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ABSTRACT

CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE: A STUDY OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE VALUES

by Lana Adelaide McDowell

December 2012

As time progresses, criminologists continue to search for philosophies and policies which possess the ability to reduce criminal behavior. One such philosophy and policy may be restorative justice. This study explores the meaning of restorative justice as well as types of restorative justice processes including peacemaking circles, group conferencing, reparative boards, victim offender mediation/reconciliation programs, victim offender panels, social justice initiatives, and community justice. This study also provides a tentative definition/theory of restorative justice which suggests crime creates broken relationships; therefore, reparation, inclusion, acceptance of responsibility, remorse, apology, forgiveness, resolution, reintegration, reconciliation, and restoration are necessary components of justice.

Logistic regression is utilized to determine prediction ability of the demographic variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level for respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action and whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action.
The sample consists of students enrolled in criminal justice courses in the spring 2012 semester at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University. Findings suggest the overall model of demographic variables including gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level may significantly predict respondents’ perceptions of whether community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action (community reparation) as well as perceptions of whether victims and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action (victim and community inclusion). The findings also suggest gender and ethnicity may predict respondents’ perceptions of whether community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action (community reparation) while ethnicity may also predict respondents’ perceptions of community inclusion.
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As time progresses, criminologists continue to search for philosophies and policies which possess the ability to reduce criminal behavior. The current methods utilized in an attempt to reduce crime are often associated with punishments administered in numerous forms such as fines, community service, probation, jail time, and/or a prison sentence. The theoretical foundation of such policies implies a choice is made by an individual through a rational decision-making process prior to committing a criminal action. Due to such rational thought, it is suggested individuals are deterred from committing crimes in order to avoid punishment. Under such a philosophy, justice is equated with an individual receiving a prescribed punishment for different criminal actions. As described below, statistics noting an increase in America’s prisons, jails, and probationary services suggest many individuals are not deterred from committing crimes due to punitive sanctions.

In 1980, 139 of every 100,000 members of the United States population were incarcerated within federal and state prisons. By 1990, the number of such incarcerated persons more than doubled (to 297); and by 2009 had more than tripled (to 502). Moreover, jail populations for these same years experienced similar increases: approximately 182,000 in 1980, 403,000 in 1990, and approximately 760,000 in 2009 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2009). Not only has there been a trend in higher rates of incarceration but other punitive forms as well (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010).
Not only have the prison and jail populations exploded but the number of individuals that find themselves entangled in community corrections has also increased. In 1980, approximately 1,118,000 individuals were sentenced to probation. The number of probationers increased to 2,670,000 by 1990 and 4,204,000 by 2009 (U. S. Department of Justice, 2010). As the prison and jail populations continue to rise (as well as the number of citizens within community corrections), it seems imperative to consider the current conception of justice and the methods of punishment which flow from the traditional justice system philosophy. One such concept to be considered regarding crime prevention and how the term justice is perceived is restorative justice.

Brief History of Criminological Thought

The criminal justice system’s policies are partially derived from criminological theorists’ hypotheses about the reasons for crime occurrence. Criminological paradigms have been ever evolving over time. According to Moyer (2001), the history of criminology theory began in the 18th century with the classical school. Generally speaking, the classical school of thought contends individuals use their powers of rational choice to weigh costs and benefits to determine whether to act in a given manner within a given situation. Likewise, proponents of the classical school suggest if the costs of an action are great, an individual will be deterred from committing the action. The majority of members of American society would concur that this viewpoint is embedded within the current traditional criminal justice system.

Moyer (2001) asserts in the 19th century positivist school theorists emerged and explained the classical school paradigm could not be fully correct because there are other factors (such as biology) which may negate one’s ability to reason. In response to these
claims, the functionalist paradigm entered the criminological picture. The functionalist perspective implies crime is a function of the social structure of society. In the early 20th century, Chicago school theorists explained crime was the result of an individual’s environment. Due to growth within cities, individuals were forced to live in areas where they received little pay for long hours of labor and resided in unsafe congested living environments. Chicago school theorists suggest crime occurs in specific places, not because of the people who live there, but because of the environment. Once individuals have the ability to transition out of such places, Chicago school theorists contend crime rates in specific environments remain the same.

The exploration of crime causation was somewhat interrupted in the mid-20th century when the control theories paradigm emerged. Advocates of control theories did not question the causes of crime but rather what restrained an individual from committing crime. Moyer (2001) explains during the mid-to-late 20th century the interactionist school contended individuals learn deviant and criminal behaviors from others through interactions. In the late 20th century other paradigms of thought surfaced. One such thought suggested “crime includes imperialism, racism, capitalism, sexism, and other systems of exploitation” (p. 191). This perspective is the view of the radical criminological thought paradigm, whose proponents view crime as a result of the inherent nature of American society as it developed over time. At the heart of the radical criminology paradigm is the conflict school which contends there is a struggle for power which is often related to ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

At the turn of the 21st century, paradigms began to morph out of previous schools of thought. One such paradigm was the liberal feminist theory which postulated that all
humans should be treated equally. Therefore, where individuals are not treated equally, crime is a result. Other branches of feminist theory contend capitalism is responsible for the inability for women to be considered equal to men in our society. This inequality is the basis of belief for crime causation from the perspective of Marxist feminist theory which explains that while crime does result from perceived inequality by liberal feminists a further reason crime occurs is due to oppression through sexualizing women. While feminist theory paradigm was in the formulation stage, another criminological paradigm began to take shape, that of the peacemaking paradigm.

Peacemaking theorists acknowledge that previous paradigms have considered the causes of crime, to including costs and benefits of crime, the biology of an individual, social structure, an individual’s environment, restraints on criminal behavior, social interactions which led to crime, and inequality within society. Likewise, the peacemaking paradigm is mindful that policies stemming from criminological paradigms have lacked the ability to reduce criminal actions. Therefore, peacemaking paradigm theorists suggest crime occurs because of the fundamental nature of interactions among human beings and the criminal justice system. Peacemaking criminology suggests what causes crime is a lack of understanding of connectedness, care, and mindfulness among human beings. Without such awareness, crime will, at the minimum, continue at the current rate.

Foundations of Restorative Justice

In order to understand the concept of restorative justice one must first consider the philosophy such processes are built upon. The roots of peacemaking are reflected in ancient-wisdom traditions such as Christianity, Judaism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Native American customs. Restorative justice processes also possess three
essential themes -- connectedness, care, and mindfulness (Braswell & Gold, 2012) -- all of which may also be found within each of the ancient-wisdom traditions’ tenets.

The peacemaking concept of connectedness suggests the manner in which the criminal justice system responds to offenders will affect both law-abiding and law-breaking members of a given community. Zehr (1990) explains the path to true justice lies in considering the needs of those affected by a deviant action. For such considerations to occur, care must be present on the part of community members, victims, and offenders. Mindfulness in peacemaking criminology “allows (persons) to experience a more transcendent sense of awareness” and “… allows (persons) to be fully present, aware of what is immediate, yet also at the same time to become more aware of the larger picture in terms of both needs and possibilities” (Braswell & Gold, 2012, p. 12).

The concepts of care, connectedness, and mindfulness are found within processes said to be restorative in nature. For instance, peacemaking circles utilize symbolic items such as a talking stick or feather to point out the relevance of one member of the community speaking at a time (Parkinson & Roche, 2004). The symbolic item points to the importance of an individual perceiving others truly care about their perspective and feelings. Likewise, really listening to what another individual verbalizes and feels implies one is being mindful of his or her needs. Connectedness is also present within restorative justice processes. Individuals who attend conferences may include the victim and offender (Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001), family members (Goren, 2001; Ryals, 2004), police (Goren, 2001; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006), probation officers and social workers (Goren, 2001), lawyers (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006), judges, school principals and guidance counselors (Calhoun & Borch, 2002). Affected members of a community are included in
restorative justice practices because the harm created through criminal behaviors is viewed as impacting all members of a community due to the concept of connectedness.

Definition of Restorative Justice

While themes of peacemaking criminology provide an understanding of the philosophy of restorative justice, previous literature suggests no formal definition exists (Karp, 2001; Latimer, Dowden, & Muise, 2005). Restorativists currently have a difficult time pinpointing terms which represent restorative justice across all programs (Bazemore, 2000). Van Ness and Strong (2006) contend “like the words ‘democracy’ and ‘justice’; people generally understand what they mean, but they may not be able to agree on a precise definition” (p. 41). Along this line, Zehr (2002) suggests as programs emerge, the definition of restorative justice can become muddled. McCold (2004) asserts that without a definition, no one questions if programs are restorative which claim to be. Bazemore, O’Brien, and Carey (2005) explain:

“Rather than a ‘how-to’ set of instructions, restorative justice reformers adopt a ‘mind-set,’ a way of thinking about consequences of crime and the parties it harms…..they then begin to act in a different way guided by an understanding of emotional impacts, the deterioration of relationships, and the desire for restoration and healing. (p. 300)

Wachtel (2003) contends “restorative justice is a philosophy, not a model…” (p. 85). However, Vigorita (2002) maintains “restorative justice is a process; it is not an outcome” (p. 405). Cook and Powell (2003) state “a restorative approach emphasizes the presumed damaged relationships between people and aims to develop strategies for repairing those damaged relationships” (p. 279). Walgrave (2000) reasons “restorative
justice is a set of experimental practices, a field of scientific research, and a movement of beliefs as well” (p. 416). With no agreed upon definition, Zehr (2002) has attempted to provide a synthesized definition stating:

Restorative justice is a process to involve, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense and to collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations, in order to hear and put things as right as possible. (p. 37)

It seems criminologists have identified that restorative justice may be defined through its processes or the values embedded within the concept (Adams, 2004; Braithwaite, 2000; Morrison & Ahmed, 2006). The values of restorative justice seem to include but are not limited to the concepts noted in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restorative Justice Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Crime Creates Broken Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Acceptance of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Remorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A primary element of importance within the restorative justice philosophy is offenders, victims, and community members are involved in achieving each of the above values. Such involvement occurs through restorative justice processes.
Restorative Justice Processes

Peacemaking Circles

An example of a peacemaking circle is the Aboriginal sentencing circle, which is attended by the offender and victim, members of society, supporters of the offender and victim, administration of justice personnel, judges, or an individual in the community who resides over the circle, known as the community elder. As the name implies, participants are arranged in a circle format with the goal of promoting storytelling, as well as the ability for parties to create a joint resolution which will be forwarded to the formal criminal justice system (Hillian, Reitsma-Street, & Hackler, 2004).

Group Conferencing

In this restorative justice process the offender explains his or her action and the victim verbalizes the consequences of the action. Family members or supporters share the personal harms felt due to the crime and the offender responds to what has been brought to light through the dialogue process. This interaction often elicits some form of personal responsibility and remorse from the offender. Lastly, the entire group attempts to reach a compromise regarding how the harm may be repaired (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006).

Reparative Boards

Committees are made up of no more than five community members who decide what could be done to repair the harm of an action (Bazemore, 2005). The encounter allows board members to suggest the action committed by the offender goes against communal culture and the offender is therefore in need of community moral re-education (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002).
Victim-Offender Mediation/Reconciliation Programs

In this restorative justice process the encounter is initially only attended by the offender, victim, and a mediator. The storytelling phase includes the victim explaining the personal consequences of the harm, followed by the offender communicating his or her upbringing. Lastly, the offender provides explanations as to why he/she committed the crime (Browning, Miller, & Spruance, 2001).

Victim-Offender Panels

In victim-offender panels, the victim(s) of a particular crime, aggravated assault for instance, speak to a group of offenders who have committed aggravated assault. This process allows the offender to understand how a particular crime may affect numerous victims in substantial ways (Browning et al., 2001).

Social Justice Initiatives

Restorative justice processes have also become an avenue for communities to explore wrongs committed against a particular community (D’Errico, 1999). One such example is the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), the basic philosophy of which is to provide an encounter where the group that has been unjustly treated may come into contact with groups which are perceived to be responsible for the community group harm (Minow, 2003; Roche, 2006).

Community Justice

Community justice occurs within institutional realms such as prisons, college classrooms, and secondary education. Morrison, Blood, and Thorsborne (2005) note when delinquent activities arose in the past, the offender was transferred by the school to the traditional criminal justice system; however, today initiatives are being created to
transform the mindset of school administrators and teachers to utilize restorative justice principles as their central philosophy.

**Statement of the Problem**

Current criminological research has yet to include an extensive number of studies regarding perceptions of restorative justice concepts in relation to a respondent’s gender, ethnicity, religious beliefs, and education level. Prevailing perceptions of the term justice are important because changes in the criminal justice system, philosophy, and policies are created through a society’s understanding of what a just response to criminal behavior entails. Logically, for the overall American societal paradigm of justice to shift from a more traditional understanding to a more restorative understanding, individual’s personal perceptions of justice must first evolve (Braswell, 2008). This leads to the question of whether individuals currently hold a restorative belief system.

It appears personal philosophies of justice create the societal perception of justice; therefore, perceptions of criminal justice progress when members of society reshape their conception of justice. Without quantitative and qualitative research regarding perceptions of restorative justice concepts, we will be unaware if a perception shift occurs. It follows that if we do not understand perceptions of restorative justice concepts then we will be less likely to understand if and when elements of restorative justice may be viewed as an acceptable avenue within the criminal justice system. Is society ready for implementation of restorative justice processes within the criminal justice system? In order to begin to answer this question, perceptions held by members of society regarding restorative justice concepts needs to be explored. More specifically, it is imperative to obtain a greater
understanding of perceptions regarding restorative justice concepts from the viewpoints of future criminal justice practitioners and officials.

Due to the nature and intertwinement of criminological theoretical perspectives, research, and policies, it seems important to consider if future practitioners and officials of the criminal justice field hold the perceptions found within peacemaking criminology. Because criminologists are currently unaware of those perceptions, it calls into question whether perceptions align with the peacemaking paradigm. Furthermore, is criminological thought currently in the peacemaking paradigm?

In order to begin exploring the problem, this study will focus on criminal justice students’ perceptions of whether crime causes broken relationships; if offenders, victims, and community members should be included in a process of justice; and if offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair harm created by crime by examining whether four specific variables can predict respondents’ perceptions of the elements of restorative justice noted above. Gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level have been selected as those predictors within this study because little research has been conducted on such demographic variables in relation to elements of restorative justice. The rationale for the current study is derived from previous literature which suggests current criminal justice students have yet to be provided an opportunity to express their perspectives of restorative justice concepts.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study focuses on three research questions regarding perceptions of restorative justice. The research questions are as follows:
Research Question 1: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?

Research Question 2: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?

Research Question 3: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?

