



Honors College Theses

2021

Restoration of a Nation

Deshauna Williams
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Williams, Deshauna, "Restoration of a Nation" (2021). *Honors College Theses*. 633.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/633>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

**Restoration of A Nation:
How Restorative Justice Practices Influence Public Perception of Crime, Offenders,
and the Criminal Justice System**

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the
School of Criminal Justice and Criminology.

By Deshauna Williams
Under the mentorship of Dr. Laurie Gould

ABSTRACT

Restorative justice is a growing school of penal thought which places emphasis on restoration and healing rather than punitive solutions. The purpose of this study is to assess whether prior experience with the criminal justice system, either as a victim, as an offender, or as an employee, affects perceptions of the foundations of restorative justice. These foundations include ideas such as punishment, retribution, and victim involvement. Additionally, this study examines how these perspectives influence the respondents' perception of effectiveness or "justness" of the criminal justice system. Findings reveal that offenders have more negative views of punishment as a method of always dealing with crime compared to their non-offender counterparts, while the opposite is true for those employed in the criminal justice system. Additionally, findings reveal that victims tend to be less satisfied with the criminal justice system as community members, as opposed to their non-victim counterparts, while the opposite is true for those employed in the criminal justice system.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Laurie Gould

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

April 2021

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

University Honors Program

Georgia Southern University

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
List of Tables.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	6
Methodology.....	14
Results.....	15
Discussion.....	20
References.....	29

Acknowledgements

This thesis is a result from the opportunity given to me by the Georgia Southern University Honors Program, faculty assistance, and the support of family and friends. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all of them.

My biggest thanks goes to my mentor, Dr. Laurie Gould, without whom this thesis would still be a pile of incoherent notes hastily scribbled in the back of my notebook. Thank you for always believing in my ability to see this through.

Next, I'd like to thank my support team of my family and friends. To my parents, Lizz Williams and Krys Hillard, and my grandmother, Sherry Funderburk, thank you for the unrelenting support and constant belief in me. I don't know where I'd be in life without your guidance. To my best friends, Maggie White and Colby Hurst, I can never thank you enough for everything you do and continue to do for me. You all are the best things in my life.

Lastly, I'd like to thank my dog, Latte, who is lying on me as I write this. You are a pillar of support for me without you even knowing it.

To all of you, thank you eternally.

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics.....	23
Table 2. T-test: Criminal Justice System Employment.....	27
Table 3. T-test: Arrest History.....	27
Table 4. T-test: Prior Victimization.....	28

Introduction

At its most basic level, restorative justice “operates on the principle that ‘because crime hurts, justice should heal’” (Warden, 2019: 953). For the current study, a more comprehensive definition by Ahlin, Gibbs, Kavanaugh, and Lee (2017) is assumed, which defines the practice as such:

Restorative justice is the counterbalance to punitive punishments. Unlike retribution and just deserts, restorative justice uses a holistic approach emphasizing the victim’s needs as well as restoring community harmony by reintegrating the offender after communicating disapproval for their actions (Ahlin et. al, 2017: 231).

It is a response to crime that is different from the traditional American system, which is more narrowly focused on meting out punishment, most commonly in the form of incarceration (Warden, 2019). Instead, it seeks to right the wrongs that have been committed through healing and, as it states in its name, attempts to restore the offender, the victim, and the community (Warden, 2019). It involves programs such as victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing, and circle sentencing (Warden, 2019).

Restorative justice practices have found increasing support among researchers and governments, but criticisms are still present and not to be ignored, such as its increasing institutionalization and concerns over its application in sexual assault cases. While there is current literature discussing perceptions of restorative justice, few studies have examined how those perceptions translate to general perceptions about the criminal justice system, crime, and offenders. The purpose of this study is to address this gap in the literature and examine if there is evidence to 1) suggest differences in attitudes toward

restorative justice ideals based on prior experience with the criminal justice system and 2) determine whether prior experience influences the perceived effectiveness and “justness” of the criminal justice system.

The terms ‘victim’ and ‘offender’ are used in this study for the purposes of clarity and identification. The researcher acknowledges that these are stigmatizing labels, and do not encompass the whole of the individuals referenced.

Literature Review

The History Of Restorative Justice

Restorative justice, in the form we currently know and understand it, was birthed in the 1970s, when the practice began to be “advocated [for] by a small and scattered group of community activists, justice system personnel, and a few scholars in both North America and Europe” (Umbreit, Vos, Coates, & Lightfoot, 2005: 259). It remained a relatively marginalized idea, fueled by “passionate yet modest” supporters for some time after its conception. Canada established the first Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (“VORP”) in 1974, in Kitchener, Ontario (Umbreit et. al, 2005: 259). Four years later, the United States followed suit, establishing the first United States VORP in Elkhart, Alaska. From the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s, support for these programs as a viable alternative to punitive corrections began to grow. Support from organizations such as the American Bar Association (ABA) and the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) in the mid-1990s helped to further legitimize the practice in the eyes of the public, as well as lead to implementations on local and state law enforcement levels. Some have expressed concern with this development, however:

on the one hand, recognition by and active collaboration with the formal justice system is vital to implementing the underlying vision of restorative justice. On the other, such widespread growth and impact has made the movement increasingly vulnerable to being co-opted by the very justice systems that were initially so critical of its existence (Umbreit et. al, 2005: 261).

That concern will be discussed further in a later section of this work, titled *The Institutionalization of Restorative Justice*. As time has passed and restorative justice practices have grown and evolved, opinions both in favor of and in reproach of these

practices have grown and evolved as well. These opinions and arguments will be explored in the sections titled *The Case For Restorative Justice* and *The Case Against Restorative Justice*.

Most Common Forms of Restorative Justice

A variety of programs fall under the umbrella of “restorative justice,” including victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing, and circle sentencing. While these programs all handle restorative justice in a slightly different manner, present among all of them is the desire to repair the harm caused by an offense to the victim, the offender, and the community. These main three programs will be explained below.

Victim-Offender Mediation

Victim-offender mediation (“VOM”), also referred to as victim-offender reconciliation programs (“VORP”), victim-offender dialogue (“VOD”), or victim-offender mediated dialogue (“VOMD”) (Sliva et. al, 2019) is the most prevalent form of restorative justice currently in practice, with some 300 programs in the United States (Warden, 2019). VOM typically involves a face-to-face encounter with the victim and the offender, along with a trained facilitator, although it can involve additional participants such as family, friends, and/or community members (Warden, 2019). The priority of VOM is dialogue between these parties about the harm caused by the offender and its effects on the victim, the offender, and their community(ies) (Sliva et. al, 2019).

Family Group Conferencing

Family group conferencing was first established in New Zealand as a method to handle juvenile offenders (Warden, 2019). It is similar to VOM, in that it involves interaction between the victim and offender of a crime, but different in that it *necessitates*, rather than merely accepts, involvement from family, friends, and other community members, who will collectively decide on a sanction for the offender. This allows a community to feel as though they have a voice in their justice, and reassures them that action is being taken, while avoiding the traditional justice system. This practice has gained some support in the United States, although it is mainly used in cases of child protection and custody cases; however, it has been implemented in juvenile courts in Indianapolis, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and sites throughout Minnesota (Warden, 2019).

Circle Sentencing

Circle sentencing began in Canada, as a “culturally sensitive prosecuting alternative for Aboriginal offenders” (Warden, 2019: 956). This method of restorative justice seeks to rehabilitate the offender by examining and addressing causes for offending, while being grounded in ‘kindness and respect’ towards the offender. Success is measured in the demonstrated change in an offender’s behaviors and attitudes. While both Canada and Australia have successfully used circle sentencing as an alternative for the prosecution of indigenous populations, the United States has not yet embraced it, with only Minnesota having adopted it as a formal justice practice (Warden, 2019).

The Case For Restorative Justice

The Researcher Perspective

Many researchers advocate for restorative justice to give a new perspective on reacting to crime in the face of what they perceive as a failure of “... punitive justice policies [to] significantly [deter] crime [or increase] satisfaction or well-being of crime victims and survivors” (Sliva et. al, 2019: 458). It is common knowledge amongst those who have any basic knowledge of the criminal justice system how the United States earned its appellation as ‘the most punitive democracy in the world:’ there is the oft-cited statistic that “the United States has less than 5 percent of the world’s population, yet we have almost 25 percent of the world’s prison population” (Sliva et. al, 2019: 458). The deterrence goal of punitive punishments, particularly incarceration, is not serving its purpose. On the contrary, there is increasing evidence that incarceration creates instability in families and communities which leads to juvenile offending and higher levels of stress-related mental illness (Sliva et. al, 2019). As a result, scholars are seeking out restorative justice as a method “to hold criminal offenders accountable while repairing – rather than perpetuating – the harm done to victims and communities” (Sliva et. al, 2019: 458). The research seems to support this shift:

A growing body of research links participation in restorative justice processes to increased satisfaction of the victim and offender, increased completion of agreements, reduced recidivism, and an improved cost-benefit ratio when compared with standard justice processes like fines and probation. Victims and survivors of violent crime report that participation in dialogue processes gives them a voice, answers their questions, offers accountability, and assists with healing (Sliva et. al, 2019: 465).

