

A glimpse into the role of personal values within the restorative justice process: A qualitative study with restorative justice facilitators

Chelsea J Mainwaring^{a*1} Anat Bardi^b and Rosie Meek^c

^aSchool of Law, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, United Kingdom;

^bDepartment of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, United Kingdom;

^cSchool of Law, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, United Kingdom. Email: r.meek@rhul.ac.uk

* c.mainwaring@surrey.ac.uk

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Contemporary Justice Review, available online:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10282580.2019.1576131>

Notes on contributors

Chelsea Mainwaring is a research assistant in the Department of Sociology at the University of Surrey. Before this role, she obtained a BSc in Psychology and an MSc in Forensic Psychology from Royal Holloway University of London. Her research interests surround the legal system within the UK and criminal behaviour from a psychological perspective.

Anat Bardi is a professor of social/personality psychology in the Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London. Her main research area is personal and cultural

¹ Author now within the Department of Sociology, University of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom.

values, and particularly value change and value-behaviour relations. She also serves as Editor in Chief (joint) in *Frontiers in Psychology: Personality and Social Psychology*.

Rosie Meek is a professor of criminological/forensic psychology in the School of Law, Royal Holloway University of London.

Abstract

Restorative justice is a process whereby offenders and their victims communicate to address the harm caused by the crime. Currently, there is little research looking at what characterises victims and offenders who are willing to participate in this process, who benefits, and what changes occur after participating. Personal values may be important in understanding such questions because they can influence human behaviour, appraisals of behaviour, and can change following life experiences. Hence, the aim of this study was to investigate the role that the values within Schwartz's (1992) value theory may have in answering these questions. This was accomplished through a thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with 12 restorative justice facilitators. Consistently, the motivations they observed for both victims and offenders participating in restorative justice included themes of prosocial values. Additionally, prosocial values were among those highlighted as being important for the realisation of the benefits of restorative justice. There was also some preliminary evidence that this process may change what values are important for both victims and offenders. Overall, these findings have implications for restorative justice providers; a greater understanding of motivations, who will benefit, and how restorative justice can be presented to appeal to a wide audience.

Keywords

Restorative justice; values; restorative justice facilitators; victim; offender; communication

Introduction

Restorative justice is a voluntary process for which victims and offenders make a conscious decision to participate. Currently, there is little understanding about what motivates victims and offenders to participate, what modifies the benefits obtained from going through the process, and what, if any, changes occur in the participants. Answers to such questions would be important for organisations trying to advocate the use of restorative justice to both victims and offenders, as well as to funding bodies (Paul, 2015; Wager, 2013). In the current research, these questions are looked at from a value-based perspective. Personal values reflect one's motivations for enacting a particular behaviour, as well determining how we appraise behaviour. Values can also change following life experiences (e.g., Goodwin, Polek, & Bardi, 2012; Schwartz, 1992). Therefore, this research looked at the role of personal values for victims and offenders within the restorative justice process. Specifically, three questions were investigated – is the decision to participate in restorative justice guided by personal values? Are personal values related to the benefits from the process? Finally, what, if any, value-based changes occur in those who go through the process? This article begins by explaining what restorative justice is followed by a brief overview of Schwartz's theory of personal values. Following this, previous literature related to these research questions will be discussed.

What is restorative justice?

Restorative justice is a process that was introduced in the late 1970s in response to the neglect of the needs and rights of victims within the criminal justice system (Choi, Bazemore, & Gilbert, 2012). It is a process which uses communicative and interactive practices between

victims and offenders to address the conflict and harm experienced by individuals, relationships, and communities following criminal behaviour (Bolitho, 2012; Menkel-Meadow, 2007; Paul, 2016). Practices common within restorative justice include victim-offender conferences and letter writing between the two parties (Van Camp, 2016). Victim-offender conferences are where victims and offenders are brought together to discuss the criminal behaviour and potential reparations in the presence of a trained facilitator (Paul, 2016; Strang, Sherman, Mayo-Wilson, Woods, & Ariel, 2013). This meeting allows an opportunity for both parties to express their feelings, their version of events, and hopefully reach an agreement concerning the responsibility of the offender, the harm that was caused, and what can be done to put things right (Okimoto, Wenzel, & Feather, 2009). Both conferences and written communications can require significant amounts of preparation, with trained facilitators meeting with both the victim(s) and offender(s) separately on multiple occasions (Van Camp, 2016).

Despite the introduction of restorative justice, western criminal justice systems remain largely based upon retributive justice, which advocates punishment (Strelan, Feather, & McKee, 2011; Wenzel, Okimoto, & Cameron, 2012). As a contrast, restorative justice aims to heal both the victim and the offender, whilst addressing the damage that has been caused to social relationships (Okimoto et al., 2009). Such forms of justice may relate to different personal values given the contrast in goals related to each form. These values will now be discussed.

Overview of Schwartz's personal values

Personal values reflect what we consider to be important in our lives, our motivational goals, and for each individual, some values are more important than others (Bardi & Schwartz,

2003; Schwartz, 1992). By selecting values which represent our most important goals, these guide our behaviour (Bilsky & Hermann, 2016). This is because our actions are considered more attractive, and therefore more likely, when it is believed to result in the attainment of valued goals (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Cieciuch, Schwartz, & Davidov, 2015; Schwartz, 2010). Furthermore, by behaving in accordance with ones' values, one ensures that they get what they want, and therefore benefit from their behavioural decisions (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). In the current study, Schwartz's basic value theory inclusive of four higher order values and 10 primary value types is drawn upon (Schwartz, 1992, 1994), because this is the most researched and therefore validated value model. See Table 1 for a description of these values.

[Table 1 here]

Schwartz (1992) suggested that the relations between these values are represented by a circular structure, where values placed side-by-side are similar in their motivational goals and related behaviour, and values located on opposite sides of the circle conflict in their motivational goals and related behaviour. Schwartz's theory and circular structure has been validated across many cultures as well as within individual value profiles for both adults and children, making this theory a valid application to the wide variety of cultures and ages represented by victims and offenders within the UK (Borg, Bardi, & Schwartz, 2017; Lee, Ye, Sneddon, Collins, & Daniel, 2017; Schwartz, 1992, 2006). In a recently refined theory, Schwartz and colleagues (2012) identified further value subtypes for six of the primary values, as well as two previously unidentified value constructs. Figure 1 presents the circular structure of values, inclusive of those additional values within the refined theory. These

additional values will be further explained in the results section if there is clear evidence of these within the data.

[Figure 1 here]

Although values are largely stable, they can also change, both in the long- and short-term in response to life experiences (Bardi & Goodwin, 2011). In line with the circular structure, values similar in their motivational goals experience change in the same direction, and conflicting values experience change in the opposite direction (Bardi, Lee, Hofmann-Towfigh, & Soutar, 2009). Overall, the modifiability of values, as well as their influence over thoughtful behavioural actions and the evaluation of these actions shows the potential link between values and the restorative justice process. Specifically, such characteristics show the potential influence of values within the decision-making process, appraisal of the process, and potential changes to an individual's character (Schwartz, 2012). Research supporting these links is now discussed.

Role of personal values in the restorative justice process

Restorative justice is a voluntary process for which victims and offenders must make a conscious decision to participate in. Despite the generally positive outcomes of restorative justice, not all victims and offenders who have this opportunity made available to them take up the offer or feel that the process was of benefit (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection, 2012; Van Camp & Wemmers, 2016). Paul (2015) suggests that the decision by victims and offenders to participate is determined by a variety of situational, personal, and relational factors. Some situational factors which have received attention to date are that of offence

seriousness and time since the offence (Batchelor, 2017; Zebel, Schreurs, & Ufkes, 2017).

However, there remains little understanding of what differentiates victims and offenders who agree to take part and those who do not, particularly at an individual and personal level (Van Camp & Wemmers, 2016). One theoretical framework which could be used to aid our understanding is Schwartz's basic value theory.

Schwartz's basic value theory has influenced a vast range of psychological research, however its current application to criminal justice research is underdeveloped, which is surprising given the strong relationship between values and offending behaviour found in previous research (Bilsky & Hermann, 2016; Feldman, Chao, Farh, & Bardi, 2015; Goossen, Sevä, & Larsson, 2016). Restorative justice is a voluntary process, and a decision to participate requires careful consideration of pros, cons, and outcome goals, all of which can be influenced by personal values (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). Specifically, participation in this process is more likely if it would promote ones' value-related goals, and non-participation is more likely if engagement would not promote ones' goals (Schwartz, 2012).

Previous research lends support to the assertion that values are likely to influence participation in restorative justice. Firstly, McKee and Feather (2008) looked at the relationships between Schwartz's values and the views of a student sample regarding punitive actions. They found that those who valued power and hedonism held vengeance attitudes, whereas those who valued universalism and benevolence did not. The authors suggested that those who value power feel their power is threatened by being a victim of crime and are therefore motivated to restore this through revengeful and punitive actions. Conversely, those valuing self-transcendence are understanding, tolerant, and concerned for the welfare of others and therefore not concerned about revenge (McKee & Feather, 2008). These findings suggest that those who value power would be less interested in restorative justice as there is

no punitive action, whereas those valuing self-transcendence may be more interested given the focus upon addressing harm.

Research by Paul (2015) has also shown the link between self-transcendence values and the restorative justice process. He surveyed the general population and found that there was a positive relationship between affective empathy, wanting relational rebalance, and wanting offender restoration with willingness to participate in restorative justice. Such goals reflect personal concern for the offender and the wider community, goals which are closely linked to those of self-transcendence values. He also found a correlation between willingness to participate and a desire for answers (Paul, 2015). This suggests an element of curiosity and desire for knowledge which are linked to self-direction values. Furthermore, in a related piece of research with similar methodology, it was found that a victim is likely to participate in restorative justice if they need to determine whether an offender is still a threat, has learned from their mistakes, and will re-offend (Paul & Schenck-Hamlin, 2017). This further suggests that those who think security values are important would be more willing to participate in restorative justice.

Research has also measured both restorative justice orientations and Schwartz's personal values to show how these value constructs can influence a victims' willingness to engage. Okimoto, Wenzel, and Feather (2012) found unique positive correlations between restorative justice orientations and stimulation, self-direction, universalism, and benevolence values. They suggested that restorative justice appeals to those who value self-transcendence because it is an inclusive approach to justice seeking, appealing to those with an interdependent self-concept, with concerns for the victim-offender relationship and society rather than concerns for the self. In addition to this, unique positive correlations were shown between retributive justice orientations and power values. The values of achievement, tradition, conformity, and security were positively related to both restorative and retributive

orientations. However, one caveat to this piece of research is the finding that restorative and retributive justice orientations are positively correlated (Okimoto et al., 2012; Pereira, 2017). This suggests that a restorative justice orientation may not be the best predictor of willingness to engage in a restorative justice process. Research by Strelan et al. (2011) further confirmed these findings; those who valued universalism had positive attitudes towards restorative justice and negative attitudes towards retributive justice, whereas those valuing achievement, power, and security had negative attitudes towards restorative justice.

Qualitative research has also added to our understanding of the role of values in victim participation. Van Camp (2016) conducted interviews with victims during preparation before the victim-offender conference. The participants stated that restorative justice offered them choices, and they felt enabled to make an informed decision as to whether they participated or not (Van Camp, 2016). This idea around freedom and choice regarding one's participation reflects the goals of self-direction. Van Camp (2016) also confirmed the role of universalism and benevolence values in encouraging victim participation. Specifically, victims spoke of wanting to accept the apology, wanting to persuade the offender to refrain from reoffending, and show the offender that they did not feel negatively towards them (Van Camp, 2016).

Overall, the previously cited research has consistently shown the importance of self-transcendence, self-direction, and power values in determining victim participation, with less clear roles for the remaining values. The current study can address these inconsistencies given the level of detail that qualitative research can provide about when and why values may be important. This study also addresses the limited ecological validity of the previous research by using facilitators who have first-hand experience of the needs and goals of real victims and offenders going through the process, rather than using data from the general population.

Research regarding offender participation in restorative justice is more limited, so the current research is also important to obtain an initial understanding of this. However, research has shown relationships between personal values and guilt-proneness and empathetic concern, factors which may determine whether an offender engages in restorative justice (Silfver, Helkama, Lönnqvist, & Verkasalo, 2008). Silfver et al. (2008) found that power, achievement, stimulation, and self-direction was negatively correlated with feelings of guilt and empathic concern, with security also negatively correlated with empathetic concern. Self-transcendence and conformity values were positively correlated with feelings of guilt and empathy, with tradition also positively correlated with feelings of guilt.

Further research has also looked at personal values and willingness to support a hypothetical organisation to repair past harm, which may also shed light upon an offender's willingness to engage in a process aimed at repairing harm. Specifically, Feather, Woodyatt, and McKee (2012) looked at the personal values of Non-Indigenous Australian participants' and their willingness to support a hypothetical organisation to repair the harm caused to the Stolen Generations; indigenous Australians who were taken from their homes by the State. They found positive correlations between self-transcendence values and willingness to support the organisation. Conversely, negative correlations were found between power, achievement, hedonism, and security values and willingness to support. They suggested that those concerned with self-interest and security tend to deny any responsibility for past wrongs, to protect the self from previous negative events, and are therefore less likely to be prosocial (Feather et al., 2012).

As well as a limited insight into motivations for offender participation, there is also limited understanding about what influences the benefits of restorative justice, and such an insight is important to understand why restorative justice works and for whom (Choi et al., 2012; Saulnier, Lutchman, & Sivasubramaniam, 2012). Schwartz's value theory is a

framework which can also be considered for this line of enquiry because values influence appraisals of behaviour and events (Schwartz, 2012). Therefore, one would expect positive appraisals of restorative justice and any personal benefits to arise when personal goals have been met (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). In the absence of empirical evidence, a theoretically based assertion would be that if an individual's values are correctly aligned with the goals of restorative justice, they would experience the most benefits (Okimoto et al., 2012). For example, victims and offenders who value self-transcendence may experience the most benefits because the process allows attainment of their desired goals. Conversely, those who value power may benefit less from the process, because there is no opportunity to assert control and dominance over others.

The final research question concerns value-based changes. For offenders, an insight into value-based changes would be particularly informative from a rehabilitation point of view, given that many rehabilitative programmes aim to change an offender's values (Day & Casey, 2009) and given that value change was found to predict the same later change in the behaviour that expresses the values (e.g., Vecchione, Döring, Alessandri, Marsicano, & Bardi, 2016). Although the aim of restorative justice is not rehabilitation, it has been shown to reduce the number of reconvictions, so it is important to understand why (Shapland et al., 2008). This research question has not been addressed previously, but one might predict that restorative justice increases the importance of self-transcendence values, given the importance placed upon taking responsibility, addressing harm, and healing relationships (Okimoto et al., 2009). Self-transcendence values are negatively correlated with delinquent behavioural attitudes, which adds to the suggestion that increasing the importance of such values may be a factor in reducing reoffending, and therefore an important line of enquiry (Borg, Hermann, & Bilsky, 2017).

The literature regarding value-based changes for victims is slightly more advanced. Interviews with victims have shown that they felt more empowered and in control of their lives after the process, perhaps reflecting the increased importance of self-direction values (Wager, 2013). Interviews conducted by Van Camp (2016) also showed that three victims who originally took part for themselves developed more concern for the offender as they went through the process, perhaps reflecting an increase in the importance of self-transcendence values. Similarly, research by Strang et al. (2006) found that sympathy towards the offender increased and safety concerns decreased after completing the process, reflecting an increase in the importance of self-transcendence values, as well as a possible decrease in the importance of security values.

The current research is utilising the experience of restorative justice facilitators within semi-structured interviews to highlight the role of values of victims and offenders in the restorative justice process. The decision to target this population rather than victims and offenders themselves was made based upon the consideration of a few factors. Firstly, by interviewing facilitators, they can draw upon a greater number of experiences and offer an overall impression of the relationship between values and restorative justice, which also reduces the sample size needed for impactful and generalisable results. Secondly, it is understood that much of a restorative justice facilitators' time and energy is spent supporting victims and offenders during the preparation and completion of this process (Van Camp, 2016). Spending significant amounts of time with an individual increases the chances of obtaining value-based messages from them, and therefore, gaining an impression of their values (Dobewall, Aavik, Konstabel, Schwartz, & Realo, 2014). Lastly, research shows that there are significant positive correlations between self-other value ratings; a finding which validates this design (Dobewall et al., 2014; McDonald & Letzring, 2016). Finally, while victims and offenders have the best access to their own values, they may also be more prone

to social desirability biases. For example, benevolence values tend to be rated as the most important to most people around the world (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Hence people are highly likely to attribute their behaviour to benevolence values. While each facilitator may have his or her own biases, by having a range of facilitators in the research, a more balanced view is likely to emerge.

Based upon the previously cited research, one is expecting self-transcendence and self-direction values to be important, and power values not important to those victims who participate. Similarly, for offenders, self-transcendence is expected to be important for participation. The importance of self-enhancement and security values are expected to be unimportant to those who participate. Expectations regarding benefits and offender value-based changes are limited given the available literature. However, one can expect victims to have shown an increase in self-direction, self-transcendence and a decrease in security values after the process. The findings of this research are expected to have implications for organisations trying to advocate the use of restorative justice, as well as for future research. By answering these research questions, restorative justice promoters will be armed with greater knowledge of what goals might be influencing participation, as well as a greater understanding of how to present restorative justice to engage as many people as possible (Paul, 2015; Wager, 2013). Important changes in victims and offenders will also help organisations to promote participation and perhaps encourage greater funding from government bodies.

Methods

Participants

Twelve participants with an average of 8.79 years' experience facilitating restorative justice processes ($SD = 5.51$) were interviewed. Three participants were male, and the sample had a mean age of 44.64 ($SD = 11.52$), however one participant omitted this information. Five participants had experience solely with young offenders (under the age of 18), two participants had experience solely with adult offenders and five participants had experience with both young and adult offenders.

Materials and procedure

Firstly, restorative justice facilitators for which contact details were already available were contacted via email, and then a snow-ball technique was used to recruit further participants. Emails were also sent out to facilitators whose details were available on the Restorative Justice Council website. Upon consent for participation, they received and returned the consent form via email. Demographic information was also collected within this document. A time and date which was convenient for the interview was agreed, and a number for which to call them on was specified.

Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with restorative justice facilitators which explored their experiences of the values of those who took part in restorative justice, values of those who benefitted, and what value-based changes, if any, occurred in those who go through this process. An interview schedule can be found in Appendix A.

At the start of the interview, participants were asked if they had any time restrictions and were given a brief introduction to the purpose of the questions. They were asked to clarify when answering the questions if answers would be different for different aspects of the restorative justice process, such as letter writing and victim-offender conferences. See Appendix B for script used at the start of the interview. Additionally, participants with

experience of both young and adult offenders were asked to clarify any differences between the populations, where applicable. Most interviews lasted between 45-75 minutes and all interviews were recorded using QuickTime Player (Version 10.4) on a laptop whilst the interviewee was on speaker.

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was granted by the Royal Holloway University Research Ethics Committee. Upon advice, all telephone interviews took place whilst the participants were within the community and not within a prison-based setting.

Analysis

The analysis of the data followed the steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006) for a theoretical thematic analysis. This form of thematic analysis was used because it provides a more detailed analysis of an important aspect of the data which researchers want to analyse, which in this case was the role of Schwartz's personal values in the restorative justice process (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The stages of transcribing, coding, and theme development are outlined below.

Stage 1: All interviews were transcribed verbatim onto a word document, with the use of Version 2.1.3 of Audacity (2017). This application was used to adjust the speed and pitch of the audio recording to allow easier manual transcription.

Stage 2: Each interview was listened to once more and compared against the transcription. Along with checking accuracy and gaining familiarity, this stage also encouraged the generation of initial thoughts regarding what was interesting within the data.

Stage 3: Initial codes and data extractions were generated and collated. This involved using a combination of NVivo and Microsoft Word software, to copy and paste data extracts

from the transcriptions, generate corresponding codes, and collate codes. As coding utilised a predominately deductive approach, codes were generated considering the aim of identifying features of the data set related to Schwartz's values in relation to each research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, codes were also generated for other aspects of the data not necessarily regarding values. This ensured a completely holistic approach was followed at this early stage.

Stage 4: Once the codes and data extractions had been completed, codes were sorted into value-based themes, as well as any further emergent themes. Some codes were discarded upon reflection of their limited contribution to answering these research questions.

Stage 5: Upon completion of collating codes and data extracts for each theme, these extracts were checked to ensure that the theme was an appropriate representation. The themes were then reviewed in relation to the whole data set. All data was re-read to ensure that the themes were accurately reflecting the meaning of the most important aspects of the data given the current research questions.

Results

The role of personal values and any further important themes are presented in terms of willingness to participate in restorative justice, the benefits of the process, and value-based changes for both victims and offenders.

Victim participation

One of Schwartz's values which received substantial attention within the facilitators' discourse regarding victim participation was that of self-direction. Specifically, most suggested that those victims who took part made an informed choice of participation for

themselves, reflecting self-direction-action values. Victims were also described as curious, with a desire to gain knowledge and answers, reflecting self-direction-thought values (Schwartz et al., 2012).

“I think regardless of what other people say, at the end of the day it’s them that are going to go through the process, so yeah there is a lot of independence about it, and informed choice ... and I think they’re aware of that, they know that they can step out at any time, and I think probably that might be umm, one of the deciding factors, that it is your choice and you’re not being pushed into anything.” – P12.

“I think for more people it’s a broader sense of having their say or having their specific questions answered.” – P01.

A couple of facilitators also gave examples of victims who clearly valued their independence, which they believed was taken away from them because of the offence, and therefore wanted to gain their independence back through going through the process, also reflecting self-direction-action values.

“she mentioned about umm just feeling scared of leaving the house, so in that respect, she, you know, before she had been targeted ... she was very independent she would go out, she would do all her shopping, she you know, do bingo once a week, or you know whatever, whatever activity she went to. Umm, so I would say ... yeah, thinking about it ... for her, it was all about, it not happening again so she would feel safe again in her own house, therefore be able to be independent.” – P04.

The roles of universalism and benevolence values in victim participation were also substantial. However, it was often difficult to determine whether discourse about the welfare of others was for those in everyday interactions (benevolence) or for wider society (universalism) (Schwartz, 1992). Previous research has also shown difficulties with distinguishing between these two values, therefore this was not unusual (Schwartz, 1992).

Most facilitators stated that for victims who go through the process, many of them appeared to do so for the greater good, to aid the offender's rehabilitation. However, it was more commonly mentioned with victims of young offenders.