Hypotheses

In order to reach general conclusions regarding the research questions above, seven statistical analyses will be performed. Each of the seven null hypotheses are depicted by $H_0: \beta = 0$ with $\beta$ representing the unknown population parameter (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997). The above hypothesis equation states that the slope coefficient of the logistic regression model ($\beta$) for each dependent variable and the independent variables of gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level is equal to 0. The dependent variables are as follows: (1) crime creates broken relationships, (2) offender reparation, (3) victim reparation, (4) community reparation, (5) offender inclusion, (6) victim inclusion, and (7) community inclusion.
Definition of Terms

As previously outlined, the definition of restorative justice is elusive in nature. Restorative justice can be broadly defined through its processes or values embedded within the concept (Adams, 2004; Braithwaite, 2000; Morrison & Ahmed, 2006). Due to disagreement within previous literature regarding whether restorative justice is defined by process dynamics or by values embedded within such dynamics, the researcher of this study conceptualized restorative justice values for use in this study; this conceptualized restorative justice definition/theory is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Definition of Restorative Justice as Defined within this Study.
The composition of the research questions and hypotheses comprise seven dependent variables and four independent variables. A listing of the conceptualized definitions of the seven dependent variables – of which each were composed of elements within the first three stages of the tentative definition of restorative justice in this study are listed below:

**Community Inclusion:** The ability for general members of a community to aid in defining the specifications of a just response to criminal actions.

**Community Reparation:** An attempt to mend relationships ruptured through a criminal action by the community.

**Crime Creates Broken Relationships:** Crime creates ruptures in relationships among affected parties.

**Offender Inclusion:** The ability of an offender to be included in defining the specifications of a just response to a criminal action at hand.

**Offender Reparation:** An attempt of an offender to mend relationships ruptured through a criminal action.

**Victim Inclusion:** A victim’s ability to aid in defining the specifications of a just response to a criminal action perpetrated against them.

**Victim Reparation:** An attempt of a victim to mend relationships ruptured through a criminal action.

**Delimitations**

The following represent the boundaries which should be considered during interpretation of the findings of this study:
1. Participants included students enrolled in criminal justice courses at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College & State University in the spring semester of 2012.

2. Purposive or judgmental sampling was utilized in this study with the addition of a quota sampling method with a focus on the gender attribute. The researcher obtained a quota of approximately 39% male respondents and 61% female respondents due to the gender makeup of students currently attending The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University.

Assumptions

Below is a list of assumptions which apply to this study:

1. Respondents answered the survey measurement in a truthful manner based on their personal perceptions of the concepts.

2. Respondents carefully read and considered each question listed in the survey.

3. Respondents considered the terms offender, victim, and community in a generic sense rather than considering a particular individual the respondent perceives to be an offender, a victim, or community member.

4. Respondents generally held a personal perception regarding the survey questions found within the measurement.

Justification

As a society, we must begin to explore other methods of approaching individuals that commit crime. The current avenues of obtaining justice do not statistically suggest effectiveness in reducing crime. In order for positive change to occur, individual and societal perceptions must evolve. For this reason it is important to gain a greater
understanding of perceptions of restorative justice concepts held by community members, and more specifically, future criminal justice practitioners and officials.

Benefits

One benefit of this study is that criminal justice professors may better understand the perceptions of criminal justice students regarding restorative justice concepts; such knowledge can lead to further questions and examinations of the philosophies currently taught in criminal justice courses. Likewise, findings of this study will provide a better understanding of whether perceptions of certain restorative justice elements can be predicted by gender, ethnic, religious, or educational attributes. From students’ perspectives, being asked to provide perceptions of restorative justice elements may help them better understand or acknowledge their own beliefs regarding what justice entails.

A second benefit is the exploration of whether demographics of those currently studying criminal justice predict perceptions of restorative justice concepts; if so, then professors may be able to use such information to understand students’ respective positions regarding restorative concepts.

How the Current Study Expands the Restorative Justice Literature

In the twenty years peacemaking philosophy and restorative justice practices have existed within the criminal justice system, no definitive agreement has emerged regarding a definition of restorative justice. While many have discussed values, benefits, and processes of restorative justice, few have attempted to formulate a definition of the concept. However, the composition of a tentative definition/theory of restorative justice is imperative because without a definition of restorative justice, the ability to conceptualize and operationalize its elements is difficult for current and future restorativists and
practitioners. Because a conceptual definition of restorative justice evolved through the creation of this research project, it is hoped that restorativists will be more likely to conduct studies utilizing elements of the outlined restorative justice definition/theory.

While the existing literature includes perception studies of individuals that have taken part in restorative justice processes, only a handful of studies since the beginning of the 21st century have focused on perceptions of criminal justice students regarding restorative justice elements -- the majority of which aimed to understand the perceptions of those who have taken part in courses focused on restorative justice and included individuals from the juvenile justice system. The current research project is believed to be the first study to test perceptions of criminal justice students in relation to restorative justice elements and students’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. For this reason, this research project offers a unique examination of the current body of restorative justice literature available to criminologists and practitioners.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Definition of Restorative Justice

The definition of restorative justice is still up for debate (Karp & Conrad, 2005; Latimer et al., 2005). Restorativists currently have a difficult time pinpointing terms that represent restorative justice across programs which contend to be restorative in nature (Bazemore, 2000). Van Ness and Strong (2006) state “like the words ‘democracy’ and ‘justice’; people generally understand what they mean, but they may not be able to agree on a precise definition” (p. 41). The same holds true for the concept of restorative justice. Zehr (2002) suggests “with more and more programs being termed ‘restorative justice,’ the meaning of that phrase is sometimes diluted or confused” (p. 6). McCold (2004) asserts the problem with the lack of a definition is “with no agreed upon way to decide, nobody … challeng(es) the misuse of the term” (p. 143). Bazemore et al. (2005) explain:

Rather than a ‘how-to’ set of instructions, restorative justice reformers adopt a ‘mind-set,’ a way of thinking about the consequences of crime and the parties it harms” and “they then begin to act in a different way guided by an understanding of emotional impacts, the deterioration of relationships, and the desire for restoration and healing. (p. 300) Zehr (2002) has attempted to provide a synthesized definition stating “restorative justice is a process to involve, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense and to collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations, in order to hear and put things as right as possible” (p. 37). Wachtel (2003) implies “restorative justice is a philosophy, not a model…” (p. 85). However, Vigorita (2002) maintains
“restorative justice is a process; it is not an outcome” (p. 405). Cook and Powell (2003) state “a restorative approach emphasizes the presumed damaged relationships between people and aims to develop strategies for repairing those damaged relationships” (p. 279). Walgrave (2000) reasons “restorative justice is a set of experimental practices, a field of scientific research, and a movement of beliefs as well” (p. 416).

In general, restorative justice can be defined through its processes or the values embedded within the idea (Adams, 2004; Braithwaite, 2000; Morrison & Ahmed, 2006). Points of agreement of practitioners and researchers in the field of restorative justice regarding aspects which must be included within the definition of restorative justice do exist. Umbreit, Coates, and Vos (2004) point out:

How would we recognize restorative if we saw it? This is a question of measurement. We hope that researchers and practitioners will continue to grapple with how to measure the many dimensions and components of restorative practice at the individual, community and system levels. (p. 87)

A lofty, yet important aspect of the current study includes an attempt to define restorative justice by the values embedded within restorative justice processes. A definition of restorative justice developed by the researcher of this study follows.

Restorative Justice As Defined In This Study

In order to define restorative justice, one must begin with the purpose or goal of such processes. The purpose and goal of restorative justice, from the perspective of the researcher of this study, is ultimately as the name implies, restoration. Restoration is essential due to the concept that crime creates broken relationships which are in need of being restored. In order to restore the broken relationships, reparation is necessary. The
path to obtaining reparation is made through amends. In order to make amends, inclusion of all parties involved in the criminal action is paramount. By involving all parties, the offender is given the opportunity to openly take responsibility for the offense and to express remorse and apologize to those persons whom he or she harmed. The researcher of this study contends that one of the above means of amends (acceptance of personal responsibility, remorse, or apology) must occur in order for the restorative justice process to proceed with the cycle. Inclusion of all parties affected by the crime also provides the opportunity for victims to forgive the perpetrator for the action at hand if they so choose. Just as the above requirement that an offender must offer amends in one of three forms, it is also important for forgiveness to occur from either the victim or the community in order for the process to move to the next stage. From the perspective of the author of this study, without some degree of forgiveness, any resolution created would be null and void. Inclusion, the ability of the offender to take personal responsibility for their actions and hold themselves accountable, the ability for the offender to show remorse, the ability for an apology to be voiced and the opportunity for a victim to forgive the individual that harmed them are the essential elements necessary to make amends.

When amends have been made, an opportunity arises for the community, victim, and offender to create a resolution to repair the harm, which in turn provides an opportunity for both the victim and the offender to be reintegrated back into the community in which they have either harmed or felt harmed within. By creating a resolution, the possibility of reconciliation emerges. Through understanding how such broken relationships are in need of repair and seeing the importance of parties coming together (inclusion) to work towards such repair, amends may be made through
acceptance of responsibility, remorse, and/or an apology by the offender. Once amends has been made and an appropriate level of forgiveness has occurred, a resolution may be developed which moves both the offender and victim into a realm of possible reintegration back into the community and further morphs into a reconciled relationship ultimately restoring the relationship. Each principle within the above restorative justice definition is further defined through the following literature.

*Figure 2. Restorative Justice as Defined in this Study.*
Further, the researcher of this study agrees with Howard Zehr (2002) that results of restorative justice processes are based on a continuum. Zehr explains restorative justice practices can be fully restorative, mostly restorative, partially restorative, potentially restorative, and pseudo or non-restorative.

Figure 3. Zehr’s (2002) Concept of a Continuum of Restorative Justice.

What Zehr’s (2002) continuum reveals is there are varying degrees of restorativeness in every restorative justice process. While one specific process may not include every element of the restorative justice definition presented in this research, a process may in many ways still be restorative on some level and may therefore still be considered a restorative justice process. Every element of restorative justice as defined through this study, including crime creates broken relationships, reparation, inclusion, amends, means of obtaining amends, resolution, reintegration, reconciliation, and restoration, must not necessarily be included in each process in order to be considered restorative in nature. However, the number of elements which are present within a particular process may aid in determining where a certain restorative justice encounter fits within Howard Zehr’s (2002) continuum of restorative justice.

The Problem: Crime Creates Broken Relationships

One point of agreement within the debate of the definition of restorative justice is that at the heart of criminal behavior is a broken relationship (Browning et al., 2001; Burford & Hudson, 2001; Cook & Powell, 2003; Drewery, 2004; McCold, 2000; Morrison & Ahmed, 2006; Roche, 2001; Zehr, 2002). Restorative justice processes focus
on creating a sense of balance which has become unbalanced due to a criminal action (Zehr, 2004). Scimecca (1991) contends disputes suggest an imbalance in a community and will exist until the needs of the disputants have been achieved. Sullivan and Tifft (2001) also suggest the root of the problem is related to needs of the community. Lederach (2003) uses the analogy of a window to explain how humanity currently thinks about crime. He implies that in our traditional system of justice we only focus on the window frame or the crime and fail to actually look through the window. In other words, we fail to see criminal actions as a symptom of something deeper which has led to broken relationships. Toews (2006) explains when crime occurs, the traditional thought process is to question “What law was broken?, Who did it?, and what do they deserve?” (p. 17). The mindset of a restorativist asks “Who has been hurt?, What does he or she need?, Who should be involved in meeting those needs?, and what is the best way to repair the harm and meet those needs?” (p. 21). Restorative justice shifts the focus of the crime away from the offender and how he or she should be punished and focuses on the end product as well as the causes of the crime which ultimately results in ruptures in relationships.

Previous Studies

Since 2000, studies have been conducted regarding offenders’, victims’, parents’ of participants of restorative justice, restorative justice community volunteers’, and multiple participants’ within restorative justice processes perceptions of the importance of recognizing how criminal actions rupture relationships. There is value in understanding that one’s actions do not occur in a bubble but rather that actions are subjected to the laws of karma or cause and effect. Once a crime occurs, individuals will be harmed and this law of cause and effect creates an imbalance within a relationship.
When Holsinger and Crowther (2005) studied perceptions of offenders participating in a restorative justice college class they found offenders held a greater understanding of the impact their actions had on others within the community after taking part in the course.

Likewise, researchers studied perceptions of offenders regarding police facilitated juvenile conferences in Ireland and found that all of the juvenile offenders believed the conference experience had aided in their ability to better comprehend how their actions had affected others. The researchers also found the majority of parents believed the process allowed the offender to comprehend the gravity of the harm created for the victim (O’Mahony & Doak, 2004).

Another researcher studied perceptions of victims and victim supporters of a family group conferencing process in England. After moving through the process, a report was written about the offender identifying elements of the crime and the rehabilitative information about the offender. This report is created to aid families in determining the appropriate response to delinquent behavior. Findings suggest most respondents perceived the purpose was to assist offenders in gaining a better understanding of victim perspectives of harm (Zernova, 2009).

Researchers have studied the perceptions of individuals who served as community volunteers on reparative boards in the state of Vermont. The researchers found reparative board members felt completion of the process created greater acknowledgement of the harm created (Karp, Bazemore, & Chesire, 2004). Other researchers have studied circle processes referred to as the South Saint Paul Restorative Justice Council (SSPRJC) between 1997 and 2000. The researchers were interested in understanding how the
processes had affected members of the circles including the victims, family members of the victims, offenders, family members of the offenders, facilitators, traditional justice system personnel, and community members. The results suggest a number of participants of the circle felt they developed new and stronger relationships with those who were members of the circle process (Coates, Umbreit, & Vos, 2003).

Literature Summary

Literature regarding the creation of broken relationships due to criminal actions suggests offenders, parents, and community volunteers believe offenders develop a greater understanding of the causes and the effect or harm of the offense through restorative justice processes; therefore, a greater sense of connectedness is said to be developed through restorative processes. Previous research also suggests victims and supporters of victims participate in restorative justice practices due to the belief that a greater understanding of the cause and the effect of the crime will be addressed through such processes. Lastly, multiple participants within such processes contend a result of restorative justice practices includes strengthened relationships of all involved parties.

The Path to Healing: Reparation

Just as with anything that is broken, reparation is necessary in response to criminal transactions. Trenczek (2002) contends “reparation and the idea of making-good are an ethically based tenet of criminal law” (p. 31). A number of criminologists who study restorative justice suggest reparation is a primary focus of restorative justice processes (Ball, 2003; Browning et al., 2001; Gavrielides, 2005; Goren, 2001; Harris, 2006; Karp & Conrad, 2005; Keeva, 2005; Klein & Van Ness, 2002; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; McCold, 2004; Roche, 2001; Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Lightfoot, 2005; White,
Reparation may also be viewed as the ability to build social ties which have not existed or to rebuild social ties which have been broken (Rodriguez, 2007).