Restorative justice is also able to address victim concerns in a way that our current criminal justice system is not. For example, Sliva (2019) argues that voluntary, victim-centered restorative justice processes may be able to recover physical, material, and financial losses that our current system cannot or does not address (Sliva et. al, 2019). Additionally, it increases the role of direct accountability and acknowledgement of the hurt caused on the part of the offender. Research suggests that this ability to acknowledge and apologize for their offense may benefit offenders in a number of ways, “including accessing psychological growth, repairing relationships, and preventing further harm to the victim,” in contrast to the loss of the same freedom of this ability in the formal justice system, which may cause resentment, lessening “the offender’s bonds with the community and respect for the law, reducing the likelihood of successful reintegration” and increasing the likelihood of recidivism (Sliva et. al, 2019: 465).

Restorative Justice Internationally: Canada

While restorative justice practices are not as prevalent in the United States, countries such as Canada use them more frequently, and therefore provide data regarding its use, benefits, and drawbacks. Canadian use of restorative justice practices, also known as community-based sentencing, began as an experiment when in Elmira, Ontario,

a probation officer and a volunteer took two youths to meet their victims and pay restitution for property damage from a vandalism spree. The willingness of the judge and probation officer to try a different approach eventually led to the widespread use of victim–offender mediation, which remains one of the most common restorative practices in Canada (Tomprowski, 2014: 218).

In 1996, the Criminal Code of Canada was amended to allow for “community-based

sentencing alternatives for adults” (Tomporowski, 2014: 219). The Youth Criminal Justice Act and the Youth Protection Act both promoted the use of community-based sentencing for juveniles; now, for example, 35 percent of Québec’s juvenile offenses are handled using community-based programs. The Correctional Service of Canada, a governmental organization, supports a number of restorative justice-based initiatives, including Restorative Justice Week, the National Restorative Justice Symposium, the National Ron Wiebe Restorative Justice Award, and the Restorative Opportunities Program, which is a “post-sentence mediation programme for cases involving serious crimes” (Tomporowski, 2014: 220). While there are concerns in Canada over how ‘tough on crime’ approaches have sidelined restorative justice practices, there has been much more documented national movement in the area compared to the United States. However, states like Minnesota and Colorado do present exceptions.. A principal reason cited for the widespread acceptance of restorative justice in Canada is the presence of Aboriginal populations in Canada, with whom restorative justice practices such as circle sentencing are believed to have originated.

The Case Against Restorative Justice

Feminist Critique

There is a critique of restorative justice practice from some feminist ideologies, particularly as it relates to the handling of rape and sexual assault cases and female sexual assault survivors. While these critiques do not necessarily disparage the practice as a whole, they do point out important flaws that can affect how restorative justice can be

used for crimes involving rape and sexual assault. The first of these critiques concerns accountability: it is considered one of the advantages of restorative justice that it encourages accountability in offenders, as discussed in the section *The Researcher Perspective*. However, Deer and Barefoot (2019) argue that this is different when it comes to rape and sexual assault:

“[Restorative justice] models generally presuppose that the offender has acknowledged responsibility for an offense, meaning that outright, categorical denial will always be a significant barrier to achieving the goals of RJ. In a patriarchal society, many male perpetrators start with the assumption that they are entitled to sexually assault women. It is not at all clear that existing [restorative justice] models have the ability to address that level of misogyny when there is disagreement as to whether the behavior in question is even wrongful” (Deer & Barefoot 2019: 519-520).

This is a completely fair critique to make. If an offender does not recognize, or refuses to recognize, the wrongness of their actions, restorative justice practices will not be beneficial to any of the individuals involved. Further, feminist researchers point to the potential for re-victimization and argue that ‘offender-focused’ methods can create an unsafe or uncomfortable environment for survivors who choose to participate in restorative justice practices (Deer & Barefoot 2019). Lastly, they point to a common concern with opponents of restorative justice practices: that offenders will ‘play the system’ and use restorative justice as a way to avoid ‘real punishment’ (generally in the form of a lengthy prison sentence) for their crimes.

The Institutionalization of Restorative Justice

The growing link between restorative justice practices and the formal justice system has led to concern within its proponents, as was mentioned earlier in the section

discussing the history of restorative justice. The point is not so much an argument *against* restorative justice as it is a critique of the implementation of the system. In the years since the birth of the restorative justice movement, Wood and Suzuki (2016) argue, “most RJ programs have been institutionalized within conventional criminal justice systems, often coupled with diversionary practices or as an alternative sanction within them,” in contrast to the original idea that restorative justice was a method of finding justice *separate* from the formal system (Wood & Suzuki, 2016: 154). They give a list of reasons for why this coupling has occurred: a lack of ‘fact-finding’ ability in restorative justice; a need for funding and growth; the presence of victim and offender needs that cannot be handled through conferencing, namely victim support services or offender treatment (Wood & Suzuki, 2016: 154). The concerns over this link stem from the fear that with increasing institutionalization of restorative justice, the goals and ‘best practice’ will be lost or replaced with goals from other institutional processes that do not align with their original purpose.

This is a concern also raised by Deer and Barefoot, who write that “perhaps the real problem is not RJ itself, but its connection to state power and control that renders it problematic,” by “reinforcing the belief that the state is the only legitimate form of safety, security and justice, while obscuring the violence it produces against marginalized communities” (Deer & Barefoot, 2019: 525).

Methodology

Participants and Procedures

The survey for the current project was administered through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), "an online service in which people registered through the site can complete questionnaires for compensation" (Paul & Swan, 2018: 149). This approach was taken in an effort to target a larger, more diverse group of participants in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the perceptions of the general public regarding the topic of restorative justice. The survey contained mostly Likert scale questions designed to assess the participant's level of agreement with the ideals and practices of restorative justice, as well as determine differences in opinion between people with a criminal history, people with a history of victimization, and people employed by the criminal justice system.

Hypotheses

The current study explores the following hypotheses:

H1) Individuals with arrest histories will feel more favorably towards non-punitive crime-response methods, compared to their counterparts without arrest histories.

H2) Individuals with experience as victims will have less favorable viewpoints towards non-punitive crime response methods, compared to individuals without victimization histories.

H3) Individuals with experience working within the criminal justice system will hold less favorable viewpoints of non-punitive methods, compared to individuals not working in the system.

H4) Individuals with experience as victims will report a higher level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system than their peers without victimization histories.

H5) Individuals working in the criminal justice system will report a higher level of satisfaction with the system than their peers not working in the system.

H6) Individuals with arrest histories will report a lower level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system, compared to those without arrest histories.

H7) Individuals with arrest histories will report more favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those without arrest histories.

H8) Individuals with experience as victims will report more favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those without a history of victimization.

H9) Individuals employed in the criminal justice system will report less favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those not employed in the criminal justice system.

Results

As shown in Table One, descriptive statistics revealed that of the survey respondents, which totaled 924, 63.5 % (n=587) identified as male and 36.5% (n=337) identified as female. 72.2% (n=667) of the respondents were white, 16.8% (n=155) were Black or African American, 4.5% (n=42) were Asian, 1.1% (n=10) were mixed race, 0.8% (n=7) were First Nations or Alaskan Native, 0.2% (n=2) were Middle Eastern, and 0.5% (n=5) identified as other. Most respondents had attained a college degree, whether it be a 2-year degree (8.7%; n=80), a 4-year degree (48.8%; n=451), a Master's degree (23.1%; n= 213), or a Doctoral degree (1%; n= 9). The mean age of participants was 38.92, with a standard deviation of 11.26 and a range from 20 - 75. 27.1% of respondents (n=250) were employed in the criminal justice system ("CJS") at the time of participation, while 72.9% (n=674) were not. 35% (n=323) of participants had taken at least one college-level course about the CJS, 65% (n=601) had not. With regard to crime, 39.9% (n=369) had been the victim of a crime at some point in their life and 22.6%

(n=209) had been arrested at some point in their life; 60.1% (n=555) and 77.4% (n=715) had not, respectively.

The purpose of this study was to assess whether certain factors, including employment in the criminal justice system or prior interactions with the criminal justice system, either as a victim or as an offender, affect perceptions of the base ideals of restorative justice, such as the role of punishment in the criminal justice system and consideration of victim/offender wants and needs. Additionally, this study sought to determine whether these factors were associated with higher or lower levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system.

