providing the chance for offenders to repair damage caused providing justification for its use within this research. The Humanistic approach is also noted to satisfy the majority of people's theories when it comes to the definition of being human, as this approach values self-fulfilment and personal ideals, whilst seeking to create social order (Klein & Ness, 2002) making strong links to the aim of this study which is to assess: What are RJ strategies for Community intervention in deprived areas? However, it is argued that this approach ignores the unconscious mind (McLeod, 2015).

3.3 - Methods and Procedures

This research required an in-depth insight of social research which is the justification for the use of qualitative methods. Taking an inductive approach, the intention of this research was to produce new theories from the in-depth data, with an aim of investigating individual points of view from a selection of participants who have all been connected to RJ. This method allowed the researcher to gain in-depth understandings of how RJ strategies are, or could be, used for Community intervention in deprived areas.

Semi-structured interviews were used as the researcher felt it was the most appropriate for the subject matter of social sciences, and is noted to be the basis of qualitative research. Furthermore, this approach was seen as the most appropriate to this study as it is noted to be

the best approach to social reality, which is relevant to the subject matter of RJ practices and community cohesion. The use of semi-structured interviews was also used with the aim of providing participants the opportunity to explore issues they felt were important.

The researcher provided participants with a set of pre-determined open questions, which leave the opportunity to prompt further discussions. In this way all participants were given the chance to explain, in their own words, their own thoughts and experiences of RJ practices, which allowed flexibility in the way issues were addressed, while giving the interviewer the opportunity to explore particular themes or responses further. However, in contrast, there are limitations with the use of semi-structured interviews. It could be argued that the interviewer could have influenced the interviewee's responses to questions, as noted by (Bryant, no date, Para. 11), who suggest that:

> "Interviewers might consciously or unconsciously lead respondents towards preferred answers. Personal beliefs could alter the integrity of the interview"

Which have led some critics to question its validity.

3.4 – Sampling

This study was conducted by the semi-structured interviewing of four individuals, from a range of institutions, to provide their professional opinions on the subject of community RJ, for example:

- A member of the Police Crime Commission
- Members of private organisations who practice RJ strategies

The researcher also conducted interviews of individual members of the public who have partaken in the RJ process. Three participants had been a victim of crime, and three participants were ex-offenders, who had also taken part in the RJ process. The reasoning for this was to gain valuable, personal opinions, from a non-professional perspective.

Sampling participation was conducted firstly through research of existing RJ organisations, followed by email invitation and tailored to suit each recipitant (example shown in Appendix 5). This method provided limitations however, when attempting to recruit victims or offenders, as this personal information was not readily accessible. The researcher relied on

snowballing for the recruitment of service users, which contributed to the small participant sample, as many were reluctant to provide information, due to the sensitive nature of the study. It is noted that had the researcher had a wider audience, the study could have been met with a stronger argument for the outcome. In addition, all participants resided, or worked, within the county of South Yorkshire, with all who were service users residing in the Town of Barnsley. This was vital to this studies aims which was to: explore Restorative Justice Strategies for Community intervention in deprived areas, together with ways in which communities could be strengthened with the use of RJ, and if indeed community RJ improves life chances/ well-being, of individual members of the public.

As noted the Town of Barnsley is defined as a deprived area, however, it could be argued that the sampling does not necessarily reflect the views, and experiences, of all individuals who reside in such areas, as norms and values differ from county to county. The research questions were designed to meet the aims of the study. However, the questions varied slightly between participants from an organisation, and participants who have been victims or ex-offenders. The reasoning for this was to gain more balanced data which could be compared and contrasted during analysis. The semi-structured interviews consisted of eight or nine main questions as shown in Appendix 4.

3.4 – Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations were addressed prior to any research taking place, which was addressed in-line with The Statement of Ethics outlined in the British Society of Criminology (2015). Due to the nature of this study complications gaining ethical approval occurred which required the researcher to address some of the aims, questions, and potential participants.

The original aim was to look for participants representing Restorative Justice on a professional level, together with ex-offenders and victims of crime, and personally been involved with the CJS partaking in Restorative Justice. This was seen as an important part of the study as the researcher wanted to assess different, personal views of with an aim of comparing these views to existing literature.

Concerns were raised by the governing ethics panel with regards to researcher safety which could arise when interviewing offenders. After deliberation the researcher sort approval to interview ex-offenders who were no longer involved within the CJS. In addition, the

researcher had to be mindful that, while ex-offenders may not pose any future risk, it could affect their anonymity, as the researcher would be compelled to notify third parties where any information provided discloses undetected criminal activity or indication of risk of harm to oneself or others. This information was included in the participant information sheet given to each person prior to interviews, with an aim to protect the researcher if the right to anonymity was cancelled. Furthermore, due to the possible risks involved when interviewing ex-offenders and Victims the researcher had to ensure that suitable, safe, public premises were provided in which interviews could take place.

Ethical considerations had to be addressed where the participant had been a victim of crime as it was a possibility that, due to the nature of the study, a participant may find themselves re-living their experience. In order to comply with the British Society of Criminology (2015) which states researchers should:

> "Recognise that they have a responsibility to minimise personal harm to research participants by ensuring that the potential physical, psychological, discomfort or stress to individuals participating in research is minimised by participation in the research".

This consideration was addressed by the researcher diverting from asking personal questions about the offence, and an information sheet was provided two weeks before the interview providing details of organisations who offer additional support (see Appendix-7).

Participants were also reminded that they can exercise their right to end their participation, in the study, at any time up to 2 weeks after interviews, to provide reassurance that if they felt they had disclosed something or did not feel comfortable during interviewing and had any concerns, they could withdraw. In addition, the research questions were designed with careful ethical consideration so as to, where possible, not prompt for personal information as to the nature of the crime in question. Furthermore, the researcher was mindful that if any participant appeared to have been affected by the interview, they would endeavour to stay with the participant for a short period of time to divert their thoughts onto a more everyday conversation in order to bring their mood back to the present, before providing them with the

debrief which contained contact details of a range of support organisations. In this instance, during the study, no cause for concern arose during interviews or in the weeks following.

Prior to the study taking place the researcher found limitations with recruiting participants from a victim or offender point of view. Due to the studies' sensitive nature, which involved victim's personal situations and views, it was difficult to recruit. As could be expected many individuals from institutions were cautious of snowballing service user's details. When asked to pass on information and the researcher details it became apparent that limitations left the study with only a small number of participants. It is noted that had the researcher had a wider audience the study could have been met with a stronger argument for the outcome.

3.5 - Data analysis

The chosen way to analyse collected data, within this study, was thematic analysis, as, it is known for its flexibility and is widely used in qualitative research, together with the claims that it is a quick and easy method to practice (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). It is argued that thematic analysis is the best suited method for qualitative research as it is provides the base skills needed for conducting many other forms of qualitative analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In addition, this method is noted to be a useful for investigating the different opinions of the participants, allowing any similarities or differences to be highlighted, while summarizing key features (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017).

Occurring over five stages, thematic analysis is said to: identify, analyse and report patterns (themes) within the data, then to follow by organising and describing the data. The first stage (identify) involved the researcher transcribing the interviews individually, this was conducted by reading the transcribed data over and over, noting any codes or ideas which arose more frequently than others. During the second stage (analyse), the data was analysed by moving between each interview transcripts, highlighting words to identify any potential patterns and themes by way of codes. The third stage involved sorting the different codes into potential themes, followed by the refinement of themes, collapsing them into other theme, s and braking them down into smaller components.

During analysis it emerged that there were four main themes which arose from the transcribed data, (themes explained in Chapter 4 - Findings and Analysis). The researcher

analysed the four themes, by using a comparison between existing literature, in order to find any similarities and differences which related to the semi-structured questions.

3.6 – Summary of chapter

A Humanistic theoretical approach was taken to conduct this study, as this approach is said to emphasize the personal worth of the individual. In addition, the Humanistic approach is said to be optimistic whilst focusing on the capabilities of humans to overcome pain, hardship, and despair. As the study involves individuals, and institutions, the researcher's justification for the use of this approach focuses on the basis that humanism strongly links to the aims of RJ which is to give an offender the chance to repair the damage caused.

The use of qualitative methods was used within this study which allowed the researcher to investigate the individual views of participants and gain a contextual understanding of how RJ strategies are, or could be, used for Community intervention in deprived areas. The choice of semi-structured interviews was justified as this approach was seen as the most appropriate to this study as it is noted to be the best approach to when explaining the experiences, lived by humans, whilst exploring attitudes, behaviours and experiences of the social world (Dawson, 2009), which is relevant to the subject matter of RJ practices and community cohesion.

Ethical considerations were addressed prior to the study, and an informed consent form was read and signed by each participant (Appendix 3). In addition, each participant also read, and signed, a full explanation of the study (Appendix 2). Due to the study's sensitive nature, complications gaining ethical approval occurred which required the researcher to address some of the aims, questions, and potential participants. Limitations were met when recruiting participants who were either a victim or ex-offender as due to the nature of the study third parties were cautious of snowballing service user's details. It is noted that had the researcher had a wider audience the study could have been met with a stronger argument for the outcome.

Chapter 4

Findings and Analysis

4.1 – Introduction

The following chapter outlines analysed, collected, data from ten semi-structured interviews, conducted within this study, to address the aims and objectives. The empirical data from the research findings will be compared, and contrasted, with findings from the literature review. This chapter will be structured around the four main themes, which emerged during transcript. The themes are as follows:

1. Public awareness

2. Education within the Community

3. Victim focus

4. Life chances

Some quotes were used within this chapter from participants. Their personal details will not be disclosed; however, the participants consisted of six females and four males. Four participants represented institutions who engage in RJ practices, three participants had been victims of crime, who had been service users of RJ, and three were ex- offenders who had also taken part in RJ. Participants represented a range of ages, which were; three aged 20 to 30 years, three aged 30 to 40 years and four were 40 to 55 years. (See Appendix 7).

4.2 – Theme 1 - Public Awareness

The first theme to emerge from the transcribed data refers to public awareness. It is noted that all participants within this study had extensive knowledge of RJ practices, either on a professional or personal level, prior to this study taking place, However, the study revealed that all participants were in agreeance that the general public shared a lack of knowledge around the subject of RJ. In addition, everyone shared the belief that most individual members of society either, do not know about, or understand the definition of RJ.

During the interviews, the researcher asked each participant what, in their opinion, is the biggest obstacle of the RJ process and it became apparent that each shared the view that awareness was a huge concern. Furthermore, during transcript, it emerged that although the lack of public awareness, around RJ, was of great concern; it became evident that there was also a lack of professional knowledge on the subject. In order to expand theme 1, the researcher split these findings into sub-themes outlining both public, and professional, awareness. This theme links in with the aim of this study, as it could be argued that if the general public are not aware of RJ processes, then how can this service improve communities or life chances for individuals living in poverty?

4.2.1- Professional awareness/ knowledge

Participant A, when asked what, in her opinion, is the biggest obstacle of the RJ process stated:

> "Well people just don't know what RJ is, which is why we have a communications plan, it doesn't matter how much we talk about it there are lots of people just don't know what it is".

The participant went on to suggest that:

> "Even knowing what it is and then thinking about, well you know, it's a bit like when they say Ron seal and you get what's on the tin. Well its quite complex to understand what RJ is, so I believe that's the biggest obstacle. It's because if the people who are the potential beneficiaries of the service don't understand what it means, the people who are making that offer, like non specialists and Police officers who might be talking to them about it, there not 100% sure, because I mean it's not only about what it is but what would be the process? how might it work?"

This statement suggests that much more training, and education, around the RJ process is needed within institutions, who offer/ deliver RJ, such as the Police Force, Probation Service and Victim Support. However, it is noted that a lack of funding could be a huge barrier when delivering RJ awareness within institutions. This is outlined by the Restorative Justice Council (2015), who suggest that The National Probation Service (NPS) provision varies between and within areas. When steps were taken to promote, and deliver, RJ with new staff, within the Probation service, several areas did not take any steps to promote RJ due to a lack of provision and competing priorities. (Restorative Justice Council, 2015).