“wishing for the offender to umm, you know to turn their lives around, to not do it again, to have a better life, you know, to avoid creating more victims ... they kind of feel that young people do make mistakes so remember when they were young people themselves, and they want their experience to kind of turn into something good by, by stressing to the offender that they need to learn from that mistake and not do it again.” – P06.

“quite a large number of victims want to do the right thing, which is always quite surprising to people, so they will start off by saying ‘no I don’t want to get anything from this process, I’m fine, but if it will help the offender’s rehabilitation ... then I’m happy to get involved if you think it will help them’.” – P09.

Interestingly, a large proportion of facilitators expressed that victims who wanted to take part, mostly adult victims of young offenders, did so because they wanted to encourage the offender not to commit further offences, to benefit society. This reflects universalism-concern values; the consideration of the protection and welfare of others (Schwartz et al., 2012).

“the ones who participated, I would say, or were willing to, I would say umm, it, that it was quite often about, umm, wanting the offender not to do it again. So, the ones who were willing to take part you know they were aware that it was going to take a bit of time ... were sort of willing, almost like quite public spirited, willing to give up their time in order to try and stop this little offender doing it again.” – P01.

Relatedly, four facilitators stated that those victims who did not seem to express values related to universalism or benevolence were unlikely to get involved with restorative justice.

“there are a lot of people who you know say ‘I’m not interested, they should just lock them up and throw away the key, I don’t really care about them, if I was put in the same room with them I would probably strangle them’ or whatever, so very strong views, very punitive kind of views.” – P02

Regarding benevolence specifically, honesty seemed to be very important to those victims who took part.

“they want to be honest with the offender, and they will be, and they want the offender to be, as far as that is possible, be honest with them.” – P11.

“a big thing that comes up quite often, what they’ll say when they’re deciding whether to go through it or not, is that they don’t want to go and do it if the offender is then not going to be honest with them.” – P08.

Lastly, the pattern regarding forgiveness, another benevolence value, was quite varied. Most facilitators suggested that it was important for some victims who participated, but not others. This may be because values only influence behaviour when they are relevant for that context (Schwartz, 2012). For example, if victims knew their offender, and valued benevolence and wanted to maintain their relationship, forgiveness may have been a natural part of that process. Contrastingly, victims who did not know their offender may have had less desire for forgiveness because it is more relevant for ingroup contexts. This may explain the mixed findings.

Regarding conformity values, most facilitators suggested that obedience and keeping within social norms was not characteristic of victims who took part in restorative justice, or that there was generally a mixture in terms of adherence to rules and obedience. It is possible that this stems from the fact that many victims who participated in restorative justice were ex-offenders themselves.

“quite often we’ll have victims that are also perpetrators. Umm, we will have umm you know victims from all walks of life, with all different levels of kind of, you know, how they adhere to social norms and stuff like that, so they’re, again it’s, it’s completely varied.” – P07.

For victims who took part in the process, safety motivations were consistently mentioned as a reason for taking part. Many spoke of victims who took part for reassurance that the offender would not be coming back or re-victimise them. This represents the value of security-personal; an emphasis upon safety of the self, family, and friends (Schwartz et al., 2012).

“the majority, they want to know why, why me, was I targeted, are you coming back, there’s a level of fear or anxiety that they need help, gaining some kind of reassurance from.” – P09.

“the biggest umm age group of victims of young offenders are young people themselves, and often, their greatest need is to know whether they are safe and whether it’s going to happen again, so there’s a need for a sort of reassurance and safety.” – P06.

Contrastingly, three facilitators stated that concerns for personal safety, whether that be concern for re-victimisation or safety within the process, meant that victims did not want to take part.

“usually people who don’t feel safe, that there might be reprisal attacks or, wouldn’t take part, and that would probably be one of the risks that you’d talk about.” – P12.

Regarding power values, most facilitators suggested that there was a mixture of victims who wanted control over the offender in the process, as a form of revenge or dominance, and those who did not. However, three facilitators suggested that victims who did not want to take part were those who valued power over people and resources. Additionally, there was also some indication that as facilitators, having a victim who was using the process to overpower the offender would be a warning that the process would not be appropriate.

“if we had a victim who wanted to engage to kind of take control of the situation and exert their power over that offender, then we’d be assessing whether that was appropriate ... it’s a fair process and we wouldn’t want people to be engaging for that reason.” – P10.

Regarding the remaining values; tradition, hedonism, stimulation, and achievement, patterns were less clear. Generally, facilitators suggested that victims who took part did not show obvious commitment to tradition or religion, or that there was a real mixture. Additionally, most facilitators stated that there was a mixture of those who valued and did not value achievement. For hedonism and stimulation, these values were difficult for the facilitators to reflect upon given their role in those victims’ lives.

Offender participation

As a contrast to victim participation, the role of self-direction values in offender participation was mixed. Most facilitators suggested that such values were both present and absent in offenders who took part.

However, like victims, facilitators talked in great deal about self-transcendence values. Many facilitators stated that offenders who went through the process empathised and wanted to help the victim after they had caused harm.

“people have said ‘look you know, what can I do for them that will make it better?’.”
– P08.

Interestingly, quite a few facilitators highlighted the importance of family and friends to young offenders and adult offenders with children who took part in the process, reflecting benevolence values.

“they’ve had that change where they think actually I don’t want to have a life of crime, I want to support my family, and spend time with them, I don’t want to be in and out of prison all the time.” – P10.

Furthermore, most facilitators suggested that those offenders who went through the process were extremely remorseful and wanted to put things right, often with victims for whom they were in close contact, also reflecting benevolence-caring values; the importance of closeness and preservation of relationships (Schwartz et al., 2012).

“a lot of the ones I’ve seen have, I mean especially if they’ve committed crimes against someone they know, which a lot of them have, they are very remorseful, and want to put things right, and, and ashamed, you know quite ashamed of it really.” – P08.

Similarly, nearly all the facilitators stated that offenders who were willing to take part accepted responsibility for their actions and wished to apologise and repair the harm that was caused. This suggests that offenders higher on benevolence values are more likely to take part.

“those who took responsibility, those who are open to go, ‘yeah I’ve done it’, ... just the fact that they can take that responsibility, and be willing to be part of the process, umm ... because sometimes the offenders that we meet, they have no idea what taking responsibility looks like, they have no idea umm what fairness looks like, what respect looks like, umm, what an opportunity to have their say looks like, they just don’t know, umm, so, so for me,

when I came across an offender who was willing, and willing to take part, and to take responsibility, they were the types of people that were open to it.” – P04.

Conversely, those offenders who were unable to acknowledge or understand the victim’s point of view, and unable to accept responsibility, showing little importance of self-transcendence values, did not take part.

“they don’t see the severity of their offence, umm maybe they don’t understand the impact that they’ve had, or don’t fully understand the consequence of their behaviour on others or themselves ... which is why quite often ... you might want to do some level of victim empathy work or victim awareness work before, so that they can have some level of understanding of the impact that they’ve had.” – P09.

Regarding conformity values, many facilitators found it difficult to comprehend the idea of offenders being obedient, given their criminal history. This is in line with previous research which showed that valuing conformity correlates with negative attitudes towards delinquency, suggesting that offenders do not tend to value conformity (Borg, Hermann, & Bilsky, 2017). However, facilitators did suggest that offenders who took part were more compliant, implicating conformity-rules values. They also suggested that often young offenders took part because their parents expected them to, implicating conformity-interpersonal values; the avoidance of upsetting others (Schwartz et al., 2012).