As shown in Table 3, H₁ had mixed results. On a scale of 1-5, 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree,' individuals with arrest histories did report higher levels of disagreement with the statement "Offenders should always be punished for their crimes" (p=0.38). In the same vein, individuals with arrest histories indicated higher levels of disagreement with the statement "People should almost always go to jail or prison for serious crimes" (p=0.44). These survey results would seem to support H₁. However, on that same scale, individuals with arrest histories reported a higher level of agreement with the statement "Retribution is an important part of a good criminal justice system," (p=0.38), contradicting H₁. For the last statement in this family of questions, "Rehabilitating offenders is an important part of a good criminal justice system," while individuals with arrest histories did indicate a higher level of agreement with that statement than their counterparts, the difference was too small to be significant (p=.760). These results suggest that individuals with arrest histories, while they do view rehabilitation as a more important part of the CJS than they do retribution, and view

punishment, including jail or prison sentences, as not always necessary at a higher rate than their counterparts, they do still view retribution as a much more important part of the CJS than hypothesized.

H₂ does not appear to be supported by the data, as individuals with a history of victimization had a lower level of agreement with the statement “Offenders should always be punished for their crimes” than their counterparts, although the difference was not statistically significant ($p=.720$). These individuals did indicate a slightly higher rate of agreement with the statement “People should almost always go to jail or prison for serious crimes”, however this again was not statistically significant ($p=.822$). For the next statement, “Retribution is an important part of a good criminal justice system,” individuals with a history of victimization reported a slightly lower rate of agreement, again at a statistically insignificant level ($p=.559$). The only statement to which these individuals indicated a statistically significant difference from their counterparts is the last item, “Rehabilitating offenders is an important part of a good criminal justice system.” To this statement, respondents with a victimization history reported a higher rate of agreement compared to their peers without a history of victimization ($p=.030$).

H₃ was mostly supported, as individuals employed in the CJS at the time of participation reported a much higher level of agreement with the statement “Offenders should always be punished for their crimes” than their counterparts, ($p<.001$). They also reported a higher level of agreement with the statement “People should almost always go to jail or prison for serious crimes;” however, the difference was not statistically significant ($p=.452$). Additionally, respondents employed in the CJS reported a much higher level of agreement with the statement “Retribution is an important part of a good

criminal justice system” than their counterparts ($p < .001$). Finally, these individuals reported a much higher level of disagreement with the statement “Rehabilitating offenders is an important part of a good criminal justice system” than their counterparts ($p < .001$).

H_4 was not supported by the data, as individuals with experience as victims reported a much lower level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system ($p = .011$), contradicting the hypothesis. H_5 , however, was strongly supported by the data. Individuals employed in the CJS reported much higher levels of satisfaction with the system, ($p < .001$), as hypothesized. Lastly, the results do not appear to support H_6 , as individuals with experience as offenders reported slightly higher levels of satisfaction with the CJS compared to their counterparts, although this difference was not statistically significant ($p = .204$).

H_7 , H_8 , and H_9 had mixed results. For the purposes of these hypotheses, the statements we identified as highlighting the ideals within the restorative justice movement were:

1. The criminal justice system should consider the wants and needs of victims.
2. The criminal justice system should consider the wants and needs of offenders.
3. Including victims in the criminal justice process is important.
4. Victims should be able to influence the criminal justice system.
5. Victim satisfaction should be the most important goal of the criminal justice system.
6. The criminal justice system meets the needs of crime victims.
7. Victims should have unlimited access to information about their case.

For H_7 , those with experience as offenders had nearly no statistically significant differences from their counterparts in regards to these statements, contrasting initial expectations. Respondents did indicate higher levels of agreement with statements two

($p=.006$), four ($p=.396$), five ($p=.616$), six ($p=.096$), and seven ($p=.213$), which generally supports our hypothesis; however, only one was at a statistically significant level. The only statements these individuals indicated a lower level of agreement with were the first ($p=.970$) and the third ($p=.118$), but again the difference was not statistically significant.

For H_8 , the responses of those with experience as victims to these statements were varied. They indicated higher levels of agreement with statements one ($p=.022$), three ($p=.009$), and seven (.185). Additionally, they indicated lower levels of agreement with statements two ($p=.036$), four ($p=.726$), five ($p=.002$), and six ($p=.001$). Although these individuals were more statistically significantly different from their counterparts in response to most of these statements compared to the last group, they did not respond to most in the way hypothesized.

For H_9 , those employed in the CJS also indicated higher levels of difference from their counterparts; however, these differences do not validate the hypothesis. These individuals only showed lower levels of agreement with statements one ($p=.386$) and three ($p=.344$), neither being statistically significant. These individuals further indicated higher levels of agreement with statements two ($p<.001$), four ($p<.001$), five ($p<.001$), six ($p<.001$), and seven ($p<.001$), all vastly contrasting with the hypothesized results.

Overall, most hypotheses were not supported, however statistically significant findings were noted for those employed in the CJS, as well as those with a history of victimization. The implications of these findings will be explored in the next section.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gauge public attitudes toward offenders, victims, and the criminal justice system as a whole, while also gauging attitudes toward ideas that form the basis of restorative justice ideology, including ideas of victim inclusion, retribution, and the needs of victims and offenders, while focusing on the perceptions of those with experience in the criminal justice system. It was hypothesized that:

H1) Individuals with arrest histories will feel more favorably towards non-punitive crime-response methods, compared to their counterparts without arrest histories.

H2) Individuals with experience as victims will have less favorable viewpoints towards non-punitive crime response methods, compared to individuals without victimization histories.

H3) Individuals with experience working within the criminal justice system will hold less favorable viewpoints of non-punitive methods, compared to individuals not working in the system.

H4) Individuals with experience as victims will report a higher level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system than their peers without victimization histories.

H5) Individuals working in the criminal justice system will report a higher level of satisfaction with the system than their peers not working in the system.

H6) Individuals with arrest histories will report a lower level of satisfaction with the criminal justice system, compared to those without arrest histories.

H7) Individuals with arrest histories will report more favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those without arrest histories.

H8) Individuals with experience as victims will report more favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those without a history of victimization.

H9) Individuals employed in the criminal justice system will report less favorable attitudes towards restorative justice ideals, compared to those not employed in the criminal justice system.

However, the majority of the results do not support these hypotheses. The results of this survey seem to suggest a number of things. The first is that people with experience as victims view the criminal justice system much differently than those without that experience, including viewing the system more negatively, or less satisfactory. However, this negative perception of the criminal justice system does not translate to a more negative perception of offenders than is held by their counterparts without victim

histories. These individuals also have mixed reactions to the ideals that lay at the basis of restorative justice: they support victim inclusion and access to information, but show less support for victims' influence on the system and the idea of victim satisfaction being most important. It was expected that these individuals would strongly support all efforts to involve victims in the criminal justice system more, so these results were surprising.

Next, individuals with experience working within the criminal justice system also view the system much differently than those without that experience, but these individuals tend to view the system much more positively. They also tend to be much more supportive of punitive responses to crime than their counterparts. However, they concurrently demonstrate more support for the base ideas of restorative justice than their counterparts do, and at highly significant rates. This would seem to contrast with support of punitive practices so this is an interesting dynamic which would benefit from further research.

Lastly, individuals with arrest histories appear to generally support less punitive policies, but there are exceptions to that, as shown in their responses towards the 'retribution' statement. These individuals seemed to indicate slightly more positive feelings towards the restorative justice ideals put forth in the survey, but nowhere near the extent hypothesized. They also displayed slightly higher levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system than those without their experience. While these differences were not statistically significant, it is still important to note that they exist. The opinions of these respondents differed the most from initial expectations the most.

Limitations

This survey did have some limitations which may have affected the data collected. First, questions more suited to the topic at hand should have been selected to appear in the survey; this would have allowed for more topical data on which to base conclusions on. Additionally, while I only asked about current employment in the criminal justice system, I should have expanded that to be any experience working in the criminal justice system, so as to have more data points for that identifier as it seems to have been a fruitful one. Requesting more information about victim and offender identifiers, as well, would have provided more perspectives from which to view the data; for example, the level of offense committed or experienced (misdemeanor, felony, etc.).

Conclusion

In summary, the results of this study generally did not support the hypotheses set forth. However, the results indicate that an arrest history has less influence on one's views towards the criminal justice system than a history of victimization or employment within the criminal justice system. Additionally, the data suggests that those employed in the criminal justice system have more positive views towards restorative justice concepts, compared to those with either arrest or victimization histories. Further research into these topics may help shed light on whether these are isolated results, or if these results indicate larger truths about these populations.