Findings show that there is still some confusion as to the understanding of RJ with professionals, although strategies have been put in place to enable the training. These findings support existing literature for example: It is noted that South Yorkshire Police commenced a pilot scheme, in 2017, to address the problem of Police awareness. The key components of the scheme were training in RJ for response officers, which included training on how to refer individuals to either the Youth offending team, Community Justice Panel, or charitable organisations. However, a previous study, conducted by Shapland, Crawford, Gray & Bur (2017), show that the use of RJ, by the Police force, was still very inconsistent. The study revealed that while RJ was offered by some officers, many did not offer the service, resulting in services received by a victim being largely dependent on the Police officer dealing with their case, which could contribute to the lack of service users. More training will enable the right information being given to potential service users, so they are able to make an informed choice on whether they wish to proceed with RJ.

The results of this study also indicate that much more awareness of RJ is needed with the general public if RJ is to continue as a future way forward to meet the needs of a victim, offender and the general public.

4.2.2 - General public awareness

When asked how public awareness could be addressed, participant A stated that:

> "Although stories have been placed within the local press, plans were in place within the Police force and that It is very much linked in the new service specification that is out to tender at the moment, however those plans were not outlined within the interview".

Participant J supported this by suggesting:

> "Well I know the Police force have some plans to address awareness, but up to now even the press coverage doesn't seem to be getting the word out there".

Three participants, within this study, had been a victim of crime who had participated in the RJ process, findings show that all three stated they had not heard the term RJ prior to being approached, by professionals, to take part in RJ, and all three did not fully understand the process until they read leaflets handed to them. During the interview of Participant C, it emerged that due to the lack of knowledge, conflicts arose between her, her family and friends as they did not understand what RJ was. After disclosing that she initially did not want to meet her offender, due to the fact she was scared of him, she decided to go ahead after some research and understanding from agencies, but disclosed she also still had doubts. When asked the reason for her doubts, Participant C said her family became unsupportive to the idea, stating:

> "Well a lot was my family, they didn't understand why I'd want to see him, thought I was crazy, they hadn't heard of RJ. I suppose they just expected it all to go away after the court case, but in my head, it was still there all time".

These findings suggest that although many victims are offered the service of RJ, it could provide limitations if the general public, not directly involved in the CJS are not aware of the

meaning. It could be argued that many victims will not receive the support they need from their family/friends due to their lack of understanding and could result in the refusal of the process being offered. These findings were confirmed during the interview of Participant B, who suggested that public awareness was indeed a huge problem. When asked why he agreed to partake in RJ he revealed that he knew nothing about what RJ was, stating

"I wasn't really informed; I might have been informed but back then I didn't listen".

It is noted that Participant B met with his victims in 1992 and admits the process has improved somewhat over the years. Now very much involved within the field of RJ, Participant B has concerns as to public awareness and suggests that the reason for this is that only direct service users are involved with the process. When asked his thoughts on public awareness he stated:

> "Oh yes public awareness that is my big bee in the bonnet, drives me crazy. Yes, you get all the RJ conferences where they get together and have a good jolly and talk about public awareness, but there are no members of the public. This is not rocket science, I like a bit of academia. Basically, there's a saying, and the saying goes like this, tell me and I'll forget, show me and I'll remember, yes? Involve me and I'll understand. This would be perfect for public awareness, I mean, how can you make the public aware if you're not involving em?"

This statement could provide valuable insight for this study, as all data collected points to the lack of knowledge around RJ. It is then questioned why no general members of the public are invited to meetings, why does someone have to be involved either in the CJS or a victim of crime before knowledge is made available? It could be argued that to meet the aims of RJ, and the Victim's code, which aims to provide provision of RJ interventions to all victims (Ruthven, 2013), more involvement from the general public is needed to create awareness. Once the general public are made aware of RJ, and how it can meet a victim's needs, many more victims may receive much needed support from their families and friends.

During the interview of Participant G, when asked her thoughts on what the biggest obstacles in the process are, she said she also found public awareness to be a huge problem, stating that

> "Unless I knew what RJ was, how would I know to ask for it if I wasn't under victim's services?"

Furthermore, it could be argued that very few people know anyone who has been through the RJ Process; this could cause social ignorance due to the facts that in this contemporary society/ community, people go on recommendations. It is suggested that unless you know someone who has done RJ then there is a good chance you will say no thank-you without finding out more information.

It is clear in the findings of this study that public awareness, or lack of it, effects the decisions of offenders, victims and their families, with regards to participation of RJ. However, data clearly points more to problems and decisions around recruiting victims for the process. It was pointed out, by participants representing institutions, that it is probably easier to recruit offenders who are serving a custodial sentence. The reasoning for this is that most inmates will talk to each other in their cells about where they have been and what happened during the meeting, or share their thoughts if partaking in an indirect approach, creating awareness within a prison. This could not be said for victims, as many victims very rarely meet other victims so the opportunity to talk and spread awareness is somewhat limited.

Previous literature shows that not only is RJ practiced within the CJS but also within the community in ways such as community mediation, which can involve justice panels, the Police or trained facilitators who, for low level crime, can deal with conflicts at the time of an offence (Restorative Justice Council, 2014).

Literature also tells us that many schools are beginning to use RJ when there are conflicts between pupils. The Department for Education published a report (Restorative Justice Council, 2015) where it gave whole-school restorative approaches the highest rating of effectiveness at preventing bullying, with a survey of schools showing 97% rated restorative approaches as effective.

It is argued then why members of the public are still showing social ignorance to the term Restorative Justice? It could be questioned how members of society, who have never been involved within the CJS, are going to be interested in RJ if they simply do not know of its

existence, also if they do not know about RJ how can they fully understand, and support, a friend or family member through the process?

These results support the notion that RJ is limited just to those directly involved with the CJS, or directly involved with bad behaviour in schools, rather than educating all members of society. This could raise the question of the term RJ and is this one of the reasons the general public are not aware of the process or meaning. It could be that if you are dealing with people who have committed crime or people who had a crime committed against them it's called Justice, so these people may be given more information of the process. However, if you're dealing with children in schools, should it be called justice or an approach? It could be argued that the word Justice implies criminality, and that is not what is going on in average schools.

When asked how the lack of public awareness could be addressed, 100% of participants believed that there was a lack of advertising. Suggestions were made that advertising on documentaries or incorporating RJ in Television soap operas could make people more aware of the problems people face as a victim, with Participant H suggesting:

> "Some offenders might think twice before they do something really bad to someone".

It could be that future real-life documentaries could be shown where RJ has been used, what the advantages and disadvantages were from the perspective of both an offender and victim point of view. Recommendations also could be made to include the education of RJ into the school curriculum; possibly it could be incorporated into the subject of PHSE, (personal, social, health and economic education) which would raise awareness with children of all backgrounds, genders and race, regardless of whether they have been a victim or offender. This recommendation was supported by Participant G who, when asked how she though RJ could be improved, stated:

> "I would put it as part of sentencing, make it that you have to at least have a conversation about RJ and also, they should teach it in schools in PHSE or something. Also, it's such a good opportunity in soaps but the one on Coronation Street they did before was not portrayed as in real life".

4.3 – Theme 2 - Education within the community

The second theme to arise from the transcribed data relates to education, or lack of education in these circumstances. The field of education is noted to be

> "One of the most fascinating, yet complex fields of study in social science, having experienced extraordinary technological, societal, and institutional change in recent years" (Peterson, Baker & Barry, 2010.p1).

Linking in to theme 1 of this study (public awareness), which shows concerns for the lack of knowledge around the field of RJ, together with theme 4 (life chances), education plays a huge part of these findings. The study showed that the lack of knowledge around the subject of RJ leaves many people not gaining access to services

During the transcription of data within this study, it was evident that results support existing literature. 100% of participants agreed that RJ practices were a positive step towards a restorative society if people were educated within this service. Although many strategies are in place within the CJS, the Police, communities, and in some cases within schools, data reveals that many individuals who have partaken RJ training are still confused about the process, confirming that more education and training is needed for RJ to be successful. This is confirmed by Participant A, who stated:

> "The people who are making that offer like non-specialists, like police officers who might be talking to them about it, there not 100% sure because I mean it's not only about what it is but what would be the process? how might it work?"

Whilst a lack of education is closely linked to public awareness, the findings from this study show clearly that academic education plays a key role within everyday life chances, together with the notion that RJ, if practiced from early years, could prevent many crimes being committed whilst also providing some individuals with more chance of achievement.

Participants with offending backgrounds all agreed that RJ had given them an opportunity to change their lives, and all agreed that they had not had a good academic education when young. These findings were consistent with existing literature, and the latest figures, published by the Prison Reform Trust (2016), revealed that over half (51%) the number of people being sent to prison have the literacy skills of an 11-year-old. The report also shows that 42% of prisoners had a history of being permanently excluded from school, with one in five people in custody having learning difficulties, which is supported by Participant F who said:

> "I realised I wasn't educated from school; I didn't know how to do things like studying. I knew nothing really about the world or how others might think or live. I was labelled ADHD (attention deficit hypertension disorder) and I guess I lived up to that label".

Furthermore, it is noted that mainly young men with an over-representation of youth are from: low income families. With many having low educational achievement and poorly paid employment (White & Cunneen, ND).

When asked by the researcher if he thought education, after RJ, had improved his life chances Participant F replied;

> "Hell yeh, before, I got judged. People are judgemental, which adds pressure onto that person. And you know, in my case the ones who judged me the least are the ones who I hurt the most. Like my victim's mum".

Participant E also confirmed this when stating:

> "RJ gave me the chance to change when before I'd lost all hope and would probably have ended up back in prison".

The researcher asked how things could be improved he replied:

> "People, especially youths need to be taught that failure is ok, but everyone can change their lives. Education is paramount if they take the time to think how some actions, even name calling, affects others they might think twice"

Supporting the findings that education plays a vital role, not just with RJ and changing lives, but also in crime prevention and future community cohesion.

Results showed an overwhelming theme of empathy towards others after being educated in, and practicing, RJ. It is apparent that prior to RJ many participants were, what is known as, self-absorbed, which is when a person thinks only about things which concern themselves, they do not notice other people or things around them. In this context the researcher refers, not just to some actions, but also to feelings towards others. The study suggests that even within the professional world many individuals overlook how some actions can affect other people. For example: within the CJS when a victim reports a crime, statements are taken and in many cases that is the point when victims then become represented, with no say in proceedings.

It is suggested that many victims, and families of victims, feel let down, some people experience emotions such as anger, becoming more afraid, more unsettled and confused with many developing long-term problems such as depression or anxiety-related illness (Victim Support, ND). Supporting this existing literature, the findings of this study show that many victims' often feel alone after a crime. Participants acknowledged that, they felt, no-one understood how they were feeling, due to a lack of education around crime or reasons behind some behaviours. For example: Participant H stated:

> "Yes, Restorative Justice allowed me to be heard, I had emotions I hadn't felt before. To be honest I was probably ignorant to anyone's feelings before I was assaulted, I used to think they should just get over it, until it happened to me that is. I guess I just wasn't educated in crime and how it affects people".

When asked to elaborate, Participant H replied:

> "Well, I think if I had known, or even bothered to ask anyone who had been a victim, how they felt I could have been more prepared for my own feelings. They should teach about crime and how it affects others in school, even in primary. Doing Restorative Justice gave me the chance to address my own feelings but also think about why they

> did it. I now don't just think about myself, I think about how and why people do things".

The results found that all participants agreed that if everyone was educated on RJ at a young age, more people would think about others and how their actions can affect them.

It is noted that RJ is becoming more and more practiced within mainstream schools as a way of tackling challenging behaviour, providing education on less punitive measures (Payne, A. & Welch, K. 2015). Schools who practice restorative programs place emphasis on the building of relationships while repairing the harm caused to others by acts of misbehaviour. First introduced within schools in Australia, in 1994, RJ conferences offer students a chance to address the harm caused to individuals whose trust was broken by reconciliation, thereby mending the relationship building and maintaining positive relationships with pupils and those among the school community (Payne, A. & Welch, K. 2015).

Literature shows that Schools which do not take a restorative approach tend to handle negative behaviour by way of expulsions from school (Doward, 2017). Existing research suggests student exclusions are linked to long-term mental health problems and future criminal behaviour, with suggestions that children who are excluded from school may encounter long-term psychiatric problems and psychological distress. Research, conducted by the University of Exeter also finds that poor mental health can lead to school exclusion (Doward, 2017). Furthermore, research shows that more than half of UK prisoners were excluded from school (Gill, Quilter-Pinner & Swift, 2017).

These findings are supported with the findings from this study which show that participants, who had offended, did not do well in school. Also, participants felt they had failed in education, as supported by Participant F who suggested:

> "I wish I had learnt more at school, if I had known then how things affected people I might have thought twice, I only thought about how I was bullied, never thought my bullies might have problems".

Joseph Norton academy in Kirklees, West Yorkshire, practice RJ within the school and has 63 pupils between the ages of six and 17, who have emotional, social, and mental health needs whose behaviour can be extremely challenging. Assistant head-teacher, Ryan Gladwin

suggests that using a restorative approach has resulted in huge reductions in the number of exclusions, he said:

> "We were very high with our exclusions four or five years ago. This year so far, we have not had one exclusion"

going on to explain:

> "We know excluding our pupils is not an effective sanction. Often, they have difficulties coming to school in any case. It creates shame within pupils, it reinforces negative feelings. With restorative practice, we've found that if you can start to address the feelings behind the behaviour that starts to improve the behaviour" (Weale, 2017. P1).

In addition, the Department for Education, published a report suggesting that whole school restorative approaches are the in effectiveness with the prevention of bullying. The report also shows a 97% rating restorative approaches as effective (Restorative Justice Council, 2016), these results fully support the findings of this study, with reference to bullying, as outlined by Participant J who explained:

> "Nearly every service user I deal with says they didn't do well in school; I believe that's where a lot people begin on the wrong track."

When asked if they could elaborate the participant replied:

> "Well, lots of people get bullied at school, not all, but many feel worthless, and get labelled as bad. I think that's when they kind of give up on themselves, they then often become the bullies, kind of living up to what has become expected of them."

From a victim's point of view, results also support the use of RJ within schools, with Participant C stating:

> "In a way I felt sorry for him because he said he had got in with wrong crowd and that. And he was bullied at school if he didn't do as they said he would get hurt. I actually felt like, like a bit better off than him. They should teach kids early what it does to people. He started off as a victim, being bullied so didn't care about anyone else".

It could be questioned therefore why all schools do not practice RJ? As results from this study show that many people could avoid the CJS by addressing problems early in their childhood. It is argued that funding plays a huge part in the education of school staff, in order to put RJ into daily strategies in many schools. School based training packages, come at a financial cost to individual schools, and it could be argued that funding for training is not always available in many deprived areas where funding is needed for other necessary equipment. For example: a three-day conference facilitation training for selected staff can cost, for up to 12 delegates, £1,600, and for more than 12 delegates £3,000 (prices set out in 2015) (Restorative Justice Council, 2015).

The results of this study clearly support existing literature with the suggestion that RJ works as a crime prevention in the community (College of Policing, 2015), together with the use in schools to help combat many problems a child may be enduring, and aiding empathy towards others. Recommendations could be made to incorporate RJ into every local-authority maintained school and included within the national curriculum for England. A recommendation would be to include RJ, perhaps, within the subject taught PHSE (personal, social, health and economic education). The findings of education within the field of RJ meet with the aims of this study, as although many strategies are in place to support RJ, findings show that with the education at early stages community cohesion is improved within society together within schools. However, funding could prove problematic to training and education, showing limitations in more deprived areas and schools where funding is already in short supply. This is supported by existing Literature which suggests that RJ is often subjected to geographical funding, where some areas do not invest in RJ (Commons select committee, 2016). Moreover, suggestions have been made that this should not be the case and that the reliance of RJ should not be affected by cost saving claims (Commons select committee, 2016)

4.4 – Theme 3 - Victim focus

The third theme to emerge from the transcribed data within this study is victim focus. By this term, the study refers to RJ as being victim-centred which seeks to provide answers for victims by means of Victim/offender mediation with an aim of repairing the harms caused.

Many victims are affected by sudden, often random or violent crimes which not only affects their lives but often the lives of their families, friends and in many cases the whole community. Many coping mechanisms which people use in everyday situations are lost when a crime is committed against them. Crime is often described as having three primary impacts which are: emotional, financial and physical, and it is noted that while one or all three can affect an individual, the most devastating, and often the least understood, is the emotional impact (Bazemore & Schif, 2015).

It is hard to deny that, in many ways, the current CJS fails to do justice for many victims of crime, with many being so ignored within the process of trial and conviction, during which many victims are subjected to re-victimization. Nils Christie (a Norwegian Criminologist) suggests that victims have no say in the CJS, and that they are represented in such a way that they are pushed out of the proceedings by the professionals (Christie, 2007). A leading specialist on trauma, Judith Lewis Herman stated that:

> "If one set out to design a system for provoking intrusive post-traumatic symptoms, one could not do better than a court of law" (Herman, 1992: 72).

This statement suggests that the current legal system can indeed add pressures and stress to an already traumatised victim. Over the past thirty years a variety of strategies have been put in place to improve the criminal justice process for victims, such as: more victim services, self-referral groups and legally defined rights. RJ is probably the most influential movement to address the needs of a victim, often receiving the opportunity to repair the harms caused to them by giving them a voice and often receiving answers to their questions.

Existing literature reveals that many strategies in place within the CJS are victim focussed, for example: as outlined in the Victims code, which supports the aims of RJ, gives victims the opportunity to ask questions, receive some answers, and sometimes to have a say in the outcome or resolutions (Ministry of Justice, 2015). However, results from this study indicate that there are many limitations for access to services. Participants who represented agencies

revealed that out of all victims who are asked if they want to take part in RJ, around 50% were interested in finding out what the process involved. However, the study also revealed that out of the 50% who were interested, the percentage who accepted the offer was significantly lower. These findings show that future research is needed to address why so many victims are not accessing the service, as it is also documented that not all victims are offered the service. Statistics from the Crime Survey for England and Wales, (2015-16), revealed that only 4.2 % of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to meet with their offender (Barrett, D. 2016), which tells us that the 50% who are interested is actually only around 2.1% of all victims. These low offer figures are in contrast to the victim's code of practice which states that:

> "First the Police must pass the victim's contact details to the organisation that is to deliver Restorative Justice Services for victims to enable the victim to participate in Restorative Justice, unless asked not to do so by the victim". (Ministry of Justice, 2015).

It is questioned then why, as stated above, statistics show only 4.2 % of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to meet with their offender. The code also states:

> "Dependent on Restorative Justice being available in the relevant area, the service provider that delivers Restorative Justice Services must: provide victims with full and impartial information on Restorative Justice and how they can take part" (Ministry of Justice, 2015).

This statement suggests that RJ services are not available in all areas, which could prove difficult therefore for all victims to access services.

This study clearly found that victim recruitment, and participant, is a major problem when offering RJ services, as noted above, Professionals who deliver RJ, have found that the take up offer from victims is low. Participant G, who works for an independent RJ organisation confirmed the problems around recruiting service users stating:

> "I get more referrals from offenders, part of reason is there are more places you can find offenders, prisons, probation, drug n alcohol groups, those sorts of places, and it's more difficult with victims".

When asked what the reason for the difficulty with recruiting victims was, Participant G replied:

> "Well, where do you find victims? They're not sitting around in the same groups, it's not as easy to talk to a victim about RJ. Also, many don't want it at the time but may do a year or two down the line, and many don't agree if they don't understand, or might change their mind".

It could be questioned who is responsible for offering victims RJ, participant G agreed that more work is needed with victims but also suggested the difficulties stating:

> "but where to find them? We are working more with Victim Support but at the minute is it down to them to ask?"

It became apparent during this study that there is much confusion as to who is responsible for approaching victims. Data revealed a mixture of responses when asked how they were approached, two participants were approached by Remedi, (one of the UK's leading facilitators of RJ services), who work in partnership with the 14 Youth Offending Teams and the Police Force and Crime Commissioner.

RJ services are delivered and funded by different service providers, these can include: The Probation Service, Her Majesty's Prison Services, Police Force, Crime Commissioners, Victim support and youth offending teams, other victims are approached by either, Victim support or an independent institution. A future recommendation would be to appoint one organisation to deliver the initial approach of RJ to victims. This recommendation will be more detailed within the conclusion section of this paper.

The Victims code of practice states that: service providers who deliver RJ services must:

> "Be satisfied that Restorative Justice is in the interest of the victim, taking particular account of the sensitivities of the case and/or the vulnerability of the victim, particularly in cases involving sexual or domestic violence, human trafficking, stalking and child sexual exploitation" (Gov.UK, 2015.P2)

It has to be questioned then how much choice a victim has within this service? The statement above suggests that not all victims are approached, and not all victims are given RJ information at all, but having the choice made for them by the professionals. It could be argued that despite the victim's code suggesting all victims are offered access to RJ, in many cases this is not happening. This supports the view of Nils Christie who argued that victims lose out in two ways by not having the opportunity to participate fully during a trial (Christie, 2007).

This is acknowledged, in the fourth report, by The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016–17), which suggests that sexual types of crime are being excluded from RJ practices.

Participant A, during the interview, confirmed this to be the case within certain crimes, stating:

> "So, we don't have any cases where we might have sexual violence or domestic violence, stalking/harassment cases, or any cases where you've got some sort of requirement where there is a no contact to be made between parties where there's injunctions and things like that, so we wouldn't necessarily contact those kinds of People".

However, it is noted that other agencies may offer the process but is questioned whether victims of these types of crimes are subject to a postcode lottery? and if many institutions are assuming the responsibility of offering the process belongs to others. Participant A pointed out that:

> "We're confident that even though the police don't make that proactive offer there are others who are still able to make that offer beyond that point" stressing also "we put no limit on a referral, erm so any victim could self-refer for RJ and this is one area we want to develop".

The study revealed that many sexual violence or domestic violence victims self-referred for RJ. Participant I confirmed this to be the case stating:

> "We do get a number of victims of sexual violence who contact us, but predominantly it's when they're under the service of the victim contact service".

It is questioned though that if many victims, of sexual types of crime, are mainly self-referrals, could this limit many victims who, as found in theme 1, are not aware of RJ or how to refer themselves. The researcher therefor has linked into this theme a subsection (4.4.1) which relates to victim satisfaction in RJ.

However, it could be argued that there is greater chance of re-victimisation in cases such as sexual violence, Victim advocates argue that the power imbalance which sexual violence creates is of major concerns, which could justify, to some degree, why not all victims of crime are being offered the service (Daly 2002).

4.4.1 - Victim satisfaction in RJ

The transcribed data within this study confirms previous literature when relating to victim satisfaction of RJ as they did not know what to expect so therefore could not judge if it was the right process for them. All participants agreed that, in their experience, victims were mostly positive about their experience, with many receiving answers to their questions. All victims within this study found their experience to be positive, however, it is noted that due to the nature of the study, and difficulty recruiting, the participant sample was very small. Due to the small sample of victims, the study shows limitations as to a true extent of victim satisfaction. As explained in theme 1, the main limitation for victims was their lack of knowledge around RJ. All participants agreed that their experience of RJ both provided answers to their questions while also receiving some comfort about re-victimisation.