“quite a lot of the young people who took part, did so because their mum said, ‘oh you owe it to the victim, do it’. And ... I would say it would be the young people who had a

good relationship with their mum or, you know, wanted to keep the peace at home, or whatever, or were just obedient, to their parents, who then did take part.” – P01.

Relatedly, three facilitators suggested that offenders who did not take part had negative perceptions of the criminal justice system. This suggests that conformity-rules values were not important to those offenders.

“quite often offenders, especially if they are contacted out of the blue, umm, they can have huge guards up at the beginning of the process, because they either think we are the police, or you know, they’ve had bad experiences with the CJS so they don’t like working with professionals.” – P10.

Safety concerns on behalf of the offenders was also mentioned, however this pattern was less clear. Most facilitators indicated that this issue was not often brought up by the offenders who took part, and that such concerns were influenced by the circumstances around the case. This suggests that offenders who participated did not show any obvious indication that their safety and security was important to them.

Regarding power values, of the seven facilitators who mentioned values related to power, four suggested that for offenders who participated, there was a mixture of those who were seeking control and those who were not. The remaining three facilitators suggested that the offenders who took part were not controlling. These three further suggested that offenders would not want to take part in restorative justice if control and dominance was something that they were seeking.

“Umm, no I don’t think so [offender’s wanting control over situations] because I think if they did, they probably wouldn’t want to engage because, umm, they don’t really have a huge amount of control.” – P10.

The values of tradition, hedonism, stimulation, and achievement had a mixed pattern, suggesting a limited role of these values in offender participation. However, one additional theme which consistently emerged was the influence of difficult and uncontrollable life circumstances upon offender participation. Specifically, facilitators expressed that one of the reasons why young offenders do not take part in restorative justice is because of their chaotic and unstable life circumstances.

“increasingly we’re working with young people with more kind of complex backgrounds, where there’s been early childhood trauma and umm abuse and so on, or, or poor attachment ... a fair proportion of them have not lived in a parent’s home, you know, consistently. Umm, so, some of those what I would say is, is some of those more complex cases ... they struggle more to engage in a restorative process, umm possibly cause they’ve got more things on their mind”. – P06.

Difficult life circumstances are not necessarily related to or reflective of values, therefore the influence of values upon offender participation within restorative justice may be limited because there are other, unforeseeable and unmanageable driving forces.

Victim benefits

The discourse regarding the role of values for the benefits obtained by the victims had less scope, however, some values appeared to be important. Firstly, three facilitators suggested

that victims who showed evidence of universalism-tolerance values; understanding and open-mindedness (Schwartz et al., 2012), obtained greater benefits from the restorative justice process.

“I think people who have got a willingness to listen ... they’re open to listening to another’s story” – P11.

There was also an indication from a few facilitators that those who had personal safety concerns regarding retribution, reflective of security-personal values, experienced significant benefits.

“probably the thing that stands out the most [for those who benefit] is around I guess personal safety, as I say, you know those young people who perhaps, or even adult victims, who are worried about going into their local community” – P03.

Lastly, some facilitators suggested that victims who value power, particularly in terms of punitive actions towards the offender or attainment of compensation from the process, were those that benefitted the least.

“when you’re dealing with victims, if people are going in purely for a monetary or a compensation type of thing, then, then maybe, they’re not going to gain as much from it.” – P05.

Offender benefits

As above, the role of values in the benefits obtained by offenders was also limited. However, facilitators stated that offenders who seemed to express universalism values; understanding, open-mindedness, and consideration of the welfare of their victims, benefitted the most from the process. Additionally, those offenders who expressed benevolence values in their ability to take responsibility for their actions, benefitted more from the restorative justice process. Relatedly, three facilitators stated that those who did not take full responsibility for their actions did not benefit as much.

“I think it’s just when they have accepted responsibility for what they’ve done, and they want to do something to make amends for what they’ve done ... they acknowledge that they’ve done what they’ve done, they can’t change that but they can try and do something positive now, umm, led by what the victim wants and needs and try and fulfil that as best they can.” – P10.

Victim valued-based changes

There was some indication that values changed for victims because of this process. Firstly, nearly half of the facilitators suggested that victims felt more in control of their lives again. This idea of regaining control was not thought to reflect power values because there was no indication of domination over others and situations, but a more general sense of control over one’s life, reflecting self-direction values.

“coming out of the process feeling more empowered, like they’ve regained control, and so, they are put in a position of power ... we are not suggesting for a second that they are going to feel powerful because they are going to, by, umm, by verbally abusing the perpetrator, by shouting at the perpetrator but they may feel powerful by offloading, telling

them how they, it made them feel, just going through the process would help them to regain that, you know that feeling of control.” – P02.

Furthermore, four facilitators suggested that the process may have reduced victims' concerns regarding safety, and two facilitators linked this with an increased importance of socialising and living their lives fully. This may suggest that security became less important through having participated in restorative justice, with stimulation and hedonism values having become more important.

“there are a few that have been burgled and weren't sure if they were able to stay in the house, and then are able to stay ... don't feel they want to move.” – P09.

Offender value-based changes

For value-based changes in offenders, there was significantly less discourse from the facilitators. However, one theme did emerge. Specifically, there was a sense that offenders developed a greater understanding and empathy for others, perhaps reflecting an increased importance of self-transcendence values.

“finally meeting someone can be the point that they do actually start to understand the impact and the consequences of their behaviour.” – P09.

Discussion

The current study aimed to determine the role that the personal values of victims and offenders have in restorative justice participation, the benefits of restorative justice, as well as

any value-based changes. The presented findings have highlighted some important roles for personal values within the process. An integration of these findings with previous research, implications, limitations, and future directions are now discussed.

The first research question concerned the role of values in victim and offender participation. Firstly, as expected, self-direction-action and -thought values were important for victims who took part, with the decision to participate being an informed choice, a way to regain independence which was lost, and a way to achieve an independent question-answer process. This finding concurs with that of Paul (2015) and Van Camp (2016) who showed that victims who want answers from the offender and value having choices are more likely to participate. Similarly, self-direction values positively correlated with positive attitudes towards restorative justice in Okimoto et al. (2012), in line with the current findings. This suggests that valuing self-direction may encourage a victim to participate in restorative justice.

In addition to self-direction, universalism and benevolence values were also important in the decision to participate, with victims who participated in the process showing evidence of both universalism and benevolence; concern for the welfare of others. Contrastingly, those who did not show evidence of these values did not participate. This idea of a positive relationship between self-transcendence values and restorative justice participation agrees with previous research and suggests that valuing self-transcendence can encourage victim participation (Okimoto et al., 2012; Paul, 2015; Strelan et al., 2011; Van Camp, 2016).

The role of the remaining values was slightly more complex. For conformity values, there seemed to be evidence of victims who participated who valued conformity and those who did not. This may have been because many victims were ex-offenders themselves. Additionally, this may also be because conformity values have been shown to positively correlate with both restorative and retributive orientations, limiting the unique and

meaningful contribution that conformity values may have in understanding victim participation in restorative justice (Okimoto et al., 2012).

There also remains some inconsistency regarding the role of security values in participation. Safety and security motivations were highlighted as reasons for victims who took part in the process, reflecting the importance of personal security. This motivation has been found in previous research (Paul & Schenck-Hamlin, 2017). However, some facilitators stated that fears for personal safety meant that victims did not take part, in agreement with the findings of Strelan et al. (2011). This suggests that the conflict across previous research has not been resolved in this study, and that the endorsement of security values can influence participation in either direction, as found in the study by Okimoto et al. (2012).