Table One: Demographics

		N	%
<i>Sex</i>	Male	587	63.5
	Female	337	36.5
	Total	924	100
<i>Race</i>	White	667	72.2
	Black or African American	155	16.8
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	7	0.8
	Asian	42	4.5
	Hispanic/Latino	36	3.9
	Middle Eastern	2	0.2
	Mixed race	10	1.1
	Other	5	0.5
Total	924	100	
<i>Education</i>	High school graduate	69	7.5
	Some college, no degree	102	11
	Associate's (2-year) degree	80	8.7
	Bachelor's (4-year) degree	451	48.8
	Master's degree	213	23.1
	Doctoral degree	9	1
	Total	924	100
<i>Age</i>		Mean	SD
		38.92	11.263
<i>Annual Income</i>	0 - \$9,999	36	3.9
	\$10,000 - 19,999	64	6.9
	\$20,000 - 39,999	190	20.6
	\$40,000 - 59,999	297	32.1
	\$60,000 - 79,999	195	21.1
	\$80,000 - 99,999	79	8.5

	\$100,000 +	63	6.8
	Total	924	100
<i>Political Viewpoint</i>	Very liberal	110	11.9
	Liberal	282	30.5
	Moderate	208	22.5
	Conservative	175	18.9
	Very conservative	148	16
	Unsure	1	.1
	Total	924	100
<i>Political Party Affiliation</i>	Republican	357	38.6
	Democrat	374	40.5
	Independent	171	18.5
	Not sure	6	.6
	No preference	7	.7
	Other	9	1
	Total	924	100

Table One: Demographics (continued)

<i>Employment Status</i>	Full-time	764	82.7
	Part-time	78	8.4
	Temporarily laid off	7	0.8
	Unemployed	22	2.4
	Retired	19	2.1
	Permanently disabled	4	0.4

	Homemaker	10	1.1
	Student	5	0.5
	Other	15	1.6
	Total	924	100
<i>Current Employment Within CJS?</i>	Yes	250	27.1
	No	674	72.9
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Taken College-level Classes About CJS?</i>	Yes	323	35.0
	No	601	65.0
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Been a Victim of a Crime? (Self)</i>	Yes	369	39.9
	No	555	60.1
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Been Arrested? (Self)</i>	Yes	209	22.6
	No	715	77.4
	Other	15	1.6
<i>Ever Been Convicted of a Criminal Offense? (Self)</i>	Yes	181	19.6
	No	743	80.4
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Carried Out a Sentence in Prison or Jail? (Self)</i>	Yes	180	19.5
	No	744	80.5
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Been a Victim of a Crime? (Family)</i>	Yes	466	50.4
	No	458	49.6
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Been Arrested? (Family)</i>	Yes	276	29.9
	No	648	70.1
	Total	924	100

<i>Ever Been Convicted of a Criminal Offense? (Family)</i>	Yes	273	29.5
	No	651	70.5
	Total	924	100
<i>Ever Been Sentenced to Jail or Prison? (Family)</i>	Yes	238	25.8
	No	686	74.2
	Total	924	100

Table Two: T-test, Criminal Justice System Employment

	<i>CJS Employment</i>			<i>No CJS Employment</i>			<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>		
<i>Victim Needs</i>	3.98	.878	250	4.04	.901	674	-.868	.386
<i>Offender Needs</i>	3.95	.881	250	3.20	1.176	674	9.196	<.001
<i>Community Satisfaction</i>	3.92	.832	250	3.07	1.193	674	10.336	<.001
<i>Victim Inclusion</i>	4.02	.857	250	4.08	.856	674	-.948	.344
<i>Punishment</i>	4.05	.837	250	3.82	.983	674	3.348	<.001
<i>Retribution</i>	3.97	.900	250	3.54	1.148	674	5.335	<.001
<i>Rehabilitation</i>	3.98	.896	250	4.25	.873	674	-4.119	<.001
<i>Victim Influence</i>	4.00	.880	250	3.55	1.077	674	5.960	<.001
<i>Victim Satisfaction</i>	3.95	.908	250	3.23	1.213	674	8.597	<.001
<i>CJS Meets Victim Needs</i>	3.94	.862	250	3.29	1.076	674	8.647	<.001
<i>Restitution</i>	4.02	.878	250	4.04	.808	674	-.262	.793
<i>Victim Unlimited Access</i>	3.90	.815	250	3.61	1.095	674	3.765	<.001
<i>Jail or Prison Sentence</i>	3.99	.845	250	3.98	.821	674	.752	.452