The agreement made within restorative justice processes should include methods of reparation of the criminal action (Cook & Powell, 2003; Schwartz, Hennessey, & Levitas, 2003). Likewise, the goal of sentencing circle processes is linked to reparation (Roberts & Stalans, 2004). Reparation is said to occur through the process of dialogue (Gavrielides & Coker, 2005). Individuals who act as facilitators within restorative justice processes are faced with the dilemma of how to best repair the wrongdoing at hand (Strang et al., 2006). A number of individuals within the field of restorative justice hold the belief that reparation is inherently tied to providing an apology for one’s actions (Roberts & Stalans, 2004). Some restoratists suggest in order to repair harm integrative shaming is an inherent aspect of such processes (Morrison, 2006). Platz and Reidy (2006) explain:

Reparative claims are distinctive… (in that) they impose demands on the victims in whose name they are made. Since the repair of a moral relationship is not something wrongdoers can effect on their own, reparative justice demands of victims a willingness to venture forgiveness or at least reconciliation in response to a wrongdoer’s reparative efforts at making amends. (p. 362)

The goal of reparation through restorative justice is exhibited through programs developed by police in New Zealand to divert juveniles from punishment and instead focus on reparation (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006). Likewise, the goal of restorative justice victim panels is to provide a sense of reparation to those who have been harmed
Within the Skidmore College restorative justice process, a primary focus which guides the process is reparation (Karp & Conrad, 2005). A summary of previous studies which focus on perceptions of reparation is the next topic explored.

*Previous Studies*

Previous studies have been conducted regarding the perceptions of reparation within restorative justice processes. Samples have included offenders, victims, and community volunteers. A previously mentioned study examined the perceptions of individuals who served as community volunteers on reparative boards. Community member participants perceived community service to repair harm instead of as an act of retribution (Karp et al., 2004).

Lovell, Helfgott, and Lawrence (2002) studied the perceptions of offenders who took part in the citizens, victims, and offenders restoring justice (CVORJ) program at the Washington State Reformatory. One goal of the process included innovative reparation ideas. Three cycles of the program were implemented and at least eight inmates were included within each program cycle, which lasted ten weeks or more. The participants (offenders, victims, and community volunteers) as a whole believed reparation was not always an appropriate avenue because a number of actions may not be repaired. Community volunteers echo this same logic and conclude community service should be viewed more as a means of repair than punishment.

*Literature Summary: Reparation*

Reparation is said to be of primary focus and a goal within restorative justice processes. Research has also suggests reparation is not possible without participation of both the victim and offender. Past literature also implies community service may be
viewed as reparation and in some cases, reparation is not appropriate due to an inability to repair harm in some cases. Because one of the primary goals of restorative justice is reparation, the elements necessary to achieve reparation must also be explored beginning with the concept of inclusion.

The Path to Healing: Inclusion

Bazemore et al. (2005) contend the “common experience of personal involvement in conflict resolution, indeed in peacemaking, is the core idea whose time has come” (p. 304). A primary aspect of restorative justice is participation by community members and all individuals who have a stake in the outcome of such processes (Adams, 2004; Boyes-Watson, 1999; Braithwaite, 2000; Clark, 2005; LaPrairie, 1998; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; Roche, 2006; Schwartz et al., 2003; Umbreit, Lewis, & Burns, 2003; Van Ness & Strong, 2006; Zehr, 2002). The importance of inclusion relates to the ability of the offender to reintegrate back into the society which the crime was committed within. Inclusion of community members is important because it moves the offender away from fearing the process of justice and implies the ethical nature of the particular community being represented (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002).

The importance of community involvement centers on the idea that offenders need to feel as though the community cares for them. Therefore the offender will wish to be complemented by the community for acting in appropriate manners (Boyse-Watson, 1999). Pranis (2005) explains circle processes “draw on the ancient Native American tradition of using a talking piece, an object passed from person to person in a group and which grants the holder sole permission to speak. Within community participation, the concept of inclusion has great meaning. Dzur and Olson (2004) explain “...restorative
justice theorists see participation as having moral education effects, meaning that the community learns about both the strengths and weaknesses of its own moral resources” (p. 97). The community may be defined according to the affected parties or the region where the offense was committed (LaPrairie, 1998). In some programs the community includes only those who receive an invitation (Baskin, 2002).

It is explained if offenders are to reshape their behavior the community must be included in the process (Dyck, 2000; Gavrielides, 2005; Karp & Conrad, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2003; White, 2000; Zehr, 2004). Reformation of behaviors may occur when all members of the restorative justice process can communicate (Calhoun & Borch, 2002; Parkinson & Roche, 2004). Through this communication, it is contended reparation may occur (Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001). This dialogue process is said to bring about a community plan to right the wrong of the offender’s action (Radzik, 2003). In this sense, all members of the program, including the offender and victim(s) begin to feel a sense of dependence upon the community and each other (Gavrielides, 2005; Roche, 2006). This sense of dependence is partly achieved through creating an environment of inclusion which aids participants in feeling inherently secure that processes will not result in emotional trauma (Pranis, 2005; Schirch & Campt, 2007).

The primary victim(s) of the crime are also viewed as community members (Boyes-Watson, 1999; Cook & Powell, 2003; Drewery, 2004; Dzur & Olson, 2004; Goren, 2001; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; Maxwell & Morris, 2006; Rodriguez, 2005; Rodriguez, 2007; Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001). Such community members are an integral part of restorative justice processes due to their ability to communicate in such forums (Hillian et al., 2004; Keeva, 2005; Szmania & Mangis, 2005). Through such
communication, the victim(s) have the ability to discuss what would constitute reparation of the criminal action (Umbreit et al., 2005). In some restorative justice processes, a victim advocate may act as the facilitator (Strang et al., 2006).

Inclusion also involves participation of the offender (Baskin, 2002; Boyes-Watson, 1999; Cook & Powell, 2003; Goren, 2001; Hillian et al., 2004; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; O’Mahony & Doak, 2004; Parkinson & Roche, 2004; Rodriguez, 2005; Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001). Offender participation is essential. In order for an individual to value the outcome of a process, they must be part of it (White, 2000). Offenders are offered the opportunity to invite individuals who can help them through the process to be present (Calhoun & Borch, 2002).

Community members that participate in restorative justice practices may also include family members. These individuals may consist of offenders’ family members (Hillian et al., 2004; Karp, 2001; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; Maxwell & Morris, 2006) as well as the victims’ family members (Baskin, 2002). Family members may include parents (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; Maxwell & Morris, 2006; O’Mahony & Doak, 2004) as well as extended family members (Goren, 2001). Not only do family members attend, but they assist other community partners in reaching a solution (Grauwiler & Mills, 2004). The involvement of families is viewed as important because they are highly affected in most incidents by both the offense and the outcome of such restorative justice processes (Umbreit et al., 2005).

Friends of the offender have also been known to participate in restorative justice practices (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006). A benefit of having a friend present is that he or she can say what is on the mind of the offender if the perpetrator finds it difficult to verbally
communicate his or her thoughts (Parkinson & Roche, 2004). Friends of victims may also participate in order to provide a level of support (Goren, 2001).

Supporters of both the offender and victim have attended restorative justice meetings (Baskin, 2002; Boyes-Watson, 1999; Cook & Powell, 2003; Maxwell & Morris, 2006; Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001). Supporters play an active part in the process by verbally participating and making recommendations for a resolution (Hillian et al., 2004). Such participation may come in the form of explaining how the event has impacted their life personally (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006). However, supporters do not enter the meeting without prior explanation of restorative justice processes and an idea of their personal purpose for being in attendance (Calhoun & Borch, 2002).

Facilitators are involved in the planning of restorative justice processes, provide initial contact with the offender and victim, explain the program, and are responsible for transcribing a written understanding of the terms and agreements made during a restorative process (Calhoun & Borch, 2002). Another responsibility of the facilitator is to ensure the safety of all parties involved (Rundell, 2007). Participation may also include a coordinator of the restorative justice program. This individual may be a representative of the Department of Corrections or a more general community member who has accepted such a role (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002). Department of Corrections employees may act as facilitators of restorative justice (Strang et al., 2006). When necessary, wardens of correctional institutions may also take part in restorative justice initiatives (Bays, 1999). In other instances, individuals trained in mediation skills attend restorative justice processes and steer the activity of such meetings (Hillian et al., 2004; Strang et al.,
2006). However, mediators often withdraw personal influence and allow the victim and offender to process the wrongdoing and create a solution (Szmania & Mangis, 2005).

Members of the courtroom workgroup may also play an integral part in the community participation aspect of restorative justice processes. When professional courtroom workgroup members take part in such processes, members often act as facilitators (Ball, 2003). At other times, members of the courtroom workgroup may participate as general community members (Hillian et al., 2004). Defense attorneys have been invited to participate in conferences in selected cases (Calhoun & Borch, 2002; Hillian et al., 2004). The role of defense attorneys as a support person is different than the role played by defense attorneys in the courtroom. Prosecutors have also attended such processes (Umbreit et al., 2003). Prosecutors are in an interesting position to make references to restorative justice processes and have typically done so (Rodriguez, 2007). At other times, prosecutors have initiated restorative justice practices (Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003). Judges have also attended circles and provided input and support (Calhoun & Borch, 2002; Hillian et al., 2004). Judges in Canada have begun restorative justice processes in certain cases as well (Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003).

Law enforcement representatives may also be present (Cook & Powell, 2003; Drewery, 2004; Goren, 2001; Hillian et al., 2004; Karp & Conrad, 2005; Maxwell & Morris, 2006; Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001). In some instances, a police officer is responsible for directing an individual to a restorative justice process (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006). Sometimes police officers are responsible for bringing together the restorative justice process (Bazemore & Griffiths, 2003; Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003; Strang et al., 2006). In other instances, officers have acted as facilitators (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006;
Strang et al., 2006). In such cases, the officers dress in street clothing and reiterate their lack of judgment of individuals involved (O’Mahony & Doak, 2004).

Probation officers have also been found in attendance at restorative justice processes (Goren, 2001; Umbreit et al., 2003). At times, probation officers act as facilitators (Hillian et al., 2004; Strang et al., 2006). In other cases, probation officers act as support persons (Calhoun & Borch, 2002). When a primary victim does not feel comfortable taking part in a restorative justice process, a probation officer may speak on behalf of the victim when permission is provided (Rodriguez, 2007).

Social workers have often been found in restorative justice settings (Drewery, 2004; Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; O’Mahony & Doak, 2004; Van Wormer, 2004) Social workers have also acted as mediators in restorative processes (Strang et al., 2006). Social workers are said to be drawn to restorative practices because many of the same values of processes are intertwined with the philosophy of social work, such as individuals feeling empowered to handle personal situations (Wright, 1998). Likewise, child welfare personnel have attended restorative conferences (Pennell, 2006).

In the primary education setting, principals have acted as support persons in restorative justice processes (Calhoun & Borch, 2002). Within one school setting, a sports coach attended the restorative justice process (Drewery, 2004). In other instances, invitations have been extended to teachers of primary parties (Drewery, 2004; Goren, 2001; O’Mahony & Doak, 2004). In some processes a youth advocate is invited to the participate (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006). Juvenile justice staffs have also taken part in restorative justice initiatives (Goren, 2001; Maxwell & Morris, 2006), and members of the juvenile justice staff have taken on the role of mediator (Presser & Hamilton, 2006).
Guidance counselors associated with the offender and/or victim may also act as community members. Counselors are considered to be a prime community member to participate in restorative justice processes as a result of the inherent idea in counseling that individuals can move past events in their lives (Ryals, 2004). Likewise, juvenile case workers may be in attendance (Cook & Powell, 2003). At times the case workers may act as the facilitator (Rodriguez, 2005; Rundell, 2007). Case workers have also referred offenders to restorative justice processes (Rodriguez, 2007). Additionally, case workers may assist the offender in identifying what needs to be done to restore harm and may act as a support person for the offender during such processes (Mika & McEvoy, 2001). Case workers can create the community space to discuss an offender’s transgressions (Chatterjee & Elliott, 2003). In the college setting, student affairs officials have participated in restorative justice processes (Karp & Conrad, 2005).

One group of community members that participate in restorative justice processes encompasses volunteers; but in no way are directly related to the criminal offense (Bazemore, 2005; Rodriguez, 2005). Persons not affiliated with the victim or offender were asked to join because of their capacity to bring a fresh perspective to the table (Umbreit et al., 2004). General volunteers from the community often take part in meetings; such volunteers have been provided an understanding of the general principles guiding restorative justice processes (Maxwell & Hayes, 2006; Rodriguez, 2005). Volunteers unrelated to the crime are particularly vital in forming restorative justice plans because they are nonthreatening to both parties, can remain impartial, and have no interest or personal stake in the outcome of the agreement (Karp et al., 2004; Rodriguez, 2005, 2007). Volunteers discuss the case with the offender and his or her family prior to
the meeting. The role of volunteers may be to simply represent the community at large (Rodriguez, 2005); this is important because volunteers help teach the social norms of a given community (Bazemore, 2005; Karp, 2004). Likewise, community volunteers may be able to see past the primary harm to the victim and point out harms suffered by the larger community (Karp, 2004). In other cases, volunteers lead the process (Bazemore, 2005; Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, Rooney, & McAnoy, 2002; Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002; Umbreit et al., 2004). Volunteers can also be responsible for determining which offenders and victims would be a good fit for such processes. Likewise, volunteers may monitor if conditions of the resolution are met (Boyes-Watson, 1999), as well as supply information on community outlets of service for both the victim and offender (Karp, 2004).

**Previous Studies**

Previous studies have been conducted regarding perceptions of inclusion by offenders, victims, police, judges, community volunteers within restorative justice processes, multiple participants within restorative justice, general community members, and university students. We will begin with perceptions of inclusion by offenders.

Stahlkopf (2009) studied Youth Offender Panels (YOT) in England through multiple interviews with offenders and supporters. The results revealed the majority of offenders perceived the panel process to lead to positive assistance and felt supported by members of the panel. However, the majority of respondents did not feel as though the process transformed perceptions of self. Likewise, the majority of offenders did not feel as though the panel community members understood their perceptions. Approximately fifty percent of the offenders felt they were included in determining a just response and a number of respondents did not feel included in the process to any extent. Researchers
have studied offenders who participated in family group conferences in Exshire, United Kingdom. The researchers were interested in youth attitudes about family group conferences and whether inclusion changed such beliefs. (Mutter, Shemmings, Dugmore, & Hyare, 2008). Results suggest juveniles believed they were treated with intrinsic value because their feelings and questions were perceived to be valid. A number of respondents also took part in a time-series analysis via survey before the process, after the process, and approximately six months after the process. With regards to changes in the juvenile’s attitudes, the researchers found perceptions of future recidivism were significantly reduced.

Two criminologists studied perceptions of offenders who took part in restorative justice processes called Project Turnaround and a process in Te Whanau Awhina, New Zealand. The findings suggest motivation for participation included a diversion from the traditional justice system due to the labeling which occurs with such processes (Maxwell & Morris, 2001). The researchers also found in the majority of cases offenders believed they were included in the formulation of the resolution; however, others felt the process was not inclusive.

One researcher has studied perceptions of individuals that participated in victim impact panels in the state of Arkansas versus those individuals who took part in the traditional criminal justice system. The population of Fulkerson’s (2001) study consisted of “all of the offenders and all known victims involved in class A misdemeanor domestic violence cases in the five Arkansas district courts over a six-month period in 1998” (p. 360). The researcher divided the participants into control groups and experimental groups through random assignment. The results contend a greater percentage of the offenders
who did not experience the victim impact panel approved of the system of justice. However, the majority of experimental group respondents contended the process holds value and would agree with incorporating such processes within the current criminal justice methods. Lastly, the researchers examined court records in order to determine if offenders had recidivated within one year. Within one year one control group and one experimental group participant had recidivated.