Similarly, when looking at the role of power values, a pattern was not clear. Some facilitators suggested that victims who did not want to take part were those who valued power. This agrees with one's predictions and the findings of McKee and Feather (2008), Strelan et al. (2011), and Okimoto et al. (2012). However, some facilitators experienced both types of victims; those in search of control over the offender, and those not. This inconsistency may be due to the difficulty in assessing the importance of power for another individual. Research has shown that the statistical agreement between self-other ratings of power values is lower than that for other values (McDonald & Letzring, 2016). This may explain why there was less consistency when facilitators were asked to reflect upon power values, because such judgements are more difficult, and therefore less reliable.

The role of the remaining values (stimulation, hedonism, tradition, achievement) upon victim participation was limited. Specifically, hedonism and stimulation were difficult for the facilitators to reflect upon, which in addition to the limited and inconsistent findings of previous quantitative research, may lead one to conclude that these value constructs are of limited importance to the restorative justice process (Okimoto et al., 2012; Strelan et al.,

2011). For the values of tradition and achievement, previous quantitative research found significant relationships between these values and both restorative justice and retributive justice orientations (Okimoto et al., 2012; Strelan et al., 2011). Facilitators in the current study suggested that the victims who take part in restorative justice vary in terms of the personal importance of tradition and achievement. Together, these findings may suggest that achievement and tradition are also values of limited importance for the restorative justice process.

The role of values in offender participation found within the current study also showed agreement with previous research. Firstly, offender participation seemed to involve motivations related to self-transcendence values, with those who took part showing evidence of the importance of their family and friends, acceptance of responsibility, wanting to apologise, empathetic thinking, and a desire to repair the harm that they caused. Similarly, those not showing evidence of these values were not likely to take part. This finding agrees with that of Silfver et al. (2008) and Feather et al. (2012), that those displaying self-transcendence values show greater empathy and willingness to support those harmed by past wrongs.

Relatedly, there was some evidence to suggest that offenders who took part in restorative justice did not value power, which is on the opposite side of the circular structure to self-transcendence values (see Figure 1). This finding is compatible with those of Silfver et al. (2008) and Feather et al. (2012), that people who value power are less likely to take responsibility, feel guilt and empathy, or repair harm. Given that power was not valued by those taking part, whereas self-transcendence values were, shows agreement with Schwartz's circular structure regarding the conflict between values placed on opposite sides of the circle (Schwartz, 1992).

Further agreement with past research was also found regarding security values. Specifically, facilitators stated that offenders who took part did not seem concerned about their safety or security. This is compatible with previous research showing that offenders valuing security may be less likely to take part in such a process because they tend to deny responsibility to protect the self from negative events (Feather et al., 2012; Silfver et al., 2008).

As with victims, the role of conformity values for offenders was mixed, particularly given the incompatibility between the idea of obedience for this population. Despite this, facilitators did say that offenders who took part in restorative justice were more compliant, which aligns with the findings by Silfver et al. (2008). It was also predicted in the current research that valuing self-direction would lead to non-participation in restorative justice. However, this did not seem to be the case, as the facilitators suggested that a mixture of offenders who valued and did not value self-direction engaged. This inconsistency may be due to a confound; whether the offender was incarcerated at the time of the process. Being incarcerated results in a loss of freedom and independence, and therefore it could be argued that incarceration limits the behavioural expressions of valuing freedom and independence. Having interviewed facilitators with experience of both incarcerated and non-incarcerated offenders may have resulted in this inconsistency. The role of the remaining values in offender participation was unclear or mixed. Stimulation, hedonism, tradition, and achievement values were difficult for the facilitators to reflect upon, in a similar vein to victims.

In addition to the discourse surrounding values, an additional theme which emerged was the difficult life circumstances of offenders which influenced their engagement. This has been highlighted by previous research (Feather et al., 2012). Specifically, the lives of those involved in the criminal justice system are often filled with negative experiences, such as

mental illness, abuse, or significant losses, all of which may reduce the significance of values in decisions regarding restorative justice participation (Ardino, 2012). This is because considering the pros and cons of participating in such a process, which is influenced by values (see Bardi & Schwartz, 2003), may seem trivial given their current life tribulations. It was particularly important to highlight this theme because it shows the constraints for which the role of values in restorative justice operates within, as values are not the only factors influencing behaviour (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). Additionally, one would expect greater normative pressures upon offenders to take part in the process, which can also reduce the influence that values have upon behaviour (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). Therefore, one might speculate that values have less clear implications for offender participation due to greater societal pressure to take part in such a process, whether the behaviour is in line with their values or not (Schwartz, 2010). This is important for future research to consider.

The second research question considered how the values of victims and offenders influenced the benefits of restorative justice for those individuals. Some facilitators suggested that victims who displayed universalism-tolerance values seemed to benefit more from the process. Similarly, offenders who valued universalism and benevolence also seemed to reap greater benefits. This is in line with what value-theory would suggest about goal obtainment, that those valuing self-transcendence can attain the related goals when participating in restorative justice, leading to more positive appraisals of the process and therefore greater benefits (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). It also transpired that victims who valued personal security benefitted more, despite evidence that the importance of security is related to both restorative justice and retributive justice orientations (Okimoto et al., 2012; Strelan et al., 2011). Additionally, as predicted, it seems that victims who had power-related goals did not benefit as much from the process, likely because restorative justice does not encourage the obtainment of power-related goals.

The final research question concerned value-based changes. For victims, facilitators suggested that self-direction became more important after the restorative justice process; as they felt more in control and empowered. This has been shown in previous research (Wager, 2013). Additionally, some suggested that security became less important, and stimulation and hedonism more important after completing the process. This finding agrees with those of Strang et al. (2006) and compliments Schwartz's (1992) circular theory; as one value becomes more important, opposing values within the circular structure become less important (Bardi et al., 2009). However, increases in the importance of security values following traumatic events have been shown to return to pre-event levels as time passes, which may also explain these findings (Verkasalo, Goodwin, & Bezmenova, 2006). Unexpectedly, the facilitators did not describe any changes in self-transcendence values. This conflicts with previous research which found that victims developed greater concern and sympathy for the offenders as they went through the process (Van Camp, 2016; Strang et al., 2006). This inconsistency may be because many of the victims reflected upon in this research displayed such values before the process began, making any noticeable changes in the same direction more difficult to detect.

For offenders, self-transcendence values were described as having become more important. Specifically, they developed a greater understanding and empathy for other people. As recent research has shown that endorsing self-transcendence values is negatively correlated with delinquent behaviour, the current finding may go some way to explaining why restorative justice can lead to a reduction in reoffending (Borg, Hermann, & Bilsky, 2017).

Although the findings confirm those of past research, the implications must be considered within the limits of the method. Despite some flaws in the design, which will be considered, one must firstly reiterate the strengths of using a sample of facilitators who have

significant insight into the experiences of real victims and offenders. This is a feature which most previous research has neglected. Additionally, the qualitative design has allowed one to understand why particular values are important to the restorative justice process, at a level of detail that quantitative research cannot provide. Furthermore, this qualitative research has bolstered our understanding of which values are meaningful within the restorative justice process, over and above mere statistical relationships.

Naturally, there are also some limitations. Firstly, using a sample of facilitators to provide opinions of the values of victims and offenders means that one cannot be certain that the data accurately reflects the values of the victims and offenders which they referred to. Many facilitators expressed the difficulty they had answering some of the questions as they were not reflecting on such things in their day-to-day interactions with these people. This may have reduced the accuracy of the data obtained. However, the concurrence between this research and previous research reduces ones' concern that the data in this study are inaccurate. Unfortunately, the facilitators also had limited insight into value-based changes given the short follow-up period and limited contact after the completion of a conference. This suggests that future research which aims to answer similar research questions may benefit from working directly with victims and offenders themselves, as they are best placed to provide insight into individual changes (Paul, 2015).