Table Three: T-test, Arrest History

	<i>Arrest History</i>			<i>No Arrest History</i>			<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>		
<i>Victim Needs</i>	4.02	.933	209	4.03	.884	715	-.038	.970
<i>Offender Needs</i>	4.03	.884	209	3.60	1.131	715	2.782	.006
<i>Community Satisfaction</i>	3.39	1.282	209	3.28	1.133	715	1.272	.204
<i>Victim Inclusion</i>	4.00	.928	209	4.08	.834	715	-1.317	.188
<i>Punishment</i>	3.76	1.010	209	3.92	.931	715	-1.243	.038

Retribution	3.79	1.123	209	3.61	1.095	715	2.082	.038
Rehabilitation	4.20	.912	209	4.17	.880	715	.306	.760
Victim Influence	3.73	1.046	209	3.66	1.047	715	.849	.396
Victim Satisfaction	3.46	1.232	209	3.41	1.169	715	.502	.616
CJS Meets Victim Needs	3.57	1.031	209	3.43	1.070	715	1.668	.096
Restitution	4.05	.905	209	4.03	.804	715	.336	.737
Victim Unlimited Access	3.77	1.046	209	3.66	1.030	715	1.245	.213
Jail or Prison Sentence	3.84	1.043	209	3.99	.917	715	-2.015	.044

Table Four: T-test, Victim History

	<i>Victim History</i>			<i>No Victim History</i>			<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>		
Victim Needs	4.11	.884	369	3.97	.899	555	2.288	.022
Offender Needs	3.31	1.212	369	3.47	1.108	555	-2.099	.036
Community Satisfaction	3.18	1.241	369	3.38	1.112	555	-2.561	.011
Victim Inclusion	4.15	.825	369	4.00	.873	555	2.631	.009
Punishment	3.87	.981	369	3.89	.931	555	-.358	.720
Retribution	3.63	1.173	369	3.67	1.055	555	-.585	.559
Rehabilitation	4.26	.892	369	4.13	.881	555	2.178	.030
Victim Influence	3.66	1.087	369	3.68	1.020	555	-.346	.729
Victim Satisfaction	3.28	1.249	369	3.52	1.128	555	-3.089	.002
CJS Meets Victim Needs	3.33	1.114	369	3.56	.995	555	-3.248	.001
Restitution	4.12	.819	369	3.98	.829	555	2.509	.012
Victim Unlimited Access	3.74	1.119	369	3.65	.973	555	1.327	.185
Jail or Prison Sentence	3.96	1.005	369	3.95	.911	555	.224	.822

Reference List

- Ahlin, E. M., Gibbs, J. C., Kavanaugh, P. R., & Lee, J. (2017). Support for Restorative Justice in a Sample of U.S. University Students. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 61(2), 229–245.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15596386>
- Deer, S., & Barefoot, A. (2019). The Limits of the State: Feminist Perspectives on Carceral Logic, Restorative Justice and Sexual Violence. *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 28(3), 505–526. Retrieved from
[https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.shib&db=lgs
&AN=139604909](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.shib&db=lgs&AN=139604909)
- Paul, G. D., & Swan, E. C. (2018). Receptivity to restorative justice: A survey of goal importance, process effectiveness, and support for victim–offender conferencing. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. doi:10.1002/crq.21238
- Sliva, S. M. ., Porter-Merrill, E. H. ., & Lee, P. (2019). Fulfilling the Aspirations of Restorative Justice in the Criminal System? The Case of Colorado. *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 28(3), 456–504. Retrieved from
[https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.shib&db=lgs
&AN=139604908](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.shib&db=lgs&AN=139604908)

Tompson, B. B. T. sk. c. (2014). Restorative justice and community justice in Canada. *Restorative Justice*, 2(2), 218–224.

<https://doi.org/10.5235/20504721.2.2.218>

Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., Coates, R. B., & Lightfoot, E. (2005). Restorative Justice in the Twenty-first Century: A Social Movement Full of Opportunities and Pitfalls.

Marquette Law Review, 89(2), 251–304.

Warden, R. (2019). Where Is the Empathy? Understanding Offenders' Experience of Empathy and Its Impact on Restorative Justice. *UMKC Law Review*, 87(4),

953–977. Retrieved from

[https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,shib&db=lgs
&AN=136212813](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,shib&db=lgs&AN=136212813)

Wood, W. R., & Suzuki, M. (2016). Four Challenges in the Future of Restorative Justice.

Victims & Offenders, 1, 149.