The study showed that in most cases victims felt they could not forgive their offender; neither did they feel as much hatred towards them as they had previous to RJ. In addition, results show that many victims in fact felt empathy towards the offender when faced with their explanations as to why they committed crime. Participant C, although refusing the process originally, admitted to becoming angry when her attacker started making, what she saw as, excuses. She told the researcher:

> "He told me he wa on drugs at time, like that wa ok, but the woman who was facilitating told me to calm down n listen to his side then I can av mi say after that n ask questions"

Participant C disclosed that although she could not forgive, she was glad she had met her offender, even stating

> "Well I actually felt sorry for him cos he said he had got in wi wrong crowd n that, but I dint tell him that. I actually felt like, like a bit better off than him".

When asked if she could elaborate on that Participant C explained:

> "Well like, I ant ad a great upbringing, never really had owt, but I'd not turned to drugs, n I told him that. He said he wa weak n that made me feel stronger, more the bigger person so to speak, n I wasn't scared of him anymore".

The study also revealed, that prior to taking part in RJ, most victims and offenders did not see the other party as 'real' people. When speaking of the person who had murdered her son, Participant D suggested:

> "I think we became real people to him, and he became a real person. Before the meeting I only saw him as a monster, but when we met I saw that he was just a boy".

When asked what prompted them to agree to RJ the participant disclosed:

> "I wanted him to know that it affected more than just one person, it affected my whole family, and people in the community, as people started panicking, sort of brought it home that it could happen to anyone. After the meeting I felt relieved, I had got rid of some anger, lots of bitterness"

RJ has many positive outcomes for victims and families of victims, and as defined in the literature review, does not always result in a face to face meeting. The study revealed that although many victims do in fact benefit from meetings, this process is not suitable for everyone. Participants representing institutions pointed out that many victims, and families of victims, access the process via mediation, with no interest in meeting with the offender. The study did show that, in contrast to existing literature, not many victims receive an apology, with many not wishing for one either and one participant acknowledging that in most of her cases no one has ever said sorry. In addition, whilst all literature states that an offender has to have admitted guilt in order to access RJ, the study revealed this is not always the case. All participants representing institutions suggested that in many of their cases, guilt has not been admitted. Participant I outlined this when recalling one particular case in which a victim's mum wished to meet her daughter's murderer as she was scared that he was going to harm her too, stating:

> "He didn't admit guilt, but they met anyway. The victims mum didn't care if he admitted it or not, she just wanted to be in room with him and tell him how she felt",

Which supports the theory that many victims do not necessarily want apologies but want answers to their questions.

4.5 – Theme 4- Life chances

The third theme to arise from the transcribed data relates to life chances. The term 'life chances' was founded in the 1920s by German sociologist Max Weber, and it has since been the subject of many theoretical academic texts. Life chances are noted to be a combination of things someone can do for themselves, and opportunities which society can offer individuals, to improve their quality of life. According to Weber, opportunities in this sense are referred to as to what degree one has access to resources together with the ability to satisfy ones needs (Swedberg, & Agevall. 2005). Both Weber and German philosopher, Karl Marx, suggested that individuals actively make choices which influence their experiences. Marx stated that:

> "Men make history, but they do not make it just as they please: they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves but under the circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (LaGory, Fitzpatrick, & Ritchey. (2001).

To summarise, both Weber and Marx argue that lifestyles and social practices are made primarily by choice, influenced by the social context, which is provided by chance. The transcribed data found within this study shows that, 100% of participants believed that RJ provided positive life changes, on some scale, to those who took part in RJ. Participant B, an ex-offender, was serving a prison sentence when he took part in RJ and at the time saw at his offenses as victimless crimes. When asked his thoughts prior to RJ he stated that he knew all about behaviour patterns, and about body language, he knew how to look guilty and how not to look guilty. In his words he admitted that before the meeting his thoughts were to just go along with the process as he would get an hour out of his cell. Participant B also stated his intensions, at the time, were as follows:

> "I thought I'd just go over and speak to these people, look shameful, look guilty, show them a little bit of remorse, like I used to do with the judges, and like I used to do with the probation and that sort of stuff. I thought then everybody can be happy, and I can get on with my stay in prison".

Data revealed that all participants, who were ex-offenders, did not see their offences from a victim's point of view prior to RJ. Participant B, when referring to his criminal behaviour, and his thoughts at the time, stated:

> "You know, I'd always done it since I was a little kid and now I am in my 40s and it's my job, I'd never really given it any thought. I didn't think it harmed people other than it cost them a couple of quid, I didn't think it affected people physically, emotionally, spiritually, and I didn't even know them words. I used to make excuses like: it's only a jacket, it's only a laptop, it's only this, and it's only that, you know, there insured, there rich, all the things I used to say to myself "

This statement confirms that his thoughts were not on any victim's feelings. These finding were consistent with participant E who thought of himself as the victim. Participant E admitted that before he met face to face with his victim's parents, he believed he was the victim, blaming everyone else for his prison sentence, stating:

> "I was the one hard done by, I had never thought about anyone else, I thought I was the unlucky one. My values and beliefs were even worse than before I went to prison, and when I was released I didn't care about myself, so how was I supposed to care about someone else?"

Participant F, also an ex-offender, believed he was the victim of society because he was caught and sent to prison. When asked his feelings before RJ, Participant F replied:

> "Well, in court I was an angry young lad, and felt sorry for myself more than anyone else. While in prison I was trying to come to terms with what had happened and what I'd done really".

When asked the question, so were your thoughts more about the impact on your life than theirs (the victim)? he answered:

> "Yes, and after I was released I was probably more at risk of committing an offence than before"

The researcher asked why this was and Participant F said:

> "Well I had dwelled on what had happened and become more frustrated, I'd blamed other people, I'd blamed myself too, but to be honest, the people in prison didn't challenge me about my crimes. They pretty much thought the same way I did I suppose. When I came out of prison I wasn't in a good place, I had no likely chance of any empathy"

The transcribed data shows that before going through RJ, participants, who were ex-offenders, believed they had little, or no, chance nor choice of a positive change in lifestyle, and many would go on to re-offend, which supports existing literature. For example: a study, conducted for the University of Surrey identified that re-offending was linked to Prior offending, drug use, accommodation and lack of employment together with regular truancy from school (Brunton-Smith & Hopkins. 2013). In addition, the Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (2003) estimate that, of offenders whose offending behaviour is proven, one in ten people in England and Wales aged between ten and 65 had committed an offence in the previous 12 months.

The results from this study, also supports the theory of both Weber and Marx who argue that lifestyles and social practices are made primarily by choice, influenced by the social context, which is provided by chance (LaGory, Fitzpatrick, & Ritchey, 2001). Ex-offenders who took part in this study revealed that yes, they offended but believed at the time they were victims of a society to which circumstances had led them. Statistics, provided by The Ministry of Justice (2016) show that the overall proven reoffending rate was 29.4, however, results also show that adults released from custodial sentences of less than 12 months had a proven re-offending rate of 64.5%, and Juvenile offenders had a proven re-offending rate of 40.4%.

During interviews, participants who had gone through RJ, either as a victim or an offender, were asked: In your experience and opinion, do you think Restorative Justice has made an impact on your own sense of community? Results show that 100% of participants agreed that RJ had a positive effect on their lives which impacted on their views of others within society.

Also, 100% of ex-offenders stated that the process has given them greater life chances and changes.

Participant B, when speaking about his feelings, during a face to face meeting, told the researcher:

> "Suddenly half way through this meeting it was blatantly obvious, that for me, there was no justification in hurting people, even total strangers. This was something I had never witnessed before; I was feeling a conscience. Metaphorically, these people who I've harmed quite a lot, they said to me: we're glad you're here, because you've caused us a lot of pain, and now you're here we're going to share our pain with you".

When asked how that made him feel, Participant B stated:

> "Well that's what I'd done, I shared their pain, and I didn't give it any speal, that's what I'd done you know, I'd always done it since I was a little kid".

The researcher asked participant B if there was any part of the process which he found personally helpful, and the reply was:

> "They gave me an understanding, but it took time for me to try and explain, in words, the process and injustice. If I'm honest, because you hear this emotional intelligence banging about and err, ye you get in touch with your emotional intelligence and, err, you start empathising with people and you start hearing people, not just with your ears, but with your eyes as well, you start experiencing what you've done".

These results suggest that until an offender is faced with their victim, many do not associate their actions to be of any personal value, and give little, or no, consideration to the harm they have inflicted.

This thought process was also experienced by participant F, who, when asked also if there was any part of the process which he found personally helpful, said:

> "When I was asked the questions of why I had done it, it was the first time I took a step back and thought hang on a minute, there's people who have been harmed more than I have. I reflected on my actions and thought the least I can do is answer some of their questions and try and move forward. After listening to them I vowed to change my life, and I have".

Results of this study clearly show, at least from an offender's point that the realisation of the hurt that is caused by their actions, do indeed result in positive changes towards their lifestyle. All participants agreed that RJ had changed their future, participant B acknowledged:

> "Did it benefit me? Yeh, but at the time it didn't feel like it. It was some time later that I realised the benefit and started feeling shame, and guilt and remorse and sharing another person's pain. I didn't realise it, at that moment in time I just thought, excuse my language, I just thought, --ing hell this is heavy, I'd had easier days up the old bailey".

And one participant recalled his shock when he sat in front of his victim's parents sharing:

> "I had to hear what it was like for them, I had to hear what they did for him at his funeral, about his bright future he had, you've basically gotta be proper troubled to not have them things affect you, I decided there and then that I was going to make positive changes, to make something of my life. So, I went into education".

The study revealed that RJ improved life chances not only for an offender but also victims of crime. All participants who were victims support the notion that RJ allowed them to receive some unanswered questions, whilst also allowing them to move on with their life in a more positive way. Participant C revealed that her views changed with regards to her own career path, stating:

> "Well although I could not forgive him, I felt more at peace, stronger even that before. I decided to train to be a counsellor; I wanted to help other victims, like me but who weren't as strong".

This positive life change, it could be argued, was a direct result from RJ. This was supported by Participant J, an RJ facilitator, who suggested

> "Many service users are given the chance to restore and change their lives after RJ, it makes them evaluate their future and also gives many offenders the help they need".

When asked to elaborate she responded:

> "Well I remember this one case where a guy decided he was going to kill himself and he set his car on fire in a petrol station, despite the chaos and damage it caused, a member of public pulled him out. It also caused lots of panic within the community. He went to prison and decided to do RJ as he wanted to apologise".

When asked what the result was she replied:

> "The police and fire service were pleased with the apology, and he stopped being the guy who caused the damage and started being known as the guy who had a hard time and apologised for it. He wrote to the parish council and apologised, and they asked permission to publish it, and it got positive feedback in the community, and he was no longer scared to go back to his village".

This positive action suggests that RJ can indeed improve community cohesion, as explained by the participant, RJ allowed the man, who wanted to end his life, to overcome his actions and be accepted back onto the community, certainly providing him with a positive life chance. It is suggested that while RJ may not directly provide life chances, the study shows that the process influences decisions to positively change behaviours for many individuals. In addition, it is noted that all ex-offenders within this study positively changed their offending behaviour and were given the opportunity to turn their lives around, resulting in a crimeless

future. Participant B went back into education and is now one of RJ's leading advocates, during the interview he stated:

> "If I didn't go through this Restorative process in 2002 I would never have reached 2003, I would have been dead. The changes from RJ are second to none, erm it opens doors if you've got the courage to do it, then the worlds your oyster".

Furthermore, it is noted that Participant B currently works alongside one of his victims, which supports the notion that life chances are indeed positive following RJ. However, it is also noted that due to the nature of this study, the participant sample was indeed small, so it is questioned whether the findings are a true reflection of all offenders and victims.

4.6 – Summary of chapter

Thematic analysis was used, within this study, to transcribe the interviews as it is noted to allow patterns and themes to emerge. Four main themes emerged during transcript which are as follows: public awareness, victim focus, education in the community and life chances. The first theme, public awareness, revealed that the general public shared a lack of knowledge around the subject of Restorative Justice. Although all participants had extensive knowledge of RJ practices, either on a professional or personal level, prior to this study taking place, all shared the belief that the biggest obstacle of the RJ process was that public awareness. All participants also agreed that the definition of RJ leaves a lack of understanding by most members of society, with many never having heard of the term RJ, which the study found to be of huge concern.

This study focussed on the county of Yorkshire and it is noted that South Yorkshire Police commenced a pilot scheme in 2017 to address the problem of Police awareness. The key components of the scheme were training in RJ for response officers, which included detailed guidance on how to refer cases to Community Justice Panels, Youth Offending Teams and charitable organisations.

However, a previous study, conducted by Shapland, Crawford, Gray & Bur (2017), show that the use of RJ at the level of policing was still seen as very inconsistent; while some officers offered RJ, but many did not. These findings raise concerns as it could be that the service a victim received was dependent on the officer who dealt with the incident. These findings are consistent with the findings of this study and argue that much more training and public awareness is needed if RJ is to continue as a future way forward to meet the needs of a victim, offender and the general public. A recommendation be made to include the education of RJ into the school curriculum, possibly it could be incorporated into the subject of PHSE, (Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education) which would raise awareness with children of all backgrounds, genders and race, regardless of whether they have been a victim or offender.

The second theme which arose was Victim focus, and all participants agreed that that RJ was beneficial to victims in terms of bringing them peace of mind, and clarity by having their questions answered. In addition, 100% of participants agreed that RJ would address the pain caused by the offender, and in many cases allows them to gain some sort of power balance, which supports much existing literature, as RJ aims to find a positive way forward by allowing an offender and victim to meet and address their concerns (The Home Office, 2013). In contrast to these findings, the data also suggests that RJ is not offered to all victims. The data within this study revealed that although many strategies in place within the CJS are victim focussed, which supports the aims of RJ, there are many limitations for access to services.

Participants representing agencies revealed that out of all victims who are asked if they want to take part in RJ, around 50% were interested in finding out what the process involved. However, the study also revealed that out of the 50% who were interested, the percentage who accepted the offer was significantly lower. Future research is needed to address why victim access to RJ is low which supports statistics from the Crime Survey for England and Wales, (2015-16), who revealed that only 4.2 % of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to meet with their offender (Barrett, D. 2016).

The third theme relates to education and although many strategies are in place within the CJS, communities and schools, data reveals that many individuals who have partaken RJ training are still confused about the process, confirming that more education and training is needed for RJ to be fully successful.

Participants with offending backgrounds all agreed that they had not had a good academic education when young. These findings were consistent with existing literature, and the latest figures, published by the Prison Reform Trust (2016), revealed that (51%) the number of people entering prison have the literacy skills of an 11-year-old. Results show that offending behaviour is linked to poor education, and exclusion from school when young. These findings support existing literature which shows that 42% of prisoners had a history of being permanently excluded from school, with one in five people in custody having learning difficulties (Prison Reform Trust, 2016),

100% of participants agreed that RJ should be taught at an early age to improve community cohesion and understanding of how some actions affect others. It is noted that RJ is practiced within many schools in contemporary society with positive results. However, funding could prove problematic to training and education, showing limitations in more deprived areas and schools where funding is already in short supply. This is supported by existing Literature which suggests that the reliance of RJ should not be affected by cost saving claims (Commons select committee, 2016).

The fourth theme to arise from the transcribed data was life chances which are noted to be a combination of things one can do for themselves, and opportunities society can offer individuals, in order to improve their quality of life. Data revealed that 100% of participants believed that RJ provided positive life changes, on some scale, to those who took part in RJ. Participants, who were ex-offenders, did not look at their offences from a victim's point of view before engaging in RJ. In addition, all agreed that RJ had a positive effect on their lives which impacted on their views of others within society. Also, 100% of ex-offenders stated that the process has given them greater life chances and changes with many turning to education to turn their lives around.

Results showed that RJ had a positive effect on victims too as they were no longer scared of their offender and received answers to their questions. Participant C revealed that her views changed with regards to her own career path, stating:

> "Well although I could not forgive him, I felt more at peace, stronger even that before. I decided to train to be a counsellor; I wanted to help other victims like me but who weren't as strong"

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 – Findings

Existing literature was researched during this thesis and was compared with the in-depth data collected from ten semi-structured interviews. This chosen method of data collection was used as the researcher felt it was the most appropriate for the subject matter of social sciences and is noted to be the basis of qualitative research. Furthermore, this approach was seen as the most appropriate to this study as it is noted to be the best approach to social reality when explaining the experiences, lived by humans, which is relevant to the subject matter of RJ practices and community cohesion.

A total of ten Participants were chosen to represent a range of perspectives and comprised of: four individuals from a range of institutions, to provide their professional opinions on the subject of community RJ. Three participants had been a victim of crime, and three participants were ex-offenders, who had also taken part in the RJ process. The reasoning for this was to gain valuable, personal opinions, from a non-professional perspective. The rational for the use of qualitative methods, was examine the individual opinions of participants, allowing the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of how Restorative Justice Strategies are, or could be, used for Community intervention in deprived areas.

A pre-determined set of open questions were designed to allow all Participant's the chance to explain, in their own words, their own thoughts and experiences of RJ practices. Also, the questions allowed flexibility in the way issues were addressed, while allowing the opportunity for the researcher to explore particular themes or responses further. However, the researcher acknowledges the use of semi-structured interviews, together with the sample size create limitations which will be explained in the 5.3 - Limitations section of this chapter. The researcher chose thematic analysis to transcribe data within this study, as, it is known to be a quick and easy method to practice whilst being favoured for its flexibility and is widely used in qualitative research. In addition, this method was chosen as it is noted to be a useful method for examining the perspectives of different participants, whilst allowing similarities and differences to be highlighted, which can generate unanticipated insights while

summarizing key features (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). Occurring over five stages, thematic analysis is said to: firstly, identify recurring themes, analyse the themes and report patterns within the data, followed by organisation and describing of the data.

The researcher analysed the main four themes, by using a comparison between existing literature, in order to find any similarities and differences which address the research question. It is concluded that the results of this study support existing literature in relation to RJ practices. Thematic analysis revealed four main themes from the data, the first one of which is public awareness. Data revealed that 100% of participants agreed that the general public shared a lack of knowledge around the subject of RJ. The study shows that the definition of RJ is somewhat confusing, with all participants sharing the belief that the definition and meaning of RJ is not understood by most members of society, including members of institutions who offer, and often deliver, RJ such as the Police Force.

During the interviews, the researcher asked each participant what, in their opinion, is the biggest obstacle of the RJ process and it became apparent that each shared the view that awareness was a huge concern. This is confirmed by Participant A who stated

> "Well people just don't know what RJ is, which is why we have a communications plan, it doesn't matter how much we talk about it lots of people just don't know what it is".

The participant went on to suggest that:

> "Even knowing what it is and then thinking about, well you know, it's a bit like when they say Ron seal and you get whets on the tin. Well its quite complex to understand what is RJ, so I think that's the biggest obstacle. It's because if the people who are the potential beneficiaries of the service don't understand what it means, the people who are making that offer, like non specialists and police officers who might be talking to them about it, there not 100% sure, because I mean it's not only about what it is but what would be the process? how might it work?"

This statement suggests that if the Police, or non- specialists, offering RJ are not 100% sure of the process then members of the public, like victims or offenders, and their families, are not going to understand the process which could contribute to the lack of service users.

In addition to service users having limited access, which could be through a lack of knowledge of RJ, results also indicate that conflicts arise between service users and their family and friends. It is concluded that due to the lack of public awareness, many victims who are given the knowledge and choice of RJ are frequently discouraged from the process by friends and family members who do not understand, neither the process of RJ, nor the reasoning why a victim or offender would want to meet the other party. It is argued that while RJ is offered to victims and offenders, the general public, not directly involved in the CJS are still in ignorance as to any benefits of RJ. The results of this study confirmed that awareness of RJ needs to be extended to the general public in order to benefit many individuals.

Participant C encounted conflicts from her family which left her doubting her decision to partake in RJ. During her interview it emerged, that due to the lack of knowledge, her family became unsupportive to the idea of RJ, stating:

> "Well a lot was my family, they didn't understand why I'd want to see him, thought I was crazy. I suppose they just expected it all to go away after the court case, but in my head, it was still there all time".

These findings were confirmed during the interview of Participant B, who suggested that public awareness was indeed a huge problem. Now very much involved within the field of RJ, Participant B has concerns as to public awareness and confirms that the reason for this could be that only direct service users are involved with the process. When asked his thoughts on public awareness he stated:

> "Oh yes public awareness that is my big bee in the bonnet, drives me crazy. Yes, you get all the RJ conferences where they get together and have a good jolly and talk about public awareness, but there are no members of the public. This is not rocket science; I like a bit of academia. Basically, there's a saying, and the saying goes like this, tell me

> and I'll forget, show me and I'll remember, yes? Involve me and I'll understand. This would be perfect for public awareness, I mean, how can you make the public aware if you're not involving them?"

While the theme of public awareness is a concern for all participant's it is then questioned why no general members of the public are invited to meetings, why does someone have to be involved either in the CJS or a victim of crime before knowledge is made available? It is clear in the findings of this study that public awareness, or lack of it, effects the decisions of offenders, victims and their families, with regards to participation of RJ. However, data clearly points more to problems and decisions around recruiting victims for the process. It is argued that while many offenders can be recruited during a prison sentence, or whilst in contact with the Probation or organisations such as drug/alcohol groups, victims are not as readily able to approach as many victims will never meet other victims so the opportunity to talk and spread awareness is somewhat limited.

The second theme transcribed from the data is that of victim focus, literature suggests that many coping mechanisms which people use in everyday situations are eluded when a crime is committed against them. Crime is often described as having three primary impacts which are: emotional, financial and physical, and it is noted that while one or all three can affect an individual, the most devastating, and often the least understood, is the emotional impact (Bazemore & Schif, 2015). Over the past three decades a variety of strategies have been put in place to improve the criminal justice process for victims, such as: increased victim services, self-help groups and legally defined rights. RJ is probably the most influential movement to address the needs of a victim, implying that victims should have a central role in justice. With RJ, victims often get the opportunity to repair the harms caused to them by giving them a voice and often receiving answers to their questions. The transcribed data within this study confirms that of existing literature which suggests that the many strategies in place within the CJS are victim focussed and supports the aims of RJ. However, the data also reveals that are still many limitations for access to services.

Participants who represented agencies revealed that out of all victims who are asked if they want to take part in RJ, only around 50% were interested in finding out what the process involved, furthermore, the study also revealed that out of the 50% who were interested, the percentage who accepted the offer was significantly lower. These figures are consistent with

existing literature which shows that only 4.2 % of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to meet with their offender (Barrett, D. 2016), which tells us that the 50% who are interested is actually only around 2.1% of all victims. These low take up figures are in contrast to the victim's code of practice which states that:

> "First the Police must pass the victim's contact details to the organisation that is to deliver Restorative Justice Service's for victims to enable the victim to participate in Restorative Justice, unless asked not to do so by the victim". (Ministry of Justice, 2015).

It is questioned then why, as stated above, statistics show only 4.2 % of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to meet with their offender. The victim's code also states:

> "Dependent on Restorative Justice being available in the relevant area, the service provider that delivers Restorative Justice Services must: provide victims with full and impartial information on Restorative Justice and how they can take part" (Ministry of Justice, 2015).

With this statement, one also has to question why RJ services are not available in all areas. This study clearly found that victim recruitment, and participant, is a major problem when offering RJ services. Participant G, who works for an independent RJ organisation, confirmed the problems around recruiting service users stating,

> "I get more referrals from offenders, part of reason is there are more places you can find offenders, prisons, probation, drug n alcohol groups, those sorts of places, and it's more difficult with victims".

When asked what the reason for the difficulty with recruiting victims was, Participant G replied:

> "Well, where do you find victims? They're not sitting around in the same groups, it's not as easy to talk to a victim about RJ. Also, many don't want it at the time but may do

> a year or two down the line, and many don't agree if they don't understand, or might change their mind"

It is noted that, as stated above, these limitations could be linked to the lack of public awareness; furthermore, it could be questioned who is responsible for offering victims RJ. Participants agreed that more work is needed with victims with Participant G suggesting that some of the difficulties are due to the confusion as to who is responsible for asking victims stating:

> "But where to find them? we are working more with Victim Support but at the minute is it down to them to ask?".

RJ services are delivered and funded by different service providers, these can include: Her Majesty's Prison Services, Police Force, Crime Commissioners, The Probation Service, Victim support and youth offending teams, other victims are approached by either, Victim support or an independent institution. A future recommendation would be to appoint one organisation to deliver the initial approach of RJ to victims. This recommendation for future research will be more detailed within the recommendations section of this chapter (Future research/ recommendations 5.2).

The third theme to arise from the transcribed data relates to life chances. By term life chances the study relates to positive changes individuals can make to improve their wellbeing. This could be a combination of things one can do for themselves, and opportunities society can offer individuals, together with opportunities that individuals have access to resources. In the case of offender's life chances are also referred to as a positive effect on rehabilitation to enable a life without re-offending. This data shows that before going through RJ, participants, who were ex-offenders, believed they had little, or no, chance nor choice of a positive change in lifestyle, and many would go on to re-offend, which supports existing literature. In addition, all participants who were ex-offenders believed they themselves were the victim, showing no thoughts or empathy for their victims. Participant E admitted that before he met face to face with his victim's parents, he believed he was the victim, blaming everyone else for his prison sentence. Participant F also revealed that he too had similar thoughts before the RJ process, stating:

> "Well I had dwelled on what had happened and become more frustrated, I'd blamed other people, I'd blamed myself too, but to be honest, I couldn't think in custody, there wasn't anyone who said I'd done wrong. All my mates in there were criminals same as me. When I came out of prison I wasn't in a good place, I had no likely chance of any employment".

This study supports the theory that RJ gave offenders the chance to change their lives, opportunities were given for them to reflect on their own lifestyles and actions and implement positive change. Results show that 100% of participants agreed that RJ had a positive effect on their lives which impacted on their views of others within society. Also, 100% of ex-offenders stated that the process has given them greater life chances and changes with all entering some sort of education or training following RJ. In addition, data shows that, following RJ, all participants who had offended showed empathy and regret for their actions to which they had not felt before the process. Participant B, when speaking about his feelings, during a face to face meeting, told the researcher

> "Suddenly half way through this meeting it was blatantly obvious, that for me, there was no justification in hurting people, even total strangers. This was something I had never witnessed before; I was feeling a conscience".

RJ also had a positive life change for participant F, who replied, when asked also if there was any part of the process which he found personally helpful,

> "When I was asked the questions of why I had done it, it was the first time I took a step back and thought hang on a minute, there's people who have been harmed more than I have. I reflected on my actions and thought the least I can do is answer some of their questions and try and move forward. After listening to them I vowed to change my life, and I have".

The data within this study also shows that RJ improved life chances not only for an offender but also victims of crime. All participants who were victims shared the belief that RJ allowed them to receive some unanswered questions with the chance of putting their experience behind them and moving on with their life in a more positive way. Data supports existing literature which states RJ is victim focussed by allowing them to receive some kind of closure. Participant C revealed that her views changed with regards to her own career path, stating

> "Well although I could not forgive him, I felt more at peace, stronger even that before. I decided to train to be a counsellor; I wanted to help other victims, like me but who weren't as strong".

This statement was supported by participants who represented institutions with Participant J, an RJ facilitator, who suggested:

> "Many service users are given the chance to restore and change their lives after RJ, it makes them evaluate their future and also gives many offenders the help they need".

It is suggested that while RJ may not directly provide life chances, the study shows that the process influences decisions to positively change behaviours for many individuals. However, it is also noted that due to the sensitivity of this study, the participant sample was indeed small, so it is questioned whether the findings are a true reflection of all offenders and victims.

5.2 – Research limitations

The aims of this study have been met with the examination of ways in which communities could be strengthened with the use of Restorative Justice (RJ) practices, and if indeed community RJ improves life chances/ well-being, of individual members of the public.

The recruitment of participants proved problematic as the nature of the study was somewhat on a personal level, therefore snowballing from other parties proved difficult. The researcher found that many institutions were reluctant to forward service users details or contact them to

forward the researchers details. In addition, it was difficult finding RJ service users as the researcher was limited to resources on where to find ex-offenders or victims.

Furthermore, due to the difficulties in recruitment, it is noted that the participant sample was small, only three ex-offenders and three victims were interviewed so it could be questioned whether the findings are a true reflection of all offenders and victims. It could be argued that more in-depth data, with a wider audience, would have been more beneficial and provided different views. For example: all RJ service users who were interviewed had been recruited by snowballing and all had positive opinions of RJ.

Moreover, due to the sensitive nature of this study, which involved victims and ex-offenders, the researcher encountered a few problems gaining ethical approval. These problems involved extra sensitivity towards the victims, as there was a possibility they could re-live sensitive encounters. Also, the researcher had to be mindful of ex-offenders, so risk analysis assessments had to be addressed.

5.3 – Future Research/ recommendations

This study found that public awareness of RJ creates many limitations as for access to services. It is suggested that much more training and public awareness is needed if RJ is to continue as a future way forward to meet the needs of a victim, offender and the general public.

Recommendations for these limitations are that much more training is needed within the institutions who deliver RJ, such as the Police force and Probation services. It is concluded

that the general public would benefit from awareness of RJ practices, not just for offenders or victims. It is noted that if more members of the public were educated on RJ, more people would be in a position to offer asked advice and support to family members and friends who may want/need access to RJ. Future research is needed to assess why the victim participation of RJ is still so low.

The study supports existing literature with the suggestion that teaching RJ from a young age benefits individual. Although it is acknowledged that some schools practice RJ, the potential cost of training could prove to be problematic when it comes to schools with small budgets. It is recommended that RJ practices be implemented into the National School Curriculum,

possibly be included into the subject of PHSE, (Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education). In this way, many young people will have the knowledge of RJ practices, whilst also teaching them to think about how some actions affect others.

Another recommendation for public awareness is to involve the general public more, this could be via neighbourhood watch programs or inviting the public to some meetings. As pointed out by Participant B, who suggested:

> "Tell me and I'll forget, show me and I'll remember, yes? Involve me and I'll understand. This would be perfect for public awareness, I mean, how can you make the public aware if you're not involving them? "

In addition, recommendations are to involve RJ more within television programs such as soap operas, which attract many viewers, also the researcher recommends that televised documentaries could be made where real victims and offenders are interviewed which would give real accounts of RJ processes.

The research found that RJ services are commissioned, delivered, and funded by a number of service providers, including: The Police force, Youth Offending Teams, National Probation Service, Her Majesty's Prison Service, and Police and Crime Commissioners, other victims are approached by either, Victim support or an independent institution. A future recommendation would be to appoint one organisation to deliver the initial approach of RJ to victims. It could be argued that by having different institutions approaching service users, many individuals may not be offered the process due to each organisation assuming the responsibility is down to others.

Chapter 6

Bibliography

Appendix 1

Ethics form

THE UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD

School of Human and Health Sciences – School Research Ethics Panel

Kirsty Thomson SREP Administrator: hhs_srep@hud.ac.uk

Name of applicant: Tracey Reynolds

Title of study: What are Restorative Justice Strategies for Community intervention in deprived areas?

Department: Human and Health Sciences Date sent: 03/-1/2018

Please provide sufficient detail below for SREP to assess the ethical conduct of your research. You should consult the guidance on filling out this form and applying to SREP at http://www.hud.ac.uk/hhs/research/srep/.

Researcher details	Tracey Reynolds PGR student ID; U1457822
Supervisor details	Dr Jamie Halsall Dr Carla Reeves

All documentation has been read by supervisor (where applicable)	YES

Brief overview of research methods	To meet the aims of the study and address the research question, the study will take an interpretive approach as it is seen as the most appropriate for the social sciences and is noted to be the basis of qualitative research. This approach is most appropriate to this study as it is noted to be the best approach to social reality in the description of the lived experience of human beings, which is relevant to the subject matter of RJ practices and community involvement. Qualitative research will be used within the study to enable the researcher to examine the views of participants, together with the aim of gaining a greater understanding of how RJ practices can influence community cohesion. The study will be conducted using semi-structured interviews to provide participants the opportunity to explore issues they feel are important. Although the researcher will provide a predetermined set of open questions (questions that prompt discussion), it is important that participants are given the chance to explain their own thoughts and experiences of RJ practices to ensure flexibility in the way issues are addressed while allowing the opportunity for the interviewer to explore particular themes or responses further. Interviews will be conducted in an agreed neutral place which will provide confidentiality and safety to both researcher and participants.

start date	Oct 2017
completion date	Oct 2018
Permissions for study	The researcher will seek individual consent from each participant by asking the participant to read and sign an informed consent form (as explained below and included) prior to the study.
Access to participants Intended participants	The researcher will contact each participant individually via email or telephone with an aim of recruiting participants. Where necessary the researcher will snowball further participants (ex-offenders/victims) via institutions involved in the Restorative Justice process. Participants will include; • A member of staff from South Yorkshire Youth Offending Service • RJ practitioner Nominated by South Yorkshire Police Crime Commissioner • Individual from a RJ charitable organisation • Member of The Restorative Justice Council • Member of staff from secondary schools who practice RJ within the school • Ex-offenders/victims who have practiced RJ. (All these participants will have no current ties within the Criminal Justice System)

Confidentiality	Prior to any interview taking place, a consent form will be given to participants, along with a written information sheet
Anonymity	The researcher will inform all participants that interviews will be recorded however, all recorded interviews will be deleted after the analysis is complete and the names of participants will not be revealed to ensure anonymity. All names will be anonymised by the use of Letters.
Right to withdraw	Participants will be informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time up to a period of 2 weeks after the interview has taken place (Covered in the written consent form)

Psychological support for participants	No psychological issues are anticipated as all participants are either currently working within the field of Restorative Justice, therefore trained in such aspects, or are ex-offenders/ victims who are no longer involved within the criminal justice system. However, all participants will be provided with an information sheet providing access to additional support such as Samaritans/ victim support prior to any interview, (see Appendix 2) together with an interview schedule so they can make an informed choice as to whether the interview is likely to upset them.

Researcher safety / support (attach completed University Risk Analysis and Management form)	No safety issues are anticipated as all interviews will be conducted within a safe environment. (all participants from institutions will be interviewed within their organisations offices). It has already been agreed that at least one participant will be interviewed by telephone (due to logistics of the distance) and where ex- offenders or victims are involved interviews will take place within agreed organisation officers. Where no organisations are involved interviews will take place within a secured room at the University of Huddersfield. However, the researcher will contact a nominated person prior to any meeting and on leaving.
Information sheet	All participants will be provided with an information sheet (Attached below) two weeks prior to the study taking place together with an interview schedule.
Consent form	The researcher will receive completed consent forms (Attached below) from all participants prior to the study taking place.
Letters / posters / flyers	All correspondence will be individually tailored to each participant.

Questionnaire / Interview guide	The study will be conducted using semi-structured interview questions. Due to the nature of the study and diverse participants three sets of questions are needed. The researcher will provide prompt questions which are attached below.

Debrief (if appropriate)	Following all interviews, the researcher will say thank you, if any participant appears to have been affected by the process the researcher will endeavour to remain with the participant for a brief period of time to divert their thoughts onto a more everyday conversation in order to bring their mood back to the present, before providing them with the debrief which contains contact details of a range of support organisations.
Dissemination of results	Participants will be asked if they would like to know the results of the study and where appropriate, a copy will be provided. Together with information of any future publications.
Identify any potential conflicts of interest	There are no known conflicts of interest
Does the research involve accessing data or visiting websites that could constitute a legal and/or reputational risk to yourself or the University if misconstrued? Please state Yes/No If Yes, please explain how you will minimise this risk	NO
The next four questions in the grey boxes relate to Security Sensitive Information – please read the following guidance before completing these questions: http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2012/oversight-ofsecuritysensitive-research-material.pdf	

Is the research commissioned by, or on behalf of the military or the intelligence services? Please state Yes/No If Yes, please outline the requirements from the funding body regarding the collection and storage of Security Sensitive Data	NO
Is the research commissioned under an EU security call? Please state Yes/No If Yes, please outline the requirements from the funding body regarding the collection and storage of Security Sensitive Data	NO
Does the research involve the acquisition of security clearances? Please state Yes/No If Yes, please outline how your data collection and storages complies with the requirements of these clearances	NO
Does the research concern terrorist or extreme groups? Please state Yes/No If Yes, please complete a Security Sensitive Information Declaration Form	NO

Does the research involve covert information gathering or active deception? Please state Yes/No	No
Does the research involve children under 18 or participants who may be unable to give fully informed consent? Please state Yes/No	No
Does the research involve prisoners or others in custodial care (e.g. young offenders)? Please state Yes/No	NO
Does the research involve significantly increased danger of physical or psychological harm or risk of significant discomfort for the researcher(s) and/or the participant(s), either from the research process or from the publication of findings? Please state Yes/No	Ethical consideration has been given to participants who have been a victim of crime. It is a possibility that due to the nature of the study, a participant may find themselves re-living their experience. However, the researcher will divert from personal questions about the offence and an information sheet will be provided two weeks before the interview providing details of organisations who offer additional support (Appendix 2) The participants will also be informed that they can withdraw from the study at any time up to 2 weeks after interviews.
Does the research involve risk of unplanned disclosure of information you would be obliged to act on? Please state Yes/No	Participants will be informed within the information sheet, given two weeks before the interview, and reminded just before interview takes place during the introductions, that the disclosure of any future criminal activity, or potential threat of harm will be acted upon.

Where application is to be made to NHS Research Ethics Committee / External Agencies	N/A
Please supply copies of all relevant supporting documentation electronically. If this is not available electronically, please provide explanation and supply hard copy	

All documentation must be submitted to the SREP administrator. All proposals will be reviewed by two members of SREP.

If you have any queries relating to the completion of this form or any other queries relating to SREP's consideration of this proposal, please contact the SREP administrator (Kirsty Thomson) in the first instance – hhs_srep@hud.ac.uk

Appendix-2

Participant Information sheet

My name is Tracey Reynolds and I am a Post Graduate Research Student the University of Huddersfield.

I wold like to invite you to take part in my research project. The aim for this study is to explore what are Restorative Justice Strategies for Community Intervention in South Yorkshire? (which is explained in more detail below)

Once you have read the information sheet, and agree to take part in this study, please sign the attached consent form.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you have any questions. The study is totally voluntary, and interviews are expected to last between half an hour up to onehour maximum.

Participants have the right to withdraw at any time during the study up to a period of two weeks after interviews have taken place.

All interviews will be recorded then transcribed into a typed record. However, recorded data will be deleted after analysis is complete and your names will not be associated with your audio recording or the typed transcript, nor revealed at any stage to ensure your anonymity.

Your identity will be protected by the use of pseudonym in the report and no written information which can lead to you being identified will be included in any report. However, the researcher will be compelled to notify third parties where any information provided discloses undetected criminal activity or indication of risk of harm to oneself or others.

Raw data collected during the transcription will be only accessed by myself (researcher) and my supervisor (unless, as above, where any information provided discloses undetected criminal activity or indication of risk of harm to oneself or others.) and will be saved on a secure password protected laptop. After transcription ammonised data will be saved to a secure University hard drive for a period of ten years). If the findings revealed in the study are published in any way, I will inform you and provide a copy of the report.

After reading this information sheet and do not fully understand any words or concepts please feel free to contact me and I will explain in more detail. I would also like to inform you that you can ask me questions at any time during my study. The aim of my research is to explore ways in which communities could be strengthened with the use of Restorative Justice (RJ) practices. The study also aims to examine what RJ practices are in place within the community and how communities could be strengthened. This will be achieved by examining contemporary debates on communities in the county of South Yorkshire.

It is important to assess to what degree RJ influences communities and if indeed community RJ improves life chances of individual members of the public. To meet these aims, the study will investigate levels RJ Strategies used to build or restore understandings of different cultures and beliefs within communities with an aim of providing harmony and peace among residents.

RJ is noted to be a modern way of reducing crime whilst aiding victims in their recovery.

Thank you for your time

Tracey Reynolds (Researcher)
Tracey.Reynolds@hud .ac.uk

Appendix-3

CONSENT FORM

Title of Research Project: What are Restorative Justice

The researcher has informed me of their aims of this study and provided me with an information sheet,	☐
I give my consent to take part in this the study	☐
I fully understand that I reserve the right withdraw from this study either before, during or up to two weeks after completion of the interview. I understand that I will be given an opportunity to review the researcher's remarks, and I can ask to change or remove pieces if I do not agree with your notes or if you did not understand me correctly.	☐
I consent to my words to be quoted.	☐
I understand that any information I supply will be kept in password protected, conditions for a period of 10 years at the University of Huddersfield.	☐
I understand that only the researcher and their Supervisor will have access to any recordings provided	☐
I understand that the researcher will protect my identity by the use of pseudonym in their report and that no information that could lead to me being identified will be used	☐

Strategies for Community intervention in deprived areas?

Could you please take the time to read and understand the consent form, and sign if you agree to take part. If you understand the provided

information and you are happy to participate in this study, please print and sign below

Participant: signature	Researcher: signature
_____	_____
Print name:	Print name:
_____	_____
Date:	Date:
_____	_____

(one copy to be retained by Participant / one copy to be retained by Researcher)

Appendix- 4

RISK ANALYSIS & MANAGEMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD

			Name: Tracey Reynolds	
ACTIVITY: LOCATION:			Date:01/01/201	Review Date:
Hazards	Details of Risk(s)	People at Risk	8 Risk management	Other comments
Loss/ theft of data **Interviewing victims/offenders in community**	**Data security** **Personal safety**	**Participants**	**All data will be stored on personal password secured equipment** **Recording equipment will be kept in a lockable case.** Inform someone of times/dates of interviews	**All equipment storing data will be kept in the car boot during travel**

Lifting and handling	**Personal wellbeing g**	**Researcher** **Researcher**	**I will tell a nominated person of my wareabouts and arrange to inform on leaving the interview.** **On entering any premises, I will be vigilant to any escape routes** **Consideration of personal health and well-being will be made when moving and carrying equipment**	**Interview details will be identified with a nominated person s in advance of any meeting.**

Appendix-5

Research Questions

Participants representing institutions

- **Q1** Can you tell me your role/experience of Restorative Justice practices within the community?

- **Q2** In your opinion are there areas where you do not think Restorative Justice is helpful

- **Q3** In your experience what are the biggest obstacles/ challenges of Restorative Justice?

- **Q4** Are there areas where Restorative Justice works more than others?

- **Q5** What would you change?

- **Q6** Do you think Restorative Justice could improve and strengthen communities?

- **Q7** How would you develop Restorative Justice**?**

- **Q8** Is there anything you would like to add?

EX-Offenders / Victims

- **Q1** Could you tell me your experience of Restorative Justice? For example:

What process did you go through?

- **Q2** Can you tell me your reasons for agreeing to the process?

- **Q3** In what way did you find the process personally helpful?

- **Q4** What did you appreciate?

- **Q5** What would you change?

- **Q6** What was the final outcome for you**?**

- **Q7** In your experience and opinion, do you think Restorative Justice has made an impact on your own sense of community?

- **Q8** As a result of your RJ experience has your views changed towards offending behaviour?

- **Q9** Has RJ, in your own personal experience, made you feel more in-control of your future?

- **Q10** How would you develop Restorative Justice**?**

- **Q11** Is there anything you would like to add?

Appendix-6

Email letter for participants (this was modified to each individual/ institution)

…….

My name is Tracey Reynolds
I am conducting a piece of research for Huddersfield University into Restorative Justice Practices in South Yorkshire.
The aim of my research is to discover how Restorative Justice Practices can influence community cohesion.
In order to complete my research, I would be grateful if I could set up an informal telephone call or email communication, with you to explain the processes and importance of my research and discuss the possibility of an interview in the New Year.
After reading your Blog I believe you could help my research by providing a valuable opinion for RJ processes in South Yorkshire.
In addition, I will inform you that any interview you provide will be treat with the utmost confidentiality. A consent form, which complies with the British Society of Criminology, Statement of Ethics (2015) will be provided. The consent form will also include my declaration of the steps taken to protect your anonymity and confidentiality.
I look forward to your response and thank you in advance for your time.
Tracey Reynolds

Appendix-7

Support leaflet

Tel: 03444 111 444

https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/about-us/how-weprovideadvice/advice/Get-advice/

PRISONERS' ADVICE SERVICE

THE INDEPENDENT LEGAL CHARITY PROVIDING INFORMATION AND REPRESENTATION TO PRISONERS

Telephone: 020 7253 3323 (Monday, Wednesday, Friday 9.30am-1.00pm and 2.00pm-5.30pm)

Email: advice@prisonersadvice.org.uk

Website: Prisoners' Advice Service

National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders

(NACRO) Resettlement Advice Service Telephone: 0300 123 1889 (Monday to Friday: 9am - 5pm)

Email: helpline@nacro.org.uk Website: Nacro

Appendix- 8

Participants

	Sex	Age group	Status in RJ	Interview type
Participant_A	Female	40-55	Professional	Face to face
Participant_B	Male	40-55	Ex-Offender	Telephone
Participant_C	Female	20-30	Victim	Face to face
Participant_D	Female	30-40	Victim	Face to face
Participant_E	Male	20-30	Ex-Offender	Face to face
Participant_F	Male	20-30	Ex-Offender	Face to face
Participant_G	Female	30=40	Professional	Face to face
Participant_H	Female	40-50	Victim	Face to face
Participant_I	Male	30=40	Professional	Face to face
Participant_J	Female	40-55	Professional	Face to face

References

Atkinson, R. & Blandy, S. (2008). Gated Communities. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.au/books?hl=en&lr=&id=LTjcAAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=gated+communities+uk&ots=KppykKf4W&sig=KybG9wTtr1O3cQIV00it9rc6u0g#v=onepage&q=gated%20communities%20uk&f=true

Barrett, D. (2016), Home Affairs Correspondent, Retrieved from: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/12200545/Only-one-in-14crime-victimsoffered-restorative-justice-scheme.html

Bawden, A. (2014). How restorative justice is steering young offenders away from crime. The Guardian. Retrieved from:https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/sep/17/restorativejustice-youngoffenders-crime

Bazemore, G & Schif, M, (2015). Restorative Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities. Routledge: NewYork.