A previously discussed study also focused on perceptions of victims and victim supporters within a family group conferencing process in England. The family group conferences are utilized for juvenile offenders and attempt to combine elements of rehabilitation and restorative justice within the conferences. The victims’ rationales for participating included the perception that he or she perceived the offender could be his or her own family member and felt a responsibility to express shame in the actions of the offender (Zernova, 2009). A study conducted by Fulkerson (2001) found the vast majority of domestic violence victims believed the panel to be an important outlet and would support such panels being part of the resolution.

Another criminologist studied perceptions of justice who were victims of sexual abuse during childhood in New Zealand. The researcher found when restorative justice principles and processes were explained to the respondents they were skeptical such elements would entice him or her to report victimization experienced while young (Jülich, 2010). Reasons for such fear included possible exploitation of victims, questions regarding whose position would hold greater weight and the shift in control from the traditional system to restorative practices.
In the Stahlkopf (2009) study previously noted, the Youth Offender Panel (YOT) officers who took part in family group conferences in England who perceived panel members to have difficulty connecting with offenders and possessed the inability to adapt to such encounters. YOT officers also felt the family group conferences were not balanced because the members of the panel would attempt to take over the process rather than allowing equality of all involved. These perceptions were developed by YOT officers because panel members did not follow guidelines by acting as authority figures through eliciting amends and pushing the juveniles into resolutions.

One researcher studied perceptions of persons who participated in family group conferences in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Eighteen police officers were provided pretest-posttest surveys regarding their perceptions of the conferences facilitated. The results suggest the police did not change in attitude, culture, or perception of self as an officer. However, the results do indicate officers felt a greater sense of support from community members (McCold, 2003). One interesting finding suggests officers who agreed with the processes were less likely to agree with traditional crime control methods.

Two criminologists interviewed judges about attitudes towards sentencing circles in intimate-partner abuse (Belknap & McDonald, 2010). The researchers found perceived benefits were that inclusion of community members increased public awareness and therefore greater responsibility of the offender would be a nature extension. The sample of judges perceived the most important prerequisites for participation in sentencing circles for intimate-partner abuse included agreement of the victim, support for the victim, capability of the community to effectively handled such cases which required strengthened community as well as programming within the resolution. The researchers
also found the sample of judges held the belief that the most common problem with sentencing circles is such circles require a great number of resources and time in order to be completed.

Other researchers have studied perceptions of volunteers of restorative justice programs in British Columbia. Souza and Dhami (2008) questioned the motivations of individuals who volunteered for such programs, as well as the methods and experiences such volunteers felt were needed within the role. The results suggest the majority of volunteers do so primarily to assist others and help the larger community. The respondents believed communication tactics were the most important skill within the volunteer role and perceived prior experiences and qualifications to be related to inclusion within such processes “including career-related credentials in counseling and social work, educational certifications in areas such as dispute resolution and criminology, and specialized knowledge and experiences” (Souza & Dhami, 2008, p. 46). Factors explained approximately forty percent of satisfaction levels and included “overall amount of training received, volunteers’ clarity on their roles and responsibilities, amount of support received, sense of being valued by other volunteers, and amount of time contributed weekly to (process)” (Souza & Dhami, 2008, p. 48).

Inclusion within restorative justice processes is also connected to inclusion outside of such practices. Researchers conducted a pilot program in Atlanta, Georgia in an economically disadvantage neighborhood (Ohmer, Warner, & Beck, 2010). The researchers were interested in determining if training could affect attitudes about intervening in community conflict. Since community involvement is so valued in restorative justice, this study’s relevance and findings are essential. The researchers
utilized pre-post testing in conjunction with verbal surveys and found a significant
difference of respondents’ measures prior to training and after training in regards to
participants’ attitudes about intervening and their level of likelihood to intervene.
However, the researchers did not find a significant difference between respondents’
pretest and posttest measures regarding their confidence in intervening in conflict
situations. Lastly, a decrease was found among respondents who would utilize formal
intervention methods rather than informal methods.

Another researcher was interested in perceptions of satisfaction levels of
participants of family group conferences from 1999 to 2002 in North Carolina. Family
members were asked through interviews after the conference rank order elements in
terms of importance regarding the creation of a resolution during the family caucus.
(Pennell, 2006). The results suggest participants believed they were ready for the
encounter and perceived the ability to give input to the resolution. The findings of this
research also suggest consensus was utilized in the majority of resolution developments
which falls in line with the ideal of inclusion by all participants.

As previously discussed, one study looked at perceptions of individuals who took
part in family group conferences in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Victims’, offenders’, and
their parents’ attitudes were examined through mail surveys. The majority of victims,
offenders, and parents were happy with their choice to take part in the family group
conference and would suggest such processes to others who may find themselves
entangled in the web of the criminal justice system (McCold, 2003).

Holsinger and Crowther (2005) studied a restorative justice college class made up
of individuals labeled as juvenile delinquents as well as traditional students. College
student participants believed they were not so different from the juveniles and suggested the possibility of growth and change for the juveniles over time. Likewise, all of the traditional students believed restorative justice methods could be a positive alternative to the current practices and therefore should be implemented within the current system. The college students also believed values associated with restorative justice should be utilized within the criminal justice adult system; however, the college students did not believe every adult offender should be exposed to such values and principles.

Vigorita (2002) studied the effects of an innovative restorative justice course which combined 12 university students and 12 delinquent offenders at Rowan University in New Jersey. Class meeting times were on Wednesday and Friday; however, young delinquent offenders did not attend the second class meeting each week. The researcher provided pre-test and post-test surveys on the first and last day of class to the university students regarding “…perceptions of offenders, views towards the criminal justice system, career choices and exposure to different voices and viewpoints” (p. 418). Conclusions suggest a number of students’ attitudes shifted from a more get tough on crime stance to a greater appreciation for the current level of punishment placed on offenders. Another interesting finding is that all the university students’ perceived punishment was less important than rehabilitation. A few of the university students afterward reduced their level of support for the justice system, but none held greater reverence for the justice system upon completion of the class. A number of students also perceived the field of juvenile justice to be of interest as a career option after taking part in the course. A number of the university students gained a greater understanding that they personally could just as easily have been in the shoes of the juveniles and most of
the university students shifted their views from the pretest in which they suggested juvenile delinquents were dissimilar to law abiding individuals (Vigorita, 2002). The definition of restorative justice begins with the end goal of the practice, resolution. In order for resolution to occur, inclusion of multiple parties is a necessary condition.

*Literature Summary: Inclusion*

Previous research regarding perceptions of inclusion suggests offenders often feel support, feel treated with respect, and see restorative justice methods as valuable. The results could provide one explanation as to why inclusion of the offender has led to reduced rates of recidivism in some instances. Some offenders feel they are included in the decision-making process while others do not. Likewise, some offenders feel inclusion does not aid in changing his or her personal perception of themselves.

Previous literature asserts victims’ rationales for participation in restorative justice processes include the idea that individuals act as both offenders and victims at different points in time. Also, victims often desire the ability to shame the offender for his or her transactions. Some victim participants feel restorative justice processes have value and would suggest restorative justice processes to others. However, victims also see many downfalls of restorative justice practices. One such downfall could be that participation in restorative justice processes may not increase the likelihood that victims would report the crime committed against them. Likewise, victims may be uneasy about whose priorities, the victim’s or the offender’s, are most important. Lastly, victims of sexual abuse have had a difficult time agreeing that community members should handle such cases unless proper protection and follow through are provided for women.
Previous studies on perceptions of police and inclusion suggest officers view such processes to include inequality. Part of the issue from police officers’ perceptions is participants may have difficulty in not emotionally acting out. Likewise, officers may find it difficult to refrain from acting as authority figures with control. Police officers have had an increase in beliefs that community members hold a level of respect for police. Police officers who have acted as facilitators felt the importance of crime control decreases after acting as a facilitator. In the case of domestic violence sentencing circles, judges perceived a benefit of the restorative justice process was greater inclusion of multiple parties, the ability for the offender to hold themselves accountable, and an increase in attention directed towards domestic violence issues.

Community volunteers contend they participate in restorative justice processes to help both individuals and society in general. Likewise, volunteers note inclusion may also be related to past educational and personal development in the areas of conflict resolution and/or justice studies. General community members, after being trained in intervention during conflict situations, suggested they would be more likely to intervene or include themselves in such conflicts; however, the level of certainty general community members possessed in doing so was not high. Studies which have considered perceptions of multiple participants in restorative justice suggest a high satisfaction level of parties, enjoyment of inclusion, and a desire to recommend restorative justice processes to others. Overall, such participants feel as if all parties have a say in the decision-making process.

University students included in classes with young offenders have perceived a number of similarities between the two groups; such an understanding helps individuals reconsider the concept of us versus them. College students who have also felt a possible
positive evolution of young offenders have voiced value in attempting to help offenders change. College students included in restorative justice courses with young offenders were more likely to later move away from the get tough on crime philosophy and believed the current level of punishment for criminal activity is sufficient. The students’ perceptions of who should be included in restorative justice processes hinged on the age of the offender and type of offense committed. Inclusion within such courses also sparked career interest in some students in the field of juvenile justice.

Overall, previous literature suggests both positive and negative aspects are perceived with regard to inclusion of participants in restorative justice processes. Next is a discussion of demographic variables found within restorative justice perception studies.

Gender Based Perceptions of Restorative Justice

A number of studies have been conducted regarding perceptions of individuals based on gender and restorative justice processes. Such studies include perceptions of offenders, victims, multiple parties within processes, police, and a research-observer.

Researchers have also been interested in understanding how a program in one federal prison in Ontario, Canada, called Stride Night affected perceptions of female offenders who participated. The purpose of Stride Night is to create relationships between community members and females who are incarcerated to reduce recidivism upon exiting the criminal justice system. The researchers identified three themes which emerged from the focus group interviews including “the crisis of leaving the institution, friendship as a site for resistance, and empowerment-in-community” (Fortune, Thompson, Pedlar, & Yuen, 2010, p. 25). Respondents felt a crisis could be somewhat relieved by the circles and emotional support from community members related to the level of fear possessed
regarding exiting the institution. The focus group members suggested they believed making friends with community members would help them resist criminal activity once released from prison. The authors explain once a friendship is created, offenders are more likely to attempt to become contributing members of the community was released. Lastly, the authors identified the theme of empowerment for the female offenders.

One researcher studied the South Australia Juvenile Justice (SAJJ) project as a complete observer and witnessed approximately 90 conferences where the offenders had committed violent and property violations (Daly, 2008). The researcher focused on female juvenile offenders and found they perceived themselves to be victims as well; therefore, such offenders did not perceive her actions to be uncalled for because others had begun the conflict.

Researchers conducted a study regarding a program located in Texas prisons called Restore Peace. The researchers found the program developed greater empathy, ability to forgive others, greater religious and/or spiritual belief, and the ability of male offenders to elevate the dynamics of relationships with those in their lives to a more rewarding stature (Armour, Windsor, Aguilar, & Taub, 2008).

One criminologist interviewed female victims of peer violence within the South Australia Juvenile Justice (SAJJ) program as previously discussed. The results suggest victims did not agree with the intensity of the requirements of the resolutions because of the level of harm perceived by the victims (Daly, 2008). The female research-observer perceived that girls were less likely to make amends than boys.

One researcher found women indicates others should stand in for them and felt safety could be an issue in the case of processes included the offender (Rubin, 2010).
Likewise, women felt such processes would lead to the possibility of reverting back to the role of the victim. Women were also concerned that information shared during the process would not be held at confidential within the Nova Scotia communities. The women within the focus groups were also concerned about the level of voluntariness to participate within restorative justice processes and were concerned the harms and needs of their children would fail to be considered. The women were also concerned about how an individual’s community would be defined because the general community may not understand their position.

Nancarrow (2010) interviewed 20 women (10 indigenous, 10 non-indigenous) who were involved in restorative justice task forces in Australia as well as other victim advocates. Nancarrow was interested why perceptions of restorative justice differ in family violence cases. Results suggest indigenous women did not agree with the traditional system in such cases; conversely, the majority of non-indigenous women perceived the traditional system should be utilized in such cases. Likewise, indigenous women perceived that restorative justice could reduce family violence while the traditional system could not and the non-indigenous women felt the direct opposite. Essentially, the findings suggest culture influences perceptions of appropriateness of restorative justice in domestic and family violence cases.

*Literature Summary: Gender*

Previous studies regarding gender perceptions have found that through restorative justice processes female offenders perceive important aspects of success in the free world are related to empowerment and feeling connected to others. Young female offenders have denied personal responsibility and have also perceived themselves to be victims of
circumstances during conference processes. Males involved in one restorative justice program did indeed change their levels of empathy, forgiveness, spiritual/religious ideals, and strengthen personal relationships in a positive direction.

Research suggests female crime victims believe offenders have not been handled in a proper manner in violent cases. Many female participants -- sexual abuse victims and offenders alike -- contend that stand-in victims are not a good idea, and that inclusion in restorative justice processes could be harmful as well as present an opportunity to coerce participation. Females also worry the term community is vague and the decided community in each case may not understand the victim’s position because of a lack of shared experiences. A female research-observer perceived young female offenders are less likely to exhibit elements of amends (including remorse and apology).

Ethnicity Based Perceptions of Restorative Justice

The author found only one study which considered ethnicity based perceptions of restorative justice. Sivasubramaniam and Goodman-Delahunty (2008) examined perceptions of psychology students at University of New South Wales. The researchers questioned the choice of participating in restorative justice conferences or the traditional arbitrary system, and were interested in understanding if power-distance preferences were related to types of judicial preferences. The authors hypothesized if respondents’ perceived a power distance between themselves he or she would be less likely to agree with individuals high on the power spectrum to be appropriate for inclusion within such processes. Furthermore, the researchers’ hypothesized respondents would refrain from inclusion within police facilitated processes due to perceptions of ethnic bias. In addition, the researchers questioned if respondents high on the power spectrum would take part in
police facilitated conferences if they felt police bias existed in relation to his or her ethnicity. As hypothesized, respondents high on the spectrum were open to the possibility of police facilitated conferences; however, the trust level for police facilitators was not found to affect participation. The results suggested perceptions of racial discrimination would not affect students’ decisions to participate in restorative justice processes led by police officers.

*Literature Summary: Ethnicity*

When considering students’ perceptions regarding the choice to be included within justice processes, people with high-power distance prefer an authority to be in charge of creating a resolution. Overall, respondents are not in favor of police facilitating restorative justice processes. Moreover, perceptions of racial discrimination do not determine inclusion of parties within police facilitated processes. We will now turn to a discussion of religion based perceptions of restorative justice studies.

**Religion Based Perceptions of Restorative Justice**

Few studies have focused on perceptions of restorative justice processes based on religion, most of which include the attitudes of offenders and community members. Armour et al. (2008) found that “Christian participants were significantly more likely to increase their ability to take the perspectives of other people and display feelings of warmth and compassion for others than were non-Christian participants” (p. 164).

Jenkins (2006) interviewed individuals that do or have lived on the Gullah Islands. The Gullah Islands are composed of Islands in North Carolina South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. Historically, religious practices guided the social fabric of the Islands. Praise houses became the meeting place for community members after the civil
war where cultural practices were considered law and members acted as community elders. In the past the social structure of the Gullah community hinged on community addressing acts of wrongdoing. This system of resolution is referred to as “just law” and “unjust law is the formal law of the state…” (p. 310). However, over time the traditional criminal justice system was relied on more by the community members, and although the cultural structure of resolution has declined, it has not disappeared. The researcher was interested in understanding the perceptions of community members regarding social wrongdoings handled through just law and the traditional criminal justice system. The researcher was also interested to see if differences of perception existed between the older community generation and the younger society members. Jenkins found that older respondents did not judge unjust law but did not actually trust such a system. In contrast, the younger respondents preferred unjust law. This may be due to a lack of knowledge of just law. While the younger respondents were less likely to agree with just law, they still held a desire to be mentored to learn about the disappearing cultural norms.

Criminologists studied circle processes referred to the South Saint Paul Restorative Justice Council (SSPRJC) between 1997 and 2000. One interesting finding which ties to the peacemaking theory within this study is that members of the community who participated -- but were not the offender or family members of the offender or victim -- suggested spirituality is an important aspect of circle processes. (Coates et al., 2003). However, none of the offenders, victims, or their supporters made note of any religious tones as being part of the experience. Rather, such members pointed to elements found in peacemaking theory, including feeling cared about, equality, that people felt empowered by the talking piece because they felt others were listening to his or her feelings
Literature Summary: Religious Affiliation

The previous literature contends that holding a religious or spiritual position may be tied to possessing a greater level of care for offenders who take part in restorative justice processes. It also seems that a lack of cultural understanding in regards to religious beliefs may influence individuals’ perceptions of systems of justice. Lastly, perceptions of religious overtones in restorative justice experiences may differ based on the position one holds within the restorative justice process.

Educational Level Based Perceptions of Restorative Justice

Lee (2009) studied community members’ attitudes regarding the implementation of restorative justice within the juvenile justice system within Hong Kong. Respondents were provided a brief explanation of restorative justice and asked to express their perceptions of implementing restorative justice into the juvenile justice process in Hong Kong. The researcher found a vast majority of respondents’ agreed with implementing restorative justice within the juvenile justice system; furthermore, the higher education levels were correlated with support for restorative justice in the juvenile system. However, another researcher found that of police officers within the Port City police department of British Columbia, Canada sample approximately one-fourth perceived he or she learned about restorative justice during college (Abramson, 2003).

Literature Summary: Education Level

Previous literature contends the majority of the general public in Hong Kong agrees with implementing restorative justice with juveniles. As respondents’ education level increases, previous literature suggests support for restorative justice values and
processes also increases. However, in another study, police suggest personal knowledge of restorative justice was not gained through educational endeavors.

Literature Review Conclusion

Stemming from peacemaking criminology, restorative justice shares close ties with religious thought processes including Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, Islam and Native American thought. The themes of peacemaking criminology include the concepts of connectedness, care, and mindfulness. From these concepts flow processes coined to be restorative in nature. Such processes include peacemaking circles, group conferences, reparative boards, victim offender mediation/reconciliation programs, victim-offender panels, social justice initiatives, and community justice initiatives.

Prior literature points to the underlying understanding that, while restorative justice is made up of values also found within the roots of peacemaking criminology, restorative justice is also defined through such processes. A definition of restorative justice is still in the formulation stage. In order to conceptualize and operationalize restorative justice concepts, it seemed imperative to create a definition for this study by organizing the values/principles of restorative justice into a concrete process.

The restorative justice process, which consists of restorative justice values, suggests crime creates broken relationships; therefore, relationships are in need of reparation. In order for reparation to occur, inclusion is needed. Inclusion leads to amends. Amends can come in one or more forms from the offender including acceptance of personal responsibility, showing remorse, and/or an apology. Amends may also come in the form of forgiveness from the victim. Next a resolution to address the amends is created. Through creating a resolution, reintegration of all parties is possible. Through
reintegration of all parties, reconciliation occurs. Through reconciliation, relationships are restored and/or transformed which is the ultimate goal of restorative justice processes.

As suggested in Chapter I, an interesting realization made during the process of composing this Literature Review is that very few studies have been conducted in regards to perceptions of restorative justice values and processes. While a few have focused on gender perceptions of restorative justice values and processes, only a minimal number of studies have been conducted regarding ethnicity, religious beliefs, and educational level in relation to perceptions of restorative justice values and processes.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study explores whether respondents’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation and educational level can predict perceptions of the first three elements of the restorative justice definition outlined in the previous chapter. Logistic regression is utilized to determine if these four independent variables can predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, if reparation is needed when crime occurs and if multiple parties should be included in determining a just outcome in crime occurrences. This study will determine if the overall model for each dependent variable is statistically significant, while also explaining the variance of each dependent variable captured by the independent variables. Significant independent variables are also noted for each dependent variable as well as the size of effects for each of the significant independent variables. Standardized effects or the rank order of the predictors within the model are not examined due to the categorical nature of the independent variables.

Research Design

Independent Variables

The independent variables within this study include: gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level of respondents. The conceptual definition of gender is whether an individual perceives himself or herself to be male, female or transgendered. Ethnicity is defined as the ethnic background a respondent most identifies his or her heritage with. The conceptual definition of religious affiliation is the religious belief
system a respondent most personally identifies with and the definition of education level suggests the educational year a respondent is currently classified within.

*Dependent Variables*

The dependent variables within this study include the following: crime creates broken relationships, reparation, and inclusion. The attributes of each measurement are strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The rationale for utilizing a four point likert scale is derived from previous literature relating to perceptions of restorative justice that suggest one method of obtaining perceptions is through interview processes (Belknap & McDonald, 2010; Coates et al., 2003; Holsinger & Crowther, 2005; Jülich, 2010; Maxwell & Morris, 2001; O’Mahony & Doak, 2004; Stahlkopf, 2009; Zernova, 2009). A number of perception studies noted in the Literature Review suggest researchers have utilized observers within restorative processes (Jülich, 2010; Lovell et al., 2002; McCold, 2003) while one researcher utilized focus groups (Lovell et al., 2002). A number of studies regarding perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, reparation, and inclusion have included Likert scale attributes; such studies include a 3 point scale (Mutter et al., 2008), 4 point scales (Mutter et al., 2008; Ohmer et al., 2010; Pennell, 2006), the traditional 5 point scale (Fulkerson, 2001), a 7 point scale (Souza & Dhami, 2008) and a 9 point scale (Souza & Dhami, 2008). Karp et al. (2004) designed the attributes of an instrument as a Likert scale and recoded responses into dummy variables. This rationale was also be followed within the current study in order to gauge if respondents in general agree or disagree with restorative justice variables.

The conceptual definition of the variable crime creates broken relationships, includes whether respondents perceive that crime creates ruptures in relationships among
affected parties. There are three reparation dependent variables including offender reparation, victim reparation, and community reparation. Offender reparation is conceptualized as an attempt to mend the relationships ruptured through a criminal action by the offender. The conceptual definition of victim reparation includes an attempt to mend the relationships ruptured through a criminal action by the victim. The conceptual definition of community reparation consists of an attempt by the community to mend relationships ruptured through a criminal action. There are three inclusion dependent variables: offender inclusion, victim inclusion, and community inclusion. Offender inclusion is conceptualized as the ability of an offender to be included in defining the specifications of a just response to the criminal action at hand. Victim inclusion is defined as a victim’s ability to aid in defining the specifications of a just response to a criminal action perpetrated against them. Community inclusion is conceptualized as the ability for general members of a community, other than the primary offender and victim, to aid in defining the specifications of a just response to criminal actions.

Participants and Sampling Method

Participants included students enrolled in criminal justice courses at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University in the spring semester of 2012. Respondents were required to be 18 years of age or older to volunteer.

The non-probability sampling method known as purposive or judgmental sampling was utilized in this study. The rationale for this sampling method was based on the purpose of the study. The researcher was interested in understanding perceptions of students enrolled in criminal justice courses with regards to aspects of restorative justice.
principles. Both undergraduate and graduate students were surveyed at the universities. In addition to the purposive/judgmental sample, quota sampling is also utilized. Maxfield and Babbie (2011) contend “quota and purposive sampling may be combined to produce samples that are intuitively, if not statistically, representative” of the chosen population (p. 246). The descriptive variable utilized to obtain a quota sample was gender. The following paragraphs provide current statistics on the gender makeup of students at both universities for the 2010-2011 academic year. The demographic variables of ethnic makeup and average age of students at both universities are noted below.

According to The University of Southern Mississippi Factbook (2010-2011), 38% of students were male and 62% were female, while the average ages of undergraduate and graduate students were 24 and 33 years respectively. Whites (59.4%) represented the largest ethnic group, followed by Black (27.3%), Hispanic (2.1%), Asian (1.1%), American Indian (.4%), Multi-Racial (.7%), and other (9%). Moreover, nearly 80% of the students were pursuing undergraduate degrees (freshman = 17.2%, sophomores = 13%, juniors = 19.6% and seniors = 32.8%), while a smaller minority were pursuing a master’s degree (10.4%) or doctoral degree (7%) (The University of Southern Mississippi, 2010-2011). The above numbers do not reflect students seeking specialist degrees or non-degree seeking students due to the fact that such categories do not apply to the study at hand.

According to the Georgia College and State University Factbook (2010), 40% of students were male and 60% were female, while the average age of all students was 22. White (82.8%) represented the largest ethnic group, followed by Black (7.8%), Hispanic (3%), Asian (2%), American Indian (.28%), Multi-Racial (1.7%), and other (2.4%).
Moreover, nearly 85% of students were pursuing undergraduate degrees (freshman = 24.4%, sophomores = 20.1%, juniors = 19.8%, seniors = 20.5%), while a smaller minority were pursuing a graduate degree (15.7%) (Georgia College and State University, 2010).

Gender was selected as the quota sampling demographic variable rather than age or ethnic makeup because this variable is the most equivalent in nature of the three variables across sampling populations. Therefore, the research method entails a quota of approximately 39% male respondents and 61% female respondents.

*Purposive Sample Selection and Method*

Once the institutional review boards (IRB) at The University of Southern Mississippi (see Appendix A) and Georgia College and State University (see Appendix B) provided approval for the research projects, the researcher contacted criminal justice professors via email to obtain permission to survey classes at a scheduled date and time. Upon receiving permission, the researcher provided required IRB documents, including consent forms for respondents at each institution (see Appendixes C and D).

Consent was obtained through a written informed consent document which each respondent was required to sign to participate in the study. The researcher explained the nature of the study, the importance of anonymity and confidentiality, as well as voluntariness of participation to possible participants. The researcher collected consent forms and provided written survey instruments to students who agreed to voluntarily participate. Respondents were provided one survey and an unidentified envelope in which to place the survey upon completion. Once respondents completed the survey, he or she
was asked to place the envelope in a box which was collected by the researcher after all respondents in each classroom finished the survey.

The results of this study may possibly be generalized to the population of students from which the sample is drawn. For this reason, generalizability may only include students in criminal justice courses at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University during the spring 2012 semester.

**Instrumentation**

The survey instrument measurements for the variables within this study were constructed utilizing restorative justice research variables noted in the Literature Review (see Appendix E). The theoretical foundations for the construction of the dependent and independent variables are examined below.

*Independent Variables: Gender, Ethnicity, Religious Affiliation and Education Level*

Previous literature of restorative justice infers some studies have focused on perceptions of males and females (Armour et al., 2008; Daly, 2008; Fortune et al., 2010; Nancarrow, 2010; Rubin, 2010). Past research has not focused on the association between gender and perceptions of restorative justice elements as defined in the development of this study. In order for the measurement of gender to be exhaustive, the primary researcher has included the transgendered attribute in addition to male and female.

Past research regarding ethnicity has centered on perceptions of individuals who have taken part in restorative processes and whether they believed racial discrimination would influence the process (Sivasubramaniam & Goodman-Delahunty, 2008). Previous literature has not considered the relationship between ethnicity and perceptions of restorative justice elements. In order to develop a measure for ethnicity, the categories
within the Office of Institutional Research of Georgia College and State University (2010) and The University of Southern Mississippi’s demographics Factbook (2010-2011) were utilized: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, and Multi-Racial. To obtain exhaustiveness for the variable ethnicity, a category of other was included. In order to utilize logistic regression, White was utilized as the reference category group.

Previous literature has suggested perceptions of religious overtones during restorative justice experiences may differ based on the position one holds within the restorative justice process (Coates et al., 2003). Previous literature on perceptions of restorative justice and religious beliefs considered whether being of the Christian faith versus other religious faiths is associated with perceptions of the restorative justice element of compassion (Armour et al., 2008). To construct a measure for religious affiliation, the researcher selected the attributes of the underlying religious beliefs which make up the peacemaking paradigm: Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Taoism, and Native American thought. In order for the measurement to be exhaustive, the attributes of Agnostic, Atheist, and other were included in the measurement.

Abramson’s (2003) study centered on exposure to restorative justice principles of police officers during educational experiences, while other research has considered appropriateness of restorative justice processes for juveniles based on respondents’ education level (Lee, 2009). However, past research has not examined the link between education level and perceptions of restorative justice elements as defined within this study. Due to the nature of the population in this study, the attributes for the measurement include the categories freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, pursuing a master’s degree, and pursuing a PhD degree. The other attribute was included for exhaustive purposes.
Dependent Variable: Crime Creates Broken Relationships

Past research indicates offenders gain a better understanding of how their criminal actions affect others through learning about and/or taking part in restorative justice processes (Holsinger & Crowther, 2005; Karp et al., 2004). Research also has found motives for victims participating in restorative justice processes include the ability to share with offenders how the crime affected them (Zernova, 2009). Likewise, research on the outcomes of restorative justice processes include strengthened relationships of involved parties; it also has been contended that these processes in and of themselves build relationships (Coates et al., 2003). However, prior research does not include perceptions of students in criminal justice courses regarding whether crime creates broken relationships. Instead, such research has focused on perceptions of individuals involved in restorative processes and whether crime was perceived to create broken relationships through a number of means, to include acknowledgement during the process or through learning about restorative justice principles, as a motive for participation, or suggested through the perceptions of strengthened relationships due to such processes.

This study aims to discover whether independent factors solely or as an overall model predict if criminal justice students perceive crime creates broken relationships. The measure in this study was transformed into a dichotomous variable (agree, disagree) with possible responses of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Consideration of past literature appears to indicate the current study is the first to pose this measure.

Dependent Variable: Reparation

Previous research on reparation within restorative justice processes have focused solely on the opinions of participants within such processes (including offenders, victims,
and community members). Results suggest these participants do not always conceive reparation as the end result of restorative processes because some criminal actions are incapable of being repaired (Lovell et al., 2002). Another study suggested volunteers in restorative processes did not perceive community service to be punishment but rather a form of reparation when placed in a restorative resolution (Karp et al., 2004). There have been few studies conducted regarding perceptions of whether reparation should occur after a crime is committed.

Reparation may be defined as the ability for an offender, victim, and/or community to make reparations. This study focuses on discovering whether independent factors can solely or as an overall model predict if sampled criminal justice students perceive reparations should occur from each of the noted parties. The measure in this study was transformed into a dichotomous variable (agree, disagree) with responses composed of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that: 1) Victims should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action perpetrated against them if so desired; 2) Offenders should be provided an opportunity to repair the relationships severed due to his or her criminal action; 3) Members of the community should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action. Previous research has failed to provide answers to these questions.

**Dependent Variable: Inclusion**

Previous inclusion studies explored perceptions of offenders regarding inclusion within restorative justice processes (Mutter et al., 2008; Stahlkopf, 2009) and reasons why offenders chose to participate in such processes (Maxwell & Morris, 2001). Past research studies regarding perceptions of victims and inclusion have focused on why
victims decided to participate in restorative processes (Zernova, 2009), satisfaction with restorative processes (Fulkerson, 2001; McCold, 2003), and perceptions of implementing restorative justice into society (Jülich, 2010). Previous research studies regarding perceptions of community members and inclusion have been more broad and have considered the perceptions of police officers (McCold, 2003; Stahlkopf, 2009), judges (Belknap & McDonald, 2010), restorative volunteers (Souza & Dhami, 2008), general community members (Ohmer et al., 2010), and family members (Pennell, 2006).

Two studies have focused on perceptions of students. One study centered on perceptions of college students who engaged in a restorative justice course with juveniles labeled as delinquents. The college students suggested inclusion in the course allowed for the development of a greater shared sense of identity with the juveniles. Additionally, students perceived (1) such processes to be another method of achieving justice and (2) intertwinment of restorative justice principles to be appropriate within the traditional system but only with some offenders (Holsinger & Crowther, 2005). A similar study explored perceptions of justice of university students and juveniles labeled as delinquents enrolled in a class focused on restorative justice. The pretest posttest research design allowed the researchers to focus on whether perceptions of get tough on crime, belief in the traditional justice system, interest in joining the juvenile justice field, and the concept of us versus them changed for university students due to the experience (Vigorita, 2002).

While the two previously mentioned studies also examine perceptions of university students, the instrumentation and measures are different in that those pieces of research focused on perceptions of those with known inclusion into restorative justice processes while the current study centers on perceptions of university students who may
or may not have previous restorative justice knowledge or exposure. This study focuses on discovering whether independent factors can solely or as an overall model predict if students in criminal justice courses perceive that offenders, victims, and community members in general should be included in the process of obtaining justice. The measure in this study was transformed into a dichotomous variable (agree, disagree) with survey responses of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. The measures relate to whether the respondent agrees or disagrees that each of three individuals should be included in determining a just response to a criminal action: (1) the victim of a crime, (2) community members other than the primary offender and victim, and (3) the offender of a crime. Previous literature has lacked responses to these important questions.

Limitations

Internal threats to validity are defined as “reasons why inferences that the relationship between two variables is causal may be incorrect” (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002, p. 55). History is one threat to the internal validity of this study. While it is assumed respondents considered offender to refer to a general individual who has committed a crime, there is the possibility respondents mentally specified an offender whose case had been exposed perpetually by the media during the time frame. In the current times, the case of Casey Anthony could cause such a history threat. The not guilty verdict was announced on July 5, 2011 (Winter, 2011). While respondents may not have considered this case while completing the survey, the highly publicized case must be considered with regard to the internal validity threat of history.

The internal validity threat of maturation must also be considered due to the education level independent variable. How one responds to questions within the survey
may simply be a reflection of maturity level rather than educational level. Likewise, participants in the study may not be representative of the population which presents selection bias as a threat to internal validity. It is possible that respondents aware of restorative justice may be more likely to volunteer as a participant.

Additive and interactive effects of threats to internal validity may occur during this study as well. This suggests possible threats to internal validity may combine in numerous manners in order to suggest a relationship between independent variables and each dependent variable when one is not present.

Data Analysis

This study focuses on three research question:

Research Question 1: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?

Research Question 2: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?

Research Question 3: Can we predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level?
Hypotheses

Seven null hypotheses are depicted by $H_0: \beta = 0$ with $\beta$ representing the unknown population parameter (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997). The above hypothesis equation states that the slope coefficient of the logistic regression model ($b$) for each dependent variable and the independent variables of gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level is equal to 0. The dependent variables are as follows: (1) crime creates broken relationships, (2) offender reparation, (3) victim reparation, (4) community reparation, (5) offender inclusion, (6) victim inclusion, and (7) community inclusion.

Analysis Procedure

Logit regression was chosen as the analysis procedure due to the nature of the dichotomous dependent variables and the independent variables being categorical and ordinal. Logit regression was utilized to determine if the slope coefficient of the models were equal to zero. The instrument measures the dependent variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal actions create broken relationships.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 4.** Dependent Variable 1: Crime Creates Broken Relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenders should be provided an opportunity to repair the relationships severed due to his or her criminal action.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 5.** Dependent Variable 2: Offender Reparation.
Figure 6. Dependent Variable 3: Victim Reparation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the community should have an opportunity to</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repair the relationships severed by a criminal action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Dependent Variable 4: Community Reparation.

Do You Agree or Disagree that each of the Following Individuals Should be Included in Determining a Just Response to a Criminal Action?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Offender of a Crime</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Victim of a Crime</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members other than the Primary Offender and Victim</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Dependent Variables 5-7: Offender Inclusion, Victim Inclusion, Community Inclusion.

The logistic regression will each consist of a two tailed test due to the small number of previous studies which have focused on perceptions of the dependent variables within this study. The alpha value of the statistical tests was set at .05. This is the first study known to the researcher which questions if gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level can predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships.
relationships and if offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in a process of repairing the harm caused by criminal actions.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Students enrolled in criminal justice courses at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University completed the written survey titled: *Criminal Justice Students’ Perceptions of Restorative Justice* (Appendix E) during the spring semester of 2012 on March 27 and March 20-22, respectively. Two hundred students (100 from each university) voluntarily completed the survey instrument.

Descriptives

Four demographic/independent variables are discussed in this section: gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. Approximately two thirds of the sample was female (60.5%, n=121), which is consistent with the respective female populations at each institution: 62% (The University of Southern Mississippi, 2010-2011) and 60% (Georgia College and State University, 2010). Gender was selected as the quota sampling variable prior to data collection for this study. Another demographic variable utilized within this study is ethnicity, Whites similarly comprised nearly two thirds of the sample (64.5%, n=129) with Blacks constituting the largest minority group (26.0%, n=52). These percentages are reasonably aligned with the ethnic makeup of students at The University of Southern Mississippi (White=59.4%, Black=27.3%); however, the ethnic makeup of the student population at Georgia College and State University diverges somewhat from the sample frequencies (White=82.8% & Black=7.8%) (The University of Southern Mississippi, 2010-2011; Georgia College and State University, 2010).

Next, approximately 85% (n=169) of sample respondents identified with Christianity as religious affiliation. The University of Southern Mississippi (2010-2011)
and the Georgia College and State University (2010) do not provide data regarding the religious affiliation of the respective student populations for the 2010-2011 academic year. Lastly, approximately 90% (n=179) of the sample consisted of students pursuing an undergraduate degree which is similar to the undergraduate student populations (82.6%, 84.8%) at each respective institution (The University of Southern Mississippi, 2010-2011; Georgia College and State University, 2010). A breakdown of the descriptive statistics for the sample is provided within Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Pursuing a Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Pursuing a PhD Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Controlling for Multicollinearity

Chi-square goodness of fit analysis was used to assess whether multicollinearity was a concern among the four independent factors (gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, education level). The tables presented hereafter represent those findings.

### Table 3

Chi-Square Tests for Multicollinearity by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not White</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(43.3)</td>
<td>(78.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(27.7)</td>
<td>(50.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Christian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>(103.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td>(65.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the chi-square tests of significance suggest there is not an interaction effect between gender and the other three independent variables. Cramer’s V statistics suggest weak associations among all of the variables: Gender/Ethnicity (Cramer’s V = .058), Gender/Religious Affiliation (Cramer’s V = .026), and Gender/Ethnicity (Cramer’s V = .040). Therefore, multicollinearity is not occurring among the independent variables and will not affect the overall model’s prediction ability through interaction effects among the predictors.

Table 4
Chi-Square Tests for Multicollinearity by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Christian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(109.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Undergraduate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(63.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(115.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the chi-square tests of significance suggest there is not an interaction effect between ethnicity and the remaining independent variables. Cramer’s V statistics suggest weak associations among the variables, Ethnicity/Religious Affiliation (Cramer’s V = .029) and Ethnicity/Education Level (Cramer’s V = .084). Therefore, multicollinearity is not occurring among the independent variables and will not affect the overall model’s prediction ability through interaction effects among the predictors.

Table 5

Chi-Square Tests for Multicollinearity by Religious Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Christian</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Undergraduate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(27.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(17.7)</td>
<td>(151.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the chi-square test of significance suggest there is not an interaction effect between religious affiliation and education level. Cramer’s V statistics suggests a weak association between the variables Religious Affiliation/Education Level (Cramer’s V = .124). Therefore, multicollinearity is not occurring among the independent variables and will not affect the overall model’s prediction ability through interaction effects among the predictors.

Spearman’s Rho calculations were made to check for multicollinearity among the dependent variables. The correlation matrix ensures the dependent variables do not share too much variance. Therefore, the variables may be tested individually without duplicating variances. There was not a need to combine variables because the variables,
to a large degree, measure different perceptions. While the logistic regression statistics
will not be affected by associations of the dependent variables due to the variables being
individually tested, understanding the relationships among responses to restorative justice
concepts provides answers to whether restorative justice concepts are a mindset. A
correlation matrix of the dependent variables is presented below in Table 6.

Table 6
Correlation Matrix (n = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCBR</th>
<th>VR</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCBR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.169*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.219**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.163*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.169*</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.258*</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  * Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Note: CCBR (Crime Creates Broken Relationships), VR (Victim Reparation), OR (Offender Reparation), CR (Community Reparation), VI (Victim Inclusion), OI (Offender Inclusion), CI (Community Inclusion)

A number of the Spearman’s Rho calculations suggest correlations among the
dependent variables. Such relationships include perceptions of the following variables:
crime creates broken relationships with victim reparation (p = .001), community
reparation (p = .015), and community inclusion (p = .017); victim reparation with
offender reparation (p = .000) and community reparation (p = .000); offender reparation
with community reparation (p = .000) victim inclusion (p = .044), offender inclusion (p =
Among the significant findings, positive moderate correlations are present between victim reparation/offender reparation, victim reparation/community reparation, offender reparation/community reparation, and victim inclusion/offender inclusion. While significant relationships are present among the dependent variables the strength of associations are at most moderate.

In reference to the aforementioned correlations, when a respondent rates his or her perception of a restorative justice concept as high or low on a four point Likert scale he or she also rates his or her perceptions as high or low on other specified restorative justice concepts. If respondents agree or disagree with a particular restorative justice concept, they are likely to also agree or disagree with other restorative justice concepts in a number of the correlations above. While such questions are not the primary focus of this study, the Spearman’s Rho findings lead to additional research questions for future study.

Next to be examined is the ability of the independent variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and educational level to predict respondents’ perceptions of the seven dependent variables previously referenced. While correlations were found among the independent variables, the dependent variables may be separately tested because none of the correlations reached a level of concern with respect to interaction effects.

Statistical Results

Within this study, three research questions and seven hypotheses were posited. The hypotheses and relevant findings will be discussed first. The dependent variables regarding crime creates broken relationships, victim, offender and community
reparations, as well as victim, offender, and community inclusions were originally composed of four point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree, 3=agree; 4=strongly agree). In order to complete logistic regression, the four point scale was transformed into a dichotomous variable which merged the two disagree categories (0=Disagree) and the two agree categories (1=Agree).

The frequencies within each independent variable were calculated to obtain appropriate reference category cutoff points with the exception of education level. The independent variables will be examined as follows: gender (1=male, 0=female, 0=transgendered); ethnicity (1=White, 0=Other); religious affiliation (1=Christianity, 0=Other); education level (1=undergraduate students, 0=graduate students).

**Hypotheses Findings**

Table 7

*Significance Levels of Overall Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Creates Broken Relationships</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Reparation</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Reparation</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reparation</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Inclusion</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Inclusion</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Inclusion</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 7 illustrates that four of the seven hypotheses tested in this study were not statistically significant; as such, the slope coefficient for each of these logistic regression models ($b$) -- crime creates broken relationships ($p = .132$), offender reparation ($p = .182$), victim reparation ($p = .279$), and offender inclusion ($p = .185$) -- and the independent variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education is equal to 0. Conversely, though (and more importantly), a combination of these four independent variables did indicate some predictive ability with respect to three dependent variables – as indicated by the hypothesis testing as follows:

Hypothesis 4 -- the researcher rejects the null ($p = .011$) that the slope coefficient of the logistic regression model ($b$) of the dependent variable community reparation and the independent variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education equals 0.

Hypothesis 6 -- the researcher rejects the null ($p = .013$) that the slope coefficient of the logistic regression model ($b$) of the dependent variable victim inclusion and the independent variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education equals 0.

Hypothesis 7, the researcher rejects the null ($p = .015$) that the slope coefficient of the logistic regression model ($b$) of the dependent variable community inclusion and the independent variables gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education equals 0.
### Coefficients of Independent Variables

#### Table 8

**Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Crime Creates Broken Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>5.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>2.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>3.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>4.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 3.5\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 11.3\%*

The overall model provides low explained variance (3.5%, 11.3%) of perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships. None of the above variables predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships; as such, calculation of the size of effect for statistically significant variables is not required.

#### Table 9

**Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Offender Reparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>1.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>-.761</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>4.640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>4.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 3.1\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 4.4\%*
The overall model provides low explained variance (3.1%, 4.4%) regarding perceptions of offender reparation. None of the above variables predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders should be provided an opportunity to repair relationships severed due to his or her criminal action; as such, calculation of the size of effect for statistically significant variables is not required.

Table 10

*Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Victim Reparation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>2.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-18.591</td>
<td>8680.528</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>20.473</td>
<td>8680.528</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>7.786E8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Cox & Snell $R^2 = 2.5\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 6.6\%$

The overall model provides low explained variance (2.5%, 6.6%) regarding perceptions of victim reparation. None of the above variables predict respondents’ perceptions of whether victims should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action perpetrated against them; as such, calculation of the size of effect for statistically significant variables is not required.
Table 11

*Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Community Reparation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>4.139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>5.201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023*</td>
<td>3.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-18.627</td>
<td>8495.045</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>20.517</td>
<td>8495.045</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>8.138E8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 6.4\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 14.9\%*

The overall model provides low explained variance (6.4%, 14.9%) regarding perceptions of community reparation. Regarding the above variables, gender and ethnicity significantly predict whether respondents believe members of the community should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action. Furthermore, male respondents are .324 times less likely than female respondents to support community members other than the primary offender and victim in having an opportunity to repair the broken relationships severed by a criminal action. White respondents are 3.541 times more likely than non-White respondents to support community members other than the primary offender and victim in having an opportunity to repair the broken relationships severed by a criminal action.
Table 12

Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Offender Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>-.778</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>3.460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032^*</td>
<td>3.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 3.1\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 4.1\%

The overall model provides low explained variance (3.0%, 4.1%) regarding perceptions of offender inclusion. None of the above variables predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders should be included in determining a just response to his or her criminal action; as such, calculation of the size of effect for statistically significant variables is not required.

Table 13

Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Victim Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>-19.685</td>
<td>7192.511</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-.458</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>21.845</td>
<td>7192.511</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>3.070E9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 6.2\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 10.6\%$
The overall model provides low explained variance (6.2%, 10.6%) regarding perceptions of victim inclusion. None of the above variables predict respondents’ perceptions of whether victims should be included in determining a just response to the criminal action committed against them; as such, calculation of the size of effect for statistically significant variables is not required.

Table 14

*Coefficients of the Independent Variable: Community Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (White)</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>5.897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015*</td>
<td>2.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-1.012</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>4.672</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>5.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Cox & Snell $R^2 = 6.0\%$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 8.3\%*

The overall model provides low explained variance (6.0%, 8.3%) regarding perceptions of community inclusion. Ethnicity significantly predicts perceptions of community inclusion. Furthermore, White respondents are 2.166 times more likely than non-White respondents to support community members other than the primary offender and victim of a crime in having an opportunity to provide their perspective of a just response to a criminal action.

Standardized Effects

Walker and Maddan (2005) explain standardized effects “may be calculated simply by multiplying the logit coefficient for a particular variable by its corresponding
standard deviation” (p. 311). The standardized effects provide the ability to rank the variables to determine which variables within each model influence the dependent variable in sequential order. When a researcher has continuous independent variables rank ordering of predictors is possible. In this study, the independent variables are dichotomous and do not yield standard deviations; therefore, explaining standardized effects is not possible.

Research Questions and Findings

The first research question asked if respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships can be predicted based on respondents’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. Based on the results of this study, we cannot more accurately predict such perceptions. Findings of this study suggest a high probability of error ($p = .132$), low explained variances (3.5%, 11.3%), and no significant independent variables.

The second research question asked if respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action can be predicted with respondents’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. The results indicate gender ($p = .042$) and ethnicity ($p = .023$) can explain perceptions of community reparation. Specifically, male respondents were .324 times less likely than female respondents to support community members other than the primary offender and victim in having an opportunity to repair the broken relationships. Likewise, White respondents were 3.541 times more likely than non-White respondents to support such community members’ opportunity to repair the broken relationships. While the above independent coefficients are statistically
significant, the overall prediction model’s ability for offender reparation \((p = .182)\) and victim reparation \((p = .279)\) are not significant. However, the overall model can significantly predict perceptions of community reparation \((p = .011)\). The explained variance for each of these dependent variables is low: offender’s ability \((3.1\%, 4.4\%)\), victim’s ability \((2.5\%, 6.6\%)\), community members’ ability \((6.4\%, 14.9\%)\). While the independent variables of gender and ethnicity were found to predict respondents’ perceptions of whether community members other than the primary victim or offender should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action, none of the predictors were independently significant for the dependent variables offender reparation and victim reparation. It appears, then, that while gender and ethnicity can significantly predict if a respondent will support community members having an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action, religious affiliation, and education level cannot. Likewise, none of the predictors are significant for the dependent variables offender reparation and victim reparation.

The third research question asked if respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action can be predicted based on respondents’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. The results of this study indicate we can predict respondents’ perceptions of whether victims \((p = .013)\) and community members \((p = .015)\) other than the primary offender or victim should have the ability to be included in the process of obtaining justice based on the overall model. Only ethnicity can predict respondents’ perceptions of community inclusion \((p = .015)\). White respondents are 2.166 times more likely than non-White respondents to support
community members other than the primary offender and victim of a crime in having an opportunity to provide their perspective of a just response to a criminal action. Conversely, the findings suggest we cannot predict such perceptions regarding the primary offender’s involvement in the process of obtaining justice ($p = .185$). The explained variance for each of the dependent variables is low: offender’s ability (3.0% to 4.1%), victim’s ability (6.2%, 10.6%), and community members’ ability (6.0%, 8.3%).

It appears no predictors can independently predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender and victim reparation as well as perceptions of victim and offender inclusion. However, gender can predict respondents’ perceptions of community reparation and ethnicity can predict perceptions of community reparation and community inclusion. Likewise, the explained variances of the dependent variables are extremely low, with the highest significant explained variance of community reparation being approximately 15%. Knowing respondents’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation and education level will not significantly assist in predicting perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, and offender inclusion. However, the overall model can significantly predict perceptions of community reparation, victim inclusion, and community inclusion.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine perceptions of criminal justice students regarding restorative justice values through prediction factors. Such research questions and hypotheses are posed due to the current state of the criminal justice system. The United States population is currently faced with a rising number of individuals placed within prisons, jails, and on probation (U. S. Department of Justice, 2009). A general question posed was whether criminal justice students’ perceptions of justice coincide with restorative values. An additional question posed was whether future practitioners of the justice system may be open to restorative justice processes. Furthermore, the question of whether criminological thought is currently in the peacemaking paradigm ensues.

This study focuses on criminal justice students’ perceptions of whether crime create broken relationships; if offenders, victims, and community members should be included in processes of justice; and whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair harm created by crime. The nonprobability sampling methods of purposive/judgmental sampling and quota sampling were utilized in surveying students enrolled in criminal justice courses at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University in the spring 2012 semester.

Conclusions and Discussion

As previously noted in Chapter II, Umbreit et al. (2004) pointed out:

How would we recognize restorative if we saw it? This is a question of measurement. We hope that researchers and practitioners will continue to
grapple with how to measure the many dimensions and components of
restorative practice at the individual, community and system levels. (p. 87)

Future restorativists may view the restorative justice definition/theory developed for this study as a launching pad for conceptualization of additional restorative concepts. Likewise, the restorative justice definition/theory provides operationalized measurements for restorative justice concepts, which in turn increases the spectrum of possibilities for future attempts to measure elements of restorative justice.

**Overall Models**

This study found gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation and education level as an overall model do not significantly predict whether respondents perceive criminal actions create broken relationships. The results also imply the model does not significantly predict whether victims and offenders should have an opportunity to repair relationships severed by criminal actions; nor should the offender of a crime be included in determining a just response to a criminal action. However, logistic regression analysis did uncover that gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation and education level as an overall model do significantly predict whether respondents perceive that (1) members of the community should have an opportunity to repair relationships severed by a criminal action and (2) both the victim of a crime as well as community members other than the primary offender and victim should be included in determining a just response.

**Gender Findings**

Previous findings of gender perceptions are both confirmed and refuted by the current findings. One contradiction is that past gender literature has included perceptions of offenders, victims, multiple parties within such processes, police, and a research
observer; however, such perception studies of restorative justice elements have not included criminal justice students. The current study provides overall model findings which can serve as a starting point for researching how and if gender can predict perceptions of restorative justice elements rather than simply providing perceptions of those individuals that have taken part in restorative justice processes. When Fortune et. al. (2010) attempted to gain a better understanding of how the Stride Night prison program affected perceptions of female offenders, it was found that offenders felt empowerment and friendship aided in transitioning back to society. Gender findings of the current study also somewhat confirm Fortune et al.’s results in that female respondents were significantly more likely to believe community reparation should occur.

Furthermore, Rubin (2010) found through focus group discussions that women would not feel safe interacting with their abuser while also being emotionally difficult; thus reducing the strides in empowerment produced. The women in Rubin’s study felt safety issues could occur during meetings. Within the current study, however, the overall model was not able to predict perceptions of offender reparation, offender inclusion, and victim reparation. The findings could be related to different perceptions of particular offenders based on the relationship of the offender and victim. Further research in such areas may yield interesting findings. While the current findings suggest a number of contradictions to previous literature, a number of findings also support such literature.

When Daly (2008) studied female juvenile offenders he found victims did not feel offenders were treated harsh enough. The finding of the current study suggests male respondents are less likely than female respondents to support community members other than the primary offender and victim in having an opportunity to repair the broken
relationships severed by a criminal action, and as such whereas Daly’s finding that
female victims may be more apprehensive about restorative justice processes or inclusion
questions a different idea. Respondents’ perceptions may be due to position (victim,
offender, nonparticipant) within a restorative justice process -- future researchers should
consider exploring such questions. When Nancarrow (2010) interviewed women involved
in restorative justice task forces in Australia to gain a greater knowledge regarding
perceptions of restorative justice in cases of domestic and family violence, he found non-
indigenous women supported the traditional system of justice for such cases, whereas
indigenous women believed the traditional system created additional harm. The findings
that ethnicity may significantly predict perceptions of community reparation and
community inclusion may be perceived as somewhat confirming Nancarrow’s findings --
due to the link between ethnicity and culture. However, this connection leads to the
question of whether cultural aspects, rather than the factors of gender, ethnicity, religious
affiliation, and education level, could be a threat to internal validity within the current
study. Furthermore, such findings may simply be a product of culture among members of
the population and sample of this study which entails two southern universities.

*Ethnicity Findings*

The findings within this study that respondent perceptions do appear to be
affected by ethnicity are in opposition to the conclusions of previous studies. Specifically,
this study’s findings suggest ethnicity does predict perceptions of community reparation
and inclusion. While students comprise the populations and samples of both the current
study and that within Sivasubramaniam & Goodman-Delahunty’s (2008), they do differ
in that ethnicity within their study is linked to perceptions of participation within
processes and suggests that perceptions of racial discrimination do not affect students’ decisions to participate in restorative justice processes lead by police officers. The findings of the current study that ethnicity can predict perceptions of community reparation and community inclusion open the door for future research areas of interest which have yet to be explored.

Religious Affiliation Findings

Even though studies regarding religiosity and perceptions of restorative justice rarely appear within past literature, the results of the current study both contradict and confirm those that do exist. It should be noted that while the current study focuses on student perceptions, previous literature has considered perceptions of male prisoners and community members. One contradiction of this study’s results relates to Armour et al.’s (2008) study which suggested that those who follow Christian beliefs were more likely to show compassion and understand perceptions of others. As an independent factor, however, religious affiliation failed to predict perceptions of the dependent variables within the current study. Those researchers suggest respondents’ attributes on religious affiliation can determine perceptions of the restorative justice element of compassion; however, the findings of the current study contend religious affiliation cannot predict perceptions of any of the dependent variables. It should be noted that compassion is not a restorative justice value examined with this study.

Another contradiction exists with respect to a study conducted by Jenkins (2006) which considered how religion has affected social culture of the Gullah islands. He found older respondents did not trust the traditional criminal justice system and the younger generation did not embrace the cultural heritage of their ancestors. However, the findings
of the current study contend religious affiliation cannot predict perceptions of any of the dependent variables. It would be interesting to understand if and how the residents of Gullah islands perceived elements of restorative justice and whether a significant difference could be found between age and/or generational gaps. The conceptualized definition/theory within this study increases the ability for future research to occur.

The results of the current study also both confirm and contradict results noted by Coates et al. (2003) that being a member of the community -- not affiliated with a particular victim or offender and that participated in restorative processes – increased the importance of spirituality as an aspect of processes. However, offenders, victims, and their supporters did not make note of religious tones being an element of the restorative experience. The current study adds to this body of knowledge by providing a greater understanding of how religious affiliation can help predict perceptions of community reparation, community inclusion and victim inclusion. In both studies religion/spirituality was found to somewhat be tied to perceptions of restorative justice. Another confirmation within Coates et al. (2003) is that community members believed a deeper spiritual experience drives restorative justice processes. In the current study, religious affiliation within the overall model helped predict perceptions of community reparation, victim inclusion, and community inclusion. In this respect, their findings are contradicted in that religious affiliation did not independently predict any dependent variables in the current study. Therefore, future research should focus on gaining greater knowledge about a connection between restorative justice concepts and religious affiliation.
Education Level Findings

While previous literature focuses on perceptions of general community members and police officers, the current study diverges from this population and sample but still both confirms and contradicts the past literature related to perceptions of restorative justice and education level. One such confirmation relates to Lee’s (2009) Hong Kong study that education level had a positive correlation with perceptions of restorative justice; although the current study supports this association when education level is included within a model along with gender, ethnicity, and religious affiliation, it also differs in finding that education level does not independently predict perceptions of any dependent variables. One possible explanation for the contradiction could be that Hong Kong’s culture entails a more collective spirit than within the United States. Therefore, Lee’s findings that higher education levels are correlated with greater acceptance of restorative justice may be a product of an internal threat to validity. Furthermore, the current study may also be plagued with this threat. Culture rather than education level may be responsible for such findings. Future research should pose these questions.

The current study also confirms, to an extent, Abramson’s (2003) finding that approximately three-fourths of sampled Canadian police officers did not gain knowledge of restorative justice within a university setting. While the current study did not question perceptions of the level of restorative justice knowledge obtained within the university setting, the current study did reveal education level when combined with gender, ethnicity and religious affiliation in an overall model aids in significantly predicting community reparation, victim inclusion, and community inclusion. Likewise, education level did not predict any of the dependent variables which is in line with the Abramson’s
findings that restorative justice knowledge was not obtained during college experiences for the majority of respondents.

**Explained Variance**

The three significant overall models will be the focus of this section. The first significant model can account for approximately 6% to 15% of the error in predicting perceptions of whether community members should have an opportunity to repair relationships severed by criminal actions. Likewise, the overall models account for approximately 6% to 10% of the error in predicting perceptions of victim inclusion and approximately 6% to 8% of the error in predicting perceptions of community inclusion. Previous literature has yet to consider explained variance for criminal justice students’ perceptions of restorative justice elements. However, perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, and offender inclusion could not be significantly predicted by the overall models. However, such findings are an attempt to gain greater knowledge regarding factors that can predict such perceptions. While the explained variance is low, the findings add to the foundational literature of perceptions of restorative justice and do not confirm nor contradict previous literature because this study is the first to pose such questions.

**Coefficients of the Independent Variables**

The current study revealed no variables can independently predict respondents’ perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender or victim reparation, or offender or victim inclusion. Because past literature has yet to focus on predictions of criminal justice students’ perceptions of restorative justice concepts, these findings neither confirm nor contradict those studies. The findings do, however, raise the question
of what variables can predict one’s perception of such restorative concepts. However, three independent variable coefficients were found to be statistically significant.