As well as design limitations, there are also theoretical limitations. Firstly, although the findings have highlighted one potential moderator of the relationship between values and offender participation, i.e. chaotic life circumstances, there may be others. Research has shown that different crimes can activate different values, and values only influence behaviour when they are relevant in that context, therefore the expression of values during the restorative justice process may be dependent on the circumstances of the crime (Feather, 1998; Schwartz, 2012). Specifically, the type of offence that occurred, perceived severity of

the offence, relationship history, and the time that has elapsed have all been shown to influence the likelihood of a victim taking part in restorative justice (Batchelor, 2017; Feather, 1998; Paul, 2015; Zebel et al., 2017). Facilitators in this study often stated that the presence of characteristics reflective of values were dependent upon the type of case and found it much easier to discuss the importance of things in the lives of specific individuals, which suggests that these factors may be moderating any relationship between values and restorative justice participation. Future research should acknowledge these potential moderators to determine whether there is any evidence supporting this suggestion.

Additionally, one must also consider the role that others play in one's decision whether to participate in restorative justice. Paul and Schenck-Hamlin (2018) have demonstrated that despite self-related goal accomplishments being important in understanding restorative justice participation, the anticipated support from close friends and family, and anticipated outcomes for the offender are also important. They found that these two factors are directly linked to restorative justice participation, whereas the beliefs surrounding one's own outcomes indirectly influenced willingness to participate (Paul & Schenck-Hamlin, 2018). Altogether, these considerations suggest that there are a multitude of factors to consider when determining whether someone is likely to participate in restorative justice.

Lastly, given the complex emotional and psychological dynamics during a restorative justice conference, future researchers should pay attention to the interactions between the values of the victim and those of the offender when determining the benefits of the restorative justice process (Choi et al., 2012). For example, Wemmers and Cyr (2005) found that some victims felt worse after a conference if the offender would not take responsibility, which may reflect a conflict in the importance of benevolence values for the victim compared to the

offender. This suggests that understanding the dynamics between values of those participating in a conference is an important direction for future research.

Conclusion

This qualitative study aimed to provide a glimpse into the role of personal values in the restorative justice process, and to expand the repertoire of research which has been dominated by quantitative studies. The current findings have largely confirmed those of previous research but have also highlighted the added value of qualitative research in determining what values are practically meaningful, over and above statistical significance. This is an important theoretical advancement. Some of these findings have also shown agreement with Schwartz's circular structure of values, which is a further important theoretical application of this research. Regarding practical applications, restorative justice providers can use these findings to gain a greater understanding of the motivations behind participation, when victims and offenders can benefit from the process, and how they can benefit. Providers can use this knowledge to advocate restorative justice to victims, offenders, and government bodies, as well as to individually tailor the process to help participants reap the greatest benefits.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

References

- Ardino, V. (2012). Offending behaviour: The role of trauma and PTSD. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 3. doi:10.3402/ejpt.v3i0.18968
- Audacity (Version 2.1.3) [Computer software]. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.audacityteam.org>
- Bardi, A., & Goodwin, R. (2011). The dual route to value change: Individual processes and cultural moderators. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(2), 271-287. doi:10.1177/0022022110396916
- Bardi, A., Lee, J. A., Hofmann-Towfigh, N., & Soutar, G. (2009). The structure of intraindividual value change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(5), 913-929. doi:10.1037/a0016617
- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(10), 1207-1220. doi:10.1177/0146167203254602
- Batchelor, D. (2017). Restoring choice: The relationship between offense seriousness, intervening time, and victims' responses to the offer of restorative interventions. *Victims & Offenders*, 12, 205-232. doi:10.1080/15564886.2014.1000557
- Bilsky, W., & Hermann, D. (2016). Individual values and delinquency: On considering universals in the content and structure of values. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 22(10), 921-944. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2016.1202250
- Bolitho, J. J. (2012). Restorative justice: The ideals and realities of conferencing for young people. *Critical Criminology*, 20(1), 61-78. doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9150-z
- Borg, I., Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2017). Does the value circle exist within persons or only across persons? *Journal of Personality*, 85(2), 151-162. doi:10.1111/jopy.12228.

- Borg, I., Hermann, D., & Bilsky, W. (2017). A closer look at personal values and delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 116*, 171-178.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.043
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Choi, J. J., Bazemore, G., & Gilbert, M. J. (2012). Review of research on victims' experiences in restorative justice: Implications for youth justice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 35-42. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.011
- Cieciuch, J., Schwartz, S. H., & Davidov, E. (2015). The social psychology of values. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of social and behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 25, pp. 41-46). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Criminal Justice Joint Inspection. (2012). *Facing up to offending: Use of restorative justice in the criminal justice system*. Retrieved July 7, 2017 from <https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/files/Joint%20inspection%20report.pdf>
- Day, A., & Casey, S. (2009). Values in forensic and correctional psychology. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*, 232-238. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.03.008
- Dobewall, H., Aavik, T., Konstabel, K., Schwartz, S. H., & Realo, A. (2014). A comparison of self-other agreement in personal values versus the Big Five personality traits. *Journal of Research in Personality, 50*, 1-10. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2014.01.004
- Feather, N. T. (1998). Reactions to penalties for offenses committed by the police and public citizens: Testing a social-cognitive process model of retributive justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(2), 528-544. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.75.2.528
- Feather, N. T., Woodyatt, L., & McKee, I. R. (2012). Predicting support for social action: How values, justice-related variables, discrete emotions, and outcome expectations

- influence support for the Stolen Generations. *Motivation and Emotion*, 36, 516-528.
doi:10.1007/s11031-011-9262-5
- Feldman, G., Chao, M. M., Farh, J. L., & Bardi, A. (2015). The motivation and inhibition of breaking the rules: Personal values structures predict unethicality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 59, 69-80. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2015.09.003
- Goodwin, R., Polek, E., & Bardi, A. (2012). The temporal reciprocity of values and beliefs: A longitudinal study within a major life transition. *European Journal of Personality*, 26(3), 360-370. doi:10.1002/per.844
- Goossen, M., Sevä, I. J., & Larsson, D. (2016). Basic human values and white-collar crime: Findings from Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, 13(4), 434-452.
doi:10.1177/1477370816633260
- Lee, J. A., Ye, S., Sneddon, J. N., Collins, P. R., & Daniel, E. (2017). Does the intra-individual structure of values exist in young children? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 110, 125-130. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.038
- McDonald, J. S., & Letzring, T. D. (2016). Judging personal values and personality traits: Accuracy and its relation to visibility. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 65, 140-151. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2016.10.009
- McKee, I. R., & Feather, N. T. (2008). Revenge, retribution, and values: Social attitudes and punitive sentencing. *Social Justice Research*, 21, 138-163. doi:10.1007/s11211-008-0066-z
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2007). Restorative justice: What is it and does it work? *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 161-187.
doi:10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.110005

- Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Feather, N. T. (2009). Beyond retribution: Conceptualizing restorative justice and exploring its determinants. *Social Justice Research, 22*(1), 156-180. doi:10.1007/s11211-009-0092-5
- Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Feather, N. T. (2012). Retribution and restoration as general orientations towards justice. *European Journal of Personality, 26*, 255-275. doi:10.1002/per.831
- Paul, G. D. (2015). Predicting participation in a victim-offender conference. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 8*(2), 100-118. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12049
- Paul, G. D. (2016). But does it work?: The influence of presumed goal attainment effectiveness on willingness to use legalistic and restorative responses to offensive behavior. *Communication Studies, 67*(2), 239-258. doi:10.1080/10510974.2015.1121157
- Paul, G. D., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. J. (2017). Beliefs about victim-offender conferences: Factors influencing victim-offender engagement. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. doi:10.1002/crq.21190
- Paul, G. D., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. J. (2018). Openness to participating in a victim-offender conference. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 29*(5), 659-682. doi:10.1108/IJCMA-03-2018-0042
- Pereira, A. (2017). The decision to participate in mediation and individual factors: The role of moral foundations and their relation to restorative and retributive orientations. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal, 5*(2), 221-250. doi:10.1080/20504721.2017.1343420
- Saulnier, A., Lutchman, K., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2012). Laboratory experiments: A meaningful contribution to restorative justice research? *Critical Criminology, 20*, 99-115. doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9152-x

- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 19-45. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 47, 249-288. doi:10.3917/rfs.474.0929
- Schwartz, S. H. (2010). Basic values: How they motivate and inhibit prosocial behavior. In M. Mikulincer, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The better angels of our nature* (pp. 221-241). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1116
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(3), 268-290.
- Schwartz, S. H., Ciecuich, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663-688. doi:10.1037/a0029393
- Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Dignan, J., Edwards, L., Hibbert, J., Howes, M., Johnston, J., Robinson, G., Sorsby, A. (2008). *Does restorative justice affect reconviction? The fourth report from the evaluation of three schemes*. Retrieved July 11, 2017 from

<https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/files/Does%20restorative%20justice%20affect%20reconviction.pdf>

- Silfver, M., Helkama, K., Lönnqvist, J. E., & Verkasalo, M. (2008). The relation between value priorities and proneness to guilt, shame, and empathy. *Motivation and Emotion, 32*(2), 69-80. doi:10.1007/s11031-008-9084-2
- 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 Systematic Reviews, 9*. doi: 10.4073/csr.2013.10.
- Strang, H., Sherman, L., Angel, C. M., Woods, D. J., Bennett, S., Newbury-Birch, D., & Inkpen, N. (2006). Victim evaluations of face-to-face restorative justice conferences: A quasi-experimental analysis. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(2), 281-306. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00451.x
- Strelan, P., Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. (2011). Retributive and inclusive justice goals and forgiveness: The influence of motivational values. *Social Justice Research, 24*, 126-142. doi:10.1007/s11211-011-0132-9
- Van Camp, T. (2016). Understanding victim participation in restorative practices: Looking for justice for oneself as well as for others. *European Journal of Criminology, 1*-18. doi:10.1177/1477370816682981.
- Van Camp, T., & Wemmers, J. A. (2016). Victims' reflections on the protective and proactive approaches to the offer of restorative justice: The importance of information. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 58*(3), 415-442. doi:10.3138/cjccj.2015.E03
- Vecchione, M., Döring, A. K., Alessandri, G., Marsicano, G., & Bardi, A. (2016). Reciprocal relations across time between basic values and value-expressive behaviors:

A longitudinal study among children. *Social Development*, 25(3), 528-547.

doi:10.1111/sode.12152.

Verkasalo, M., Goodwin, R., & Bezmenova, I. (2006). Values following a major terrorist incident: Finnish adolescent and student values before and after September 11, 2001.

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36(1), 144-160. doi:10.1111/j.0021-

9029.2006.00007.x

Wager, N. (2013). The experience and insight of survivors who have engaged in a restorative justice meeting with their assailant. *Temida*, 16(1), 11-32.

doi:10.2298/TEM1301011W

Wemmers, J. A., & Cyr, K. (2005). Can mediation be therapeutic for crime victims? An evaluation of victims' experiences in mediation with young offenders. *Canadian*

Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 47(3), 527-544.

doi:10.3138/cjccj.47.3.527

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T. G., & Cameron, K. (2012). Do retributive and restorative justice processes address different symbolic concerns? *Critical Criminology*, 20, 25-44.

doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9147-7

Zebel, S., Schreurs, W., & Ufkes, E. G. (2017). Crime seriousness and participation in restorative justice: The role of time elapsed since the offense. *Law and Human*

Behavior, 41(4), 385-397. doi:10.1037/lhb0000242.

Appendix A

Semi-structured interview schedule

Normal font = questions to ask; italics = probes.

Questions about victims:

1. When considering a victim, could you describe what type of person is likely to be open to RJ?

a) Important things in their lives.

- i. Independence? Having choices? (self-direction)*
- ii. An exciting life? Making efforts to be sociable? (stimulation)*
- iii. Pleasure in life, enjoyment? (hedonism)*
- iv. The safety of their family and themselves? Do they make an effort to care for their family? (security)*
- v. Control over situations? Money? Are they in high powered jobs? (power)*
- vi. Ambition? The appearance of competence? Do they try to be competent? (achievement)*
- vii. Keeping in line with social norms? Obedience? Do they try to be self-disciplined? (conformity)*
- viii. Religion? A respect for tradition? (tradition)*
- ix. Forgiveness? Loyalty? Helpfulness? Honesty? Wanting to help the offender and forgive them? (benevolence)*

- x. *Equality? Protecting the environment? Do they try to help others?*
(*universalism*)

2. Contrastingly, could you describe what type of person would not be open to RJ?

a) *Important things in their lives.*

i. *As above*

3. Could you describe what kind of person seems to benefit from RJ?

a) *Match between values of RJ and those of the users?*

4. Could you describe what kind of person does not benefit from RJ?

a) *Mismatch between values of RJ and those of the users?*

5. Do you notice any changes in victims who go through the process?

a) *Are there changes to what victims consider important in their lives? (as above).*

b) *Any changes in personality?*

c) *Any changes in behaviour?*

Questions about offenders:

1. When considering an offender, could you describe what type of person is likely to be open to RJ?

a) *Important things in their lives.*

i. *Independence? Having choices? (self-direction)*

ii. *An exciting life? Making efforts to be sociable? (stimulation)*

- iii. *Pleasure in life, enjoyment? (hedonism)*
 - iv. *The safety of their family and themselves? Do they make an effort to care for their family? (security)*
 - v. *Control over situations? Money? Are they in high powered jobs? (power)*
 - vi. *Ambition? The appearance of competence? Do they try to be competent? (achievement)*
 - vii. *Keeping in line with social norms? Obedience? Do they try to be self-disciplined? (conformity)*
 - viii. *Religion? A respect for tradition? (tradition)*
 - ix. *Forgiveness? Loyalty? Helpfulness? Honesty? Wanting to help the victim? (benevolence)*
 - x. *Equality? Protecting the environment? Do they try to help others? (universalism)*
2. Contrastingly, could you describe what type of person would not be open to RJ?
 - a) *Important things in their lives (as above)*
 3. Could you describe what kind of person seems to benefit from RJ?
 - a) *Match between values of RJ and those of the users?*
 4. Could you describe what kind of person does not benefit from RJ?
 - a) *Mismatch between values of RJ and those of the users?*
 5. Do you notice any changes in offenders who go through the RJ process?

- a) *Are there changes to what offenders consider important in their lives? (as above)*
- b) *Any changes in personality?*
- c) *Any changes in behaviour?*

Appendix B

Schedule for beginning of the interview

- So just to start off, I'd like to say thank you for agreeing to be interviewed, it is greatly appreciated. Do you have any time restrictions for this interview?
- I'll start by giving a brief introduction to what the interview questions are about. The aim of my questions is to get an idea about what type of victims and offenders take part in RJ, what type of person benefits, and if you notice any changes in those who go through the process based upon your experiences within forensic settings.
- Now, as I understand it, RJ encompasses different processes, such as letter writing and face-to-face conferences, so if any of your answers might differ depending on the type of RJ, then if you could specify this that would be great. Otherwise I will assume that you are referring to the whole process, inclusive of all types. Does that make sense?