Beider, H. (2011). Community cohesion: the views of white working-class communities. Retrieved from: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/workingclasscommunity-cohesion-full.pdf

Blood, P., Thorsborne, M. (2005, March 3-5). The challenge of culture change: Embedding restorative practice in schools. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices: Building a Global Alliance for Restorative Practices and Family Empowerment, Sydney, Australia

Braithwaite, J. (2002) Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation. New York:

Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa Oxford University Press

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bruhn, J.G. (2011). The Sociology of Community Connections. Springer Science & Business Media. doi: 9400716338, 9789400716339

Brunton-Smith. I, & Hopkins. K, 2013). The factors associated with proven reoffending following release from prison: findings from Waves 1 to 3 of SPCR. Retrieved from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads /attachment_data/file/491119/re-offending-release-waves-1-3-spcr-findings.pdf
Bryant, L. (n.d.) Structured interviews. Retrieved from History Learning Site: http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/structured_interviews.htm

Cantle, T. (2001). Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team. Retrieved from: http://library.college.police.uk/docs/npia/CohesionGuide.pdf

Capita, (2018). Exploring the link between poor educational outcomes and youth crime. Retrieved from: https://www.capita-one.co.uk/resources/blog/exploringlink-between-pooreducational-outcomes-and-youth-crime

Child Poverty Action Group, (2017). The Impact of Poverty. Retrieved from: http://cpag.org.uk/content/impact-poverty

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

Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts of property. The British Journal of Criminology, 17 (1), 1

Creswell, J. (2013). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th Ed.). California: Sage Publications.

Christophersen, O. (2017). Community Life Survey 2016-2017, The Department of, Digital, Culture and Media & Sport, Retrieved from:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/638534/Community_Life_Survey_-_Statistical_Release_2016-17_FINAL_v.2.pdf

Circles, (2015). Circles of Support UK, About Circles. Retrieved from: http://www.circlesuk.org.uk/about-circles

Claes, E, Foqué, R & Peters, T, (2005). Punishment, Restorative Justice and the Morality of Law. Intersentia, Antewrp. Oxford

Cohen D, Crabtree B. "Qualitative Research Guidelines Project." July 2006. http://www.qualres.org/HomeSemi-3629.html

College of Policing, (2015). Restorative Justice. Retrieved from: https://whatworks.college.police.uk/toolkit/Pages/Intervention.aspx?InterventionI D=24

Collins, J. (2016). Restorative justice: Briefing for defence practitioners and prosecutors.

Restorative Justice Council. Retrieved from: https://restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/files/briefing%20for%20lawyers_web2.pdf

Commons select committee, (2016). Government should work towards right to restorative justice for victims. Retrieved from: https://www.parliament.uk/Business/committees/committees-a-z/commonsselect/justicecommittee/news-parliament-20151/restorative-justice-reportpublished-16-17/

Crawford, A. & Newburn, T. (2003). Youth Offending and restorative justice, Cullompton: Willan-15. Retrieved from http://bjc.oxfordjournals.org/content/17/1/1.full.pdf+html.

Creswell, J. (2013). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th Ed.). California: Sage Publications.

Crime and Justice Survey (2003). Proven re-offending statistics: definitions and measurement, Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from;

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/218455/proven-reoffending-definitions-measure-2012.pdf
Daly, K. (2002). Restorative justice the real story. Punishment & Society, 4462917031339334 (1), 55-79. doi: 10.1177/14624740222228464.

Department of Education, (2011). Community Cohesion, A Freedom of Information (FOI) request and disclosure about community cohesion. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-cohesion

Dignan, J. & Maguire, M. (2005). Understanding Victims and Restorative Justice. Open University Press. Retrieved from: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/hud/reader.action?docID=287897

Dorridge Primary school, (2017). Ofsted Reports. Retrieved from: https://www.dorridge.solihull.sch.uk/DPS/DPS-Ofsted-Reports/

Doward, J. (2017). School exclusion 'linked to long-term mental health problems' – study. Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/aug/19/school-exclusionlinked-tolong-term-mental-health-problems

Fessler, l. (2018). Watch a Wales rugby legend explain why he didn't press charges after a homophobic hate crime. Retrieved from: https://qz.com/1467975/watch-former-wales-rugbycaptain-gareth-thomasrespond-to-gay-hate-crime/

Gabriel, D. (2013). Inductive and Deductive approaches to research. Retrieved from: http://deborahgabriel.com/2013/03/17/inductive-and-deductive-approachesto-research/

Garvey, S. P. (2003). Restorative justice, punishment, and atonement. Utah Law Review, 2003(1), 303.

Gavrielides, DR, T. (2018). What is restorative justice? Retrieved from: https://www.rj4all.info/what-is-restorative-justice

Gill, K. Quilter-Pinner, H, & Swift, D. (2017). MAKING THE DIFFERENCE, BREAKING THE LINK BETWEEN SCHOOL EXCLUSION AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION. Retrieved from: https://www.ippr.org/files/2017-10/making-thedifference-report-october-2017.pdf

Halsall, Jamie (2014) The Re-invention of Sociology of Community. International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities, 8 (1). pp. 91-98. ISSN 2248-9010

Hendry, R. Hopkins, B. & Steele, B. (2011). Restorative Approaches in Schools in the UK. Retrieved from: http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/restorativeapproaches/RA-inthe-UK.pdf?cv=1

House of Commons Justice Committee, (2016). Restorative justice Fourth Report of Session. Retrieved from: http://www.statewatch.org/news/2016/sep/uk-justicecttee-restorative-justicereport.pdf

Howard, J. (1997). RESTORATIVE JUSTICE. Retrieved from: http://www.johnhoward.ab.ca/pub/C26.htm

Klein,L.&Van,Ness.S.R.AmSoc,(2002).33:98.https://doiorg.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1007/s12108-002-1022-2

LaGory, M., Fitzpatrick, K., & Ferris Ritchey. (2001). Life Chances and Choices: Assessing Quality of Life among the Homeless. The Sociological Quarterly, 42(4), 633-651. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/stable/4121136 Low, S. (2003a). Behind the gates: Life, security, and the pursuit of happiness in fortress America. New York: Routledge.

Macqueen, K. M., McLellan, E., Metzger, D. S., Kegeles, S., Strauss, R. P., Scotti, R.,

Trotter, R. T. (2001). What Is Community? An Evidence-Based Definition for Participatory Public Health. American Journal of Public Health, 91(12), 1929–1938.

Mantle, G., Fox, D., & Mandeep, K.D. (2005). Restorative Justice and three individual theories of crime. Internet Journal of Criminology, 1-36. Retrieved from

http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Mantle,%20Fox%20&%20Dhami%20%20Restorative%20Justice.

Marshall, T, F. (1999). Restorative Justice: An overview. Retrieved from: http://fbga.redguitars.co.uk/restorativeJusticeAnOverview.pdf

Matrix evidence, (2009), Barrow Cadbury Trust. Economic analysis of interventions for young adult offenders. Retrieved from: https://restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/files/Matrix%20Evidence%20%20Economic%20Analysis%20of%20interventions%20for%20young%20offenders...pdf

McLaughlin, E., & Open University. (2003). Restorative justice: Critical issues. London: Sage

McLeod, S. (2015). Humanism. Simply Psychology. Retrieved from: https://www.simplypsychology.org/humanistic.html

Ministry of Justice, (2013). Restorative justice action plans and progress reports. Retrieved from; https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-justice 2013

Ministry of Justice, (2015). Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. Retrieved from; https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/476900/code-of-practice-for-victims-of-crime.PDF

Ministry of Justice, (2018). Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin, July 2016 to September 2016. Retrieved from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728730/proven_reoffending_bulletin_July_to_September_16. pd f

Muers, S, (2011). What is community cohesion, and why is it important? Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/housingnetwork/2011/mar/21/community-cohesion-definitionmeasuring

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Offender management statistics, (2018). Prison: the facts. Retrieved from: http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Bromley%20Briefings/Summer%202018%20factfile.pdf

Office for National Statistics, (2018). . Payne, A & Welch, K, (2013). Restorative Justice in Schools: The Influence of Race on Restorative Discipline. Youth and Society. Vol 47, Issue 4, pp. 539 – 564, doi:10.1177%2F0044118X12473125

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative Justice in Schools: The Influence of Race on Restorative Discipline. Youth & Society, 47(4), 539–564. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X12473125

Peterson, P. L., Baker, E. L., & McGaw, B. (2010). International encyclopaedia of education (3rd ed.). Oxford: Academic Press / Elsevier

Phillipson, C. (2012). Community studies and re-studies in the 21st century: methodological challenges and strategies for the future. Sociological Review. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/doi/10.1111/j.1467954X.2012.02098.x/full

Professor Sherman, (2008). Report shows restorative justice reduces crime by 27%. Retrieved from: https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/news/nr/1045-1.175417 Prison Reform Trust (2016).

Restorative Justice Council (2014) Restorative justice and policing, Retrieved from: https://restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/files/1z87_info_packs%20(2)%20police.pdf

Restorative Justice Council, (2015). Restorative Justice for Schools. Retrieved from: http://www.restorativejustice4schools.co.uk/wp/?page_id=124

Restorative Justice Council, (2016). New Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: fundinghttps://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/all/themes/foundation/rjc/logo.p ng

Restorative Justice Council, (2016). Restorative practice in schools. Retrieved from: https://restorativejustice.org.uk/restorative-practice-schools

Restoratives, South Yorkshire, (2018). Community Justice Panels, Retrieved from: restorativessouthyorkshire.co.uk

Roitman, S. (2010). Gated communities: definitions, causes and consequences. Urban Design and Planning 163. DP1/ 31–38. doi: 10.1680/udap.2010.163.1.31.

RSME, (2017). The Origins of Restorative Justice. Retrieved from: http://www.restorativeapproaches.eu/origins

Shapland, J, Crawford, A, Gray, E, & Burn, D (2017). Restorative justice at the level of the police in England: implementing change. Retrieved from; https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.743733!/file/DevelopingRestorativePolic ing3.pdf

Shawish, A. AL. (no date). Evaluating the Impact of Gated Communities on the Physical and Social Fabric of Doha City. Retrieved from: http://www.irbnet.de/daten/iconda/CIB_DC28789.pdf

Shildrick, T. & Rucell, J. (2015). Sociological Perspectives on Poverty. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from: www.JRF.org.uk

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. Campbell Collaboration. DOI: 10.4073/csr.2013.12

Swedberg, R, & Ageval, O. (2005). The Max Weber Dictionary: Keywords and Central Concepts. University Press: California

The British Society of Criminology, Statement of Ethics (2018). Statement of Ethics 2015, Retrieved from: http://www.britsoccrim.org/ethics/

The Crown Prosecution Service (no date), Restorative Justice. Retrieved from: http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/p_to_r/restorative_justice/

The Home Office (2015). Restorative justice Restorative justice action plans and progress reports. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/restorative-justiceaction-plan

T

he Youth Justice Board, (2017). ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS 2016/17. Retrieved from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/630203/YJB_Annual_Report_and_Accounts_201617_Print_Ready.pdf

Transforming conflict, (2018). We can help you work towards and achieve the Restorative Justice Council Restorative Services Quality Mark (RSQM). Retrieved from: https://transformingconflict.org/

Umbreit, M, S. (1995). Holding Juvenile Offenders Accountable: A Restorative Justice Perspective. Retrieved from:onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1755-6988.1995.tb00815.x

Umbreit, M, S. (1997). Humanistic mediation: A transformative journey of peace making. Conflict Resolution Quarterly. Retrieved from: 14(3), 201-213. Do.10.1002/crq.3900140305

Victim Support, (2017). How can crime affect you? Retrieved from: https://www.victimsupport.org.uk/help-and-support/coping-crime/how-can-crime-affect-you

Walker, L, (2008). Restorative Justice & Other Public Health Approaches for Healing. Word Press, Retrieved from: http://www.lorennwalker.com/blog/?p=117

Weale, S. (2017). Restorative justice in UK schools 'could help reduce exclusions. Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/dec/29/restorative-justice-ukschoolshelp-reduce-exclusions

Wetherell, M. Lafleche, M. & Berkely, R. (2007). Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion. Sage Publications. London

White, R & Cunneen, C. (no date). Social Class, Youth Crime and Justice. Retrieved from:http://www.clydebankhigh.org.uk/New%20CHS%20Website/Files/modern%20studies/Adv%20Higher/CausesEffects%20of%20Crime/Articleshandouts/yourh%20crime%20and%20social%20clas.pdf