Gender can significantly predict whether respondents perceive members of the community should have an opportunity to repair relationships severed by a criminal action. Furthermore, both female respondents and White respondents are more likely to support members of the community having an opportunity to repair relationships severed by a criminal action and more supportive regarding community involvement. While previous literature noting reparation focused on the conceptualization and application of the term, the current study considered the prediction ability of overall models as well as independent factors. In some cases, the results are inconclusive; however, in other cases the findings contradict or confirm such literature.

Karp et al. (2004) and Lovell et al. (2002) found participants viewed community service as an act of reparation rather than retribution. Lovell et al. also found offenders, victims, and community members did not always agree with reparation because a number of criminal actions are incapable of such. While these studies focus on actions that could be considered acts of reparation, the current study identifies two factors – gender and ethnicity – which predict respondents’ perceptions on community reparation and may explain why respondents in the aforementioned studies hold such perceptions.

The findings of the current study confirm Fortune et al.’s (2010) results that female offenders believed making friends with community members would help to resist criminal activity once released from prison. Their results indicate females were supportive of community reparation and the finding of the current study somewhat confirm this empirical evidence, as the odds of male respondents supporting community
reparation are lower than for female respondents. However, such differences may be accounted for by other variables such as labels (victim, offender, nonparticipant) within restorative justice processes and/or knowledge of restorative justice concepts.

Rubin’s (2010) examination of women in Nova Scotia revealed that participants were concerned about who would be conceptualized as community members within processes, and were worried that individuals defined as community members may not comprehend the position of the victim in such cases. The scope of this finding suggests coordinators of restorative justice processes must consider whether community members included in such processes will be able to place themselves in the shoes of both the offender and victim. Therefore, the finding within the current study both support and contradict Rubin in two major respects: (1) gender’s ability to predict perceptions of community reparation and (2) women were more likely to agree with community reparation. Nancarrow’s (2010) research also supports that culture is an important factor when studying perceptions of restorative justice. Likewise, previous literature supports the idea that differences in perception may be due to cultural values possessed by respondents.

*Research Questions Discussion*

The first research question posed whether perceptions of crime creates broken relationships could be predicted based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. The overall model was not significant. Therefore, findings of this study suggest we cannot predict such perceptions based on these factors. This leads to the question of what variables can predict such perceptions and should be one focus of future perceptions of restorative justice studies.
The second research question queried if we can predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. The overall models neither predict perceptions of offender or victim reparation (should be offered the opportunity to repair the relationships broken by a criminal action). However, the overall model can predict perceptions of community reparation’ as such, these findings lead to further questions regarding factors which have prediction ability not only for offender and/or victim reparation but also community reparation. Additional research regarding prediction factors and perceptions of restorative justice values should be posed including the findings above because the overall model can only account for approximately 15% (at most) of the prediction error. Therefore, the answer to the second research question is yes, we can predict perceptions of whether community members should have the ability to repair the harm created by a criminal action based primarily on gender and ethnicity, but within a model which includes religious affiliation and education level. However, we are unable to predict the same regarding perceptions of offender and victim reparation.

The third research question posed asks if we can predict respondents’ perceptions of whether offenders, victims, and community members should have the ability to be included in formulating a just response for a previous criminal action based on gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level. The findings of this study suggest the answer is both yes and no. The findings imply that when predicting perceptions of victim inclusion and community inclusion, the answer is once again yes; however, when predicting perceptions of offender inclusion, the answer is no.
We can significantly predict victim inclusion (to be included in determining a just response to the criminal action committed against them) and community inclusion (to have an opportunity to provide their perspective of a just response to a criminal action); however, we are unable to significantly predict offender inclusion (to be included in determining a just response to their criminal action). Just as with the second research question, future research is needed to understand factors which do predict perceptions of inclusion of individuals within restorative justice processes. This is further implied by the finding that even with two significant overall models, the models can at most account for approximately 10% of the error in prediction of perceptions of victim inclusion and at most 8% of the error in prediction of perceptions of community inclusion.

It is important to understand factors which predict perceptions of restorative justice values (including whether crime creates broken relationships, reparation and inclusion) to learn more about what influences one’s decision to participate in restorative processes. The findings of this study serve as a starting point for such exploration.

Limitations

One limitation is that this study’s results can only be generalized to the population from which the purposive/judgmental sample was drawn – namely students enrolled in a criminal justice course at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University during the spring 2012 semester. Another limitation is the utilization of nonprobability sampling. Every member of the sampling frame was not identified nor were all students enrolled in a criminal justice course provided an equal opportunity to participate in the study due to a lack of probability sampling.
Another limitation is while logit regression allows researchers to assess prediction ability of a number of variables, the statistical test does not determine if relationships are present among the variables. Other limitations include five possible threats to internal validity. First, it is presumed respondents considered a generic offender, victim, and community members; however, one must consider current media trends. The case of Casey Anthony may then create a history threat to the findings of this study. A second potential threat to internal validity is maturation; how participants responded to questions may simply be a reflection of their maturity level rather than educational level. A third threat to internal validity could be additional variables (such as culture) which influence respondents’ perceptions of restorative justice. Selection bias could also pose a fourth threat to internal validity because respondents who possess an awareness of restorative justice may be more likely to volunteer as participants than individuals unaware of the concept. Lastly, additive and interactive effects may have occurred during this study. Threats to internal validity may have combined in numerous manners to suggest a relationship between independent and dependent variables when one was not present.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study suggest considerations should be given to restorative justice participants’ gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level in regards to whether the participant will be open to community inclusion, community reparation, and victim inclusion. Restorative justice coordinators will gain a greater understanding of why a participant openly participates or is reluctant to participate in such processes. If a criminal justice institution is moving in the direction of adopting a restorative justice philosophy, perceptions of those applying for such job positions regarding restorative justice values will be important to increase the effectiveness of such processes.
The findings further allow practitioners and facilitators to be more aware of the possible opposition of male participants to implementing restorative justice principles which support community reparation, and therefore make such considerations for each participant prior to inclusion. Moreover, this finding suggests the need for criminal justice professors to incorporate restorative justice concepts within classes which entail a high frequency of male criminal justice students. Criminal justice professors may also gain a better understanding that students with different ethnicities hold different perceptions of restorative justice elements. Likewise, facilitators and practitioners of restorative justice may gain greater insight into reactions from individuals within such processes. Future research which focuses on prediction of variables regarding perceptions of restorative justice will add additional information in this realm of knowledge.

Recommendations for Future Research

A number of questions were resolved while completing this study, yet a number of questions remain. First, what factors other than the demographic variables explored in this study help predict perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, community reparation, offender inclusion, victim inclusion, and community inclusion? Why can gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level as an overall model significantly predict perceptions of community reparation, victim inclusion, and community inclusion but cannot significantly predict perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, and offender inclusion? Another question which arose from the completion of this study is why gender and ethnicity can significantly predict perceptions of community reparation and ethnicity can significantly predict perceptions of community inclusion to
the exclusion of all other variables independently. Likewise, why do no factors individually predict perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, offender inclusion, and victim inclusion?

Another question which arose from the completion of this study is whether gender, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and education level predict other variables within the restorative justice definition/theory utilized within this study. Such variables include perceptions of amends through acceptance of personal responsibility by the offender, remorse by the offender, apology by the offender, forgiveness by the victim and community, as well as perceptions of restorative justice resolutions, reintegration, reconciliation, and ultimately, restoration of relationships.

Furthermore, are the findings of this study generalizable? Are the findings specific to the sample of criminal justice students who were enrolled in criminal justice courses in the spring 2012 semester at The University of Southern Mississippi and Georgia College and State University? Would criminal justice students at other universities hold similar perceptions? Would students in different majors (or the general public) hold similar perceptions regarding restorative justice elements? Could factors utilized within this study be significant predictors of restorative justice perceptions for these other groups? What about criminal justice professionals? Are there predictive factors which could explain perceptions of restorative justice concepts among such individuals; and if so, what are they? Lastly, are there similarities of restorative justice value perceptions among different types of criminal justice professionals, such as police officers, probation officers, court officials, prison personnel, and parole officers?

Knowing the answers to such questions can provide greater knowledge for restorative
justice practitioners regarding where and with whom restorative justice processes may be most effective.

Overall, the findings of the current study suggest focusing on factors that can predict perceptions of whether crime creates broken relationships, offender reparation, victim reparation, community reparation, offender inclusion, victim inclusion, and community inclusion is necessary. Such research is important due to the lack of knowledge about factors which predict perceptions of restorative justice concepts. We must gain a better understanding of such perceptions and their predictors to determine when restorative justice may be suitable for an individual. Information regarding whether one is in a position of criminal justice authority, is applying to be a facilitator and/or coordinator of restorative justice processes, or wishes to act as a participant in a restorative justice process can assist in assessment of suitability for such individuals.

In Chapter I, three general questions were posed; but the results of this study suggest the answers to these questions remain undetermined. First, while the independent variables can collectively predict respondents’ perceptions of community reparation, victim inclusion and community inclusion, the findings do not fully answer the question of whether we as a society are in the criminological peacemaking paradigm. Second, the findings of this study do not fully explain whether criminal justice students hold peacemaking paradigm perceptions or whether society is currently ready for further implementation of restorative justice processes. Lastly, further studies regarding these questions are imperative due to experiential and agreement reality which suggests justice policies are influenced and created through societal beliefs.
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APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM: THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
CONSENT FORM
AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

Criminal Justice Students’ Perceptions of Restorative Justice: 
A Study of Demographic Variables and Restorative Justice Values

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to explore perceptions of students in criminal 
justice courses regarding elements of restorative justice. This study is being performed 
due to a lack of literature related to perceptions of individuals who will be joining the 
criminal justice field or a related field upon graduation. The results may aid professionals 
in the criminal justice field in developing a greater understanding of students’ perceptions 
of what justice entails. This primary researcher of this study is Lana A. McDowell, a 
doctoral student under the direction of Daniel S. Capper, Ph. D at the University of 
Southern Mississippi.

Description of Study: As a respondent, you are being asked to complete a written survey 
designed to evaluate students’ perceptions of elements involved in restorative justice 
practices. The time required to participate in this research should be a maximum of 25 
minutes. You may decide at any point to not continue with the survey. There are no 
penalties or repercussions for withdrawing your voluntary consent.

Benefits: While individual respondents will not be provided with any type of financial 
compensation, criminal justice practitioners and researchers may benefit by 
understanding perceptions of students in criminal justice courses regarding restorative 
justice techniques.

Risks: There are no known psychological, physical, social or legal risks involved with 
participating in this study. However, if you feel psychological harm results from 
participation in this study please visit The University of Southern Mississippi’s Student 
Counseling Services located at 200 Kennard-Washington Hall. Student Counseling 
Services can be reached at (601)-266-4829 or counseling@usm.edu.

Confidentiality: The primary researcher will secure completed surveys in her office. All 
responses to questionnaires will be confidential. Only the primary researcher and 
dissertation chair will have access to the written surveys.

Participant’s Assurance: Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that 
may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the 
researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. 
Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from 
this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions
concerning the research should be directed to Lana A. McDowell at 478-445-0942 or lana.mcdowell@gcsu.edu.

This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-00001, (601) 266-6820.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Signatures: In conformance with federal guidelines, the signature of the participant must appear on all written consent documents. The University also requires that the date and the signature of the person explaining the study to the subject appear on the consent form.

______________________________________________________
Signature of the Research Participant                     Date

______________________________________________________
Signature of the Person Explaining the Study              Date
APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM: GEORGIA COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY
CONSENT FORM
AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

Criminal Justice Students’ Perceptions of Restorative Justice: A Study of Demographic Variables and Restorative Justice Values

I, __________________________, agree to be a participant in the research titled, Criminal Justice Students’ Perceptions of Restorative Justice: A Study of Demographic Variables and Restorative Justice Values, which is being conducted by Lana A. McDowell, who can be reached at 478-445-0942. I understand this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time and have the results of the participation returned to me, removed from the experimental records, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:
1. The purpose of this study is to explore perceptions of students in criminal justice courses regarding elements of restorative justice. This study is being performed due to a lack of literature related to perceptions of individuals who will be joining the criminal justice field or a related field upon graduation. The results may aid professionals in the criminal justice field in developing a greater understanding of students’ perceptions of what justice entails. This primary researcher of this study is Lana A. McDowell, a doctoral student under the direction of Daniel S. Capper, Ph. D at The University of Southern Mississippi.

2. The procedures are as follows: You will be asked to complete a written survey designed to evaluate students’ perceptions of elements involved in the practice of restorative justice. Participants must be 18 years of age or older in order to complete this survey. The time required to participate in this research should be a maximum of 25 minutes. You may decide at any point to not continue with the survey. There are no penalties or repercussions for withdrawing your voluntary consent. You will not list your name of the data sheet and the primary researcher will secure completed surveys in her office. All responses to questionnaires will be confidential and the primary researcher will be unable to connect respondents with completed surveys. Therefore, the information gathered will be completely anonymous. You will be asked to sign two of these consent forms. One form will be returned to the investigator and the other consent form will be kept for your records. The results of this participation will be anonymous and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without prior consent unless required by law.

3. You may find that many questions are invasive or personal. If you become uncomfortable answering any questions, you may cease participation at that time. No
discomforts or distresses are expected during this research. Likewise, no known physical, psychological, social, or legal risks exist in this study.

4. The investigator will answer any further questions about the research (see above phone numbers).

5. In addition to the above, further information, including a full explanation of the purpose of this research, will be provided at the completion of the research project, if you request.

____________________________________________________________
Signature of Investigator  Date

_______________________________________________________
Signature of Participant  Date

Research at Georgia College & State University involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Question or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to Mr. Marc Cardinalli, Director of Legal Affairs, CBX 041, GCSU, (478) 445-2037.
APPENDIX E

SURVEY INSTRUMENT MEASUREMENTS UTILIZED WITHIN THE STUDY

Criminal Justice Students’ and Perceptions of Restorative Justice

SECTION 1:
Please Answer the Following Questions by Circling the Answer Which Best Represents your Personal Opinion of the Following Ideas


1.) Criminal actions create broken relationships.

SECTION 2:
Please Answer the Following Questions by Circling the Answer Which Best Represents your Personal Opinion of the Following Ideas


1.) Victims should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action perpetrated against them if so desired.

2.) Offenders should be provided an opportunity to repair the relationships severed due to their criminal action.

3.) Members of the community should have an opportunity to repair the relationships severed by a criminal action.

SECTION 3:
Do You Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree or Strongly Disagree that each of the Following Individuals Should be Included in Determining a Just Response to a Criminal Action?


1.) The Victim of a Crime

2.) Community Members other than the Primary Offender and Victim

3.) The Offender of a Crime
### SECTION 5:
Please Answer the Following Questions by Circling the Answer Which Best Represents your Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_____ 1.) What is your gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_____ 2.) Which of the following ethnic backgrounds do you most identify with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Multi-Racial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_____ 3.) Which of the following religious beliefs do you most identify with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hinduism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Native American Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other: Please Specify ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_____ 4.) Which of the following best describes your status as a student?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other: Please Specify ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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