Open Peer Review on Qeios

[Essay] Speaking about Restorative Justice

Sigifredo Castell-Britton[1]

1 Walden University

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

Restorative Justice (RJ) offers a transformative approach to addressing criminal behavior by focusing on healing and restitution rather than punishment. This manuscript examines RJ's foundational principles, highlighting its roots in indigenous practices and its contrast with traditional retributive justice models. Evidence from diverse cultural and legal contexts demonstrates RJ's effectiveness in reducing recidivism, promoting offender rehabilitation, and enhancing community cohesion. However, the manuscript also addresses challenges, such as implementation difficulties and limitations in cases of gender-based violence. By presenting a comprehensive analysis of RJ's benefits and obstacles, this manuscript underscores its potential to create a more compassionate and effective criminal justice system.

S Castell-Britton

Doctoral Candidate, Ph.D. in Criminal Justice, Walden University

Keywords: Restorative justice, Recidivism, Offender rehabilitation, Retributive justice, Community cohesion.

Introduction

Restorative Justice stands as a pioneering and transformative method for addressing criminal behaviour, prioritizing the healing of harm over mere punishment of the offender. This approach seeks to repair the damage inflicted by criminal acts through an inclusive process that engages victims, offenders, and the community, emphasizing restitution and reconciliation to provide a more holistic solution to crime. In doing so, Restorative Justice aims to restore both the individuals involved and the relationships disrupted by criminal behaviour. This essay examines the various dimensions of Restorative Justice, shedding light on its numerous benefits, the challenges it faces, and its significant impact on reducing recidivism rates. The discussion delves into the foundational principles underpinning this approach, highlighting its stark contrast with traditional retributive justice models. Furthermore, the effectiveness of Restorative Justice programs in diverse cultural and legal contexts is examined, supported by evidence from numerous studies and practical applications.

Through a comprehensive analysis, this essay underscores the transformative potential of Restorative Justice in promoting a more compassionate and effective criminal justice system.

The Concept of Restorative Justice

Restorative Justice finds its roots in indigenous practices that emphasize communal involvement and reconciliation. Historically, justice systems worldwide have adhered to a retributive model, which focuses on penalties and punishments for offenders. This model is deeply rooted in the notion that crime is an offense against the state, often neglecting the needs and roles of victims. In contrast, Restorative Justice shifts the focus to repairing the harm done to victims and restoring social harmony. Indigenous practices of the Maoris in New Zealand and the Navajos in the United States are prime examples, where community-based approaches have long been used to resolve conflicts and restore relationships (González Ramírez & Vargas Ugalde, 2023).

The principles of Restorative Justice seek to actively involve victims in the justice process, allowing them to express their feelings and needs, and encouraging offenders to take responsibility for their actions and make amends. This model promotes the participation of all parties involved in the conflict—victims, offenders, and the community—fostering a sense of collective healing and understanding. It contrasts sharply with the historical approach of retributive justice, which has evolved from more archaic models like vindictive justice exemplified by the Law of Talion, focusing on identical retribution and vengeance. Van Ness et al. (2022) provided a comprehensive introduction to Restorative Justice, emphasizing its foundational principles and practices. They highlighted how this approach prioritizes the restoration of relationships and the rehabilitation of offenders over mere punishment. Gavrielides (2020) addressed the discrepancies between Restorative Justice theory and practice, advocating for a more consistent and integrated application of its principles to ensure justice is truly restorative.

The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice

Numerous studies have highlighted the effectiveness of Restorative Justice in various contexts. Carnevali Rodríguez and Navarro Papic (2023) found that Restorative Justice not only resolves community conflicts but also rehabilitates offenders and prevents recidivism. In Argentina, Restorative Justice practices in penitentiary units for young adults showed promising results in preventing and resolving conflicts (Danziger & López González, 2023). Similarly, Tantaleán-Olano et al. (2023) demonstrated its effectiveness in promoting social cohesion and peaceful dispute resolution in Cajamarca, Peru.

In Ecuador, the juvenile penal system adopted Restorative Justice to improve the rehabilitation and reintegration of young offenders (Cabrera Cabrera & Maldonado Ordoñez, 2023). Moreover, Ecuadorian legislation integrated Restorative Justice into expedited procedures for violence against women cases, underscoring its potential to address sensitive issues (Núñez-Paredes et al., 2023). These regional adaptations underscore the flexibility and universal applicability of Restorative Justice principles, demonstrating that this approach can be successfully implemented across different cultural

contexts.

Restorative Justice also played a crucial role in Mexico, contributing to the socio-legal construction of a culture of peace. Critical analyses and proposals for effective implementation highlighted the transformative potential of this approach (Lamas Meza & Cervantes Bravo, 2023). In Colombia, the integration of Restorative Justice into the accusatory process was seen as essential for achieving a balance between peace and justice (Lozano Parra et al., 2023; Ramos et al., 2018). This approach has been pivotal in Colombia's transitional justice process, facilitating reconciliation and peacebuilding (Fonseca, 2018; Rico & Medina, 2019; Ávila et al., 2019).

In the Caribbean, Restorative Justice addressed the unique social and cultural dynamics of the region, proving effective in reducing crime and enhancing community relations (Jones, 2007). Europe has also embraced Restorative Justice, recognizing it as a right for victims and an opportunity for offenders, thereby transforming the criminal justice system (Jiménez, 2019; Rivera González, 2021). These diverse implementations illustrate the adaptability and effectiveness of Restorative Justice across various regions and cultural settings. González (2020) discussed the state of Restorative Justice in American criminal law, noting its increasing acceptance and implementation in various jurisdictions. This growth is a testament to the effectiveness and transformative potential of Restorative Justice practices.

Impact on Recidivism

One of the most compelling arguments for Restorative Justice is its impact on recidivism rates. Numerous studies indicate that Restorative Justice programs significantly reduce the likelihood of reoffending. For instance, Wager et al. (2015) investigated the impact of victim-preference for engagement levels in Restorative Justice interventions, finding lower reconviction rates and higher harm reduction where reoffending occurred. This highlights the importance of involving victims in the justice process, not only to address their needs but also to effectively reduce the likelihood of future offenses.

Further supporting these findings, DeVaughn-Goodwin (2022) examined Restorative Justice and recidivism among formerly incarcerated women, highlighting significant reductions in reoffending rates. This research underscored the transformative potential of Restorative Justice in addressing the unique challenges faced by this demographic. Similarly, Vooren et al. (2023) demonstrated that Restorative Justice programs can improve educational outcomes and reduce recidivism among young people. Their study on the "Halt" program revealed how these interventions contributed to better educational achievements and lower recidivism rates, emphasizing the importance of integrating Restorative Justice into juvenile justice systems.

Shem-Tov et al. (2024) provided further evidence of the efficacy of Restorative Justice conferencing in reducing recidivism. Their study on the Make-it-Right program showed significant decreases in reoffending rates, supporting the idea that structured restorative conferences can foster accountability and rehabilitation. Fulham et al. (2023) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of Restorative Justice programs, finding consistent evidence of reduced recidivism and other positive outcomes. This meta-analysis highlighted the broad applicability and effectiveness of Restorative Justice

across various contexts and populations.

Rolim (2022) also examined the relationship between Restorative Justice and recidivism, reinforcing the notion that these programs can lead to meaningful reductions in reoffending. Han et al. (2021) evaluated the "Bridges to Life" program in Dallas, finding that participants exhibited lower recidivism rates compared to those who did not participate. This study underscored the potential for Restorative Justice programs to foster long-term behavioural change and successful reintegration into society.

Mahardhika (2021) argued that Restorative Justice offers a superior alternative to traditional punitive measures in reducing recidivism. His analysis of various programs highlighted how restorative practices promote rehabilitation and reintegration, ultimately leading to lower rates of reoffending. This perspective is particularly relevant in the context of criminal justice reform, where there is a growing emphasis on humane and effective approaches to justice.

Ross and Muro (2020) explored the possibilities of prison-based Restorative Justice, emphasizing that its benefits extend beyond mere recidivism reduction. Their study explored how these programs can transform the prison environment by fostering a culture of accountability and mutual respect, which in turn contributes to the overall well-being of inmates and staff. This holistic impact underscores the transformative potential of Restorative Justice within correctional facilities, creating an environment conducive to genuine rehabilitation and reintegration.

Moreover, the work of Richner et al. (2022) highlighted the implications of intervention timing, age, and gender on the effectiveness of Restorative Justice programs in prisons. Their findings suggested that tailored approaches, which consider these factors, can significantly enhance the outcomes of Restorative Justice interventions, leading to more effective recidivism reduction and better support for offender rehabilitation. Hwang (2020) provided additional evidence on the effectiveness of Restorative Justice in reducing recidivism. The study suggested that Restorative Justice offers a better alternative for reducing reoffending rates compared to traditional punitive measures. Hwang's research highlighted the importance of incorporating restorative practices to foster accountability, empathy, and rehabilitation, which are crucial elements in preventing future criminal behaviour.

Smith (2020) examined the progression of Restorative Justice programs and their effectiveness on recidivism and cost efficiency. This research found that not only do these programs reduce reoffending, but they are also cost-effective, providing significant savings to the criminal justice system. This dual benefit reinforces the value of Restorative Justice as a practical and sustainable solution for criminal justice reform. Islam et al. (2023) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on the potential outcomes of practicing Restorative Justice in criminal settings in Australia and the United States. Their findings indicated a substantial reduction in recidivism rates, further supporting the global applicability of Restorative Justice principles. This study also emphasized the importance of cultural and contextual adaptations to maximize the effectiveness of these programs.

Singla (2024) evaluated the efficacy of Restorative Justice practices in reducing recidivism rates in the Indian context. This study found significant reductions in reoffending, highlighting the universal applicability of Restorative Justice principles. The research underscored the potential for these practices to be adapted and implemented in diverse cultural

settings to achieve similar positive outcomes. The comprehensive analysis by Kimbrell et al. (2023) on juvenile justice Restorative Justice programs provided updated insights into their effectiveness. Their systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated significant reductions in recidivism, emphasizing the importance of early intervention and tailored approaches to address the specific needs of juvenile offenders.

Lloyd and Borrill (2020) also underscored the benefits of Restorative Justice in addressing victims' post-traumatic stress, illustrating that these practices not only aid in offender rehabilitation but also significantly impact victim recovery. This dual benefit is crucial in understanding the holistic impact of Restorative Justice. These studies collectively underscore the substantial benefits of Restorative Justice in reducing recidivism rates. Fostering accountability, promoting victim-offender dialogue, and addressing the underlying causes of criminal behaviour, Restorative Justice programs offer a promising pathway to more sustainable and humane justice systems. The consistent findings across diverse populations and contexts reinforce the potential of Restorative Justice to bring about significant positive change in the criminal justice landscape.

Challenges and Limitations

Despite its many benefits, Restorative Justice faces challenges and limitations. In Spain, for instance, the application of Restorative Justice in cases of sexual and gender-based violence has been contentious, emphasizing the need for a legal framework that adequately protects victims (Romero Seseña, 2023). This debate highlights the importance of tailoring Restorative Justice practices to the specific context and nature of each crime. Additionally, implementing Restorative Justice requires extensive training and a cultural shift within justice institutions, which can be challenging to achieve.

Furthermore, the success of Restorative Justice programs heavily relies on the willingness and readiness of both victims and offenders to engage in the process. In some cases, power imbalances and deep-seated mistrust can hinder the effectiveness of these interventions. Therefore, continuous support and resources are essential to address these challenges and ensure the sustainable implementation of Restorative Justice. Scholl and Townsend (2023) highlighted the need for a humanistic paradigm in Restorative Justice to effectively address the needs of victims, offenders, and communities. Their work emphasized the importance of empathy, communication, and mutual respect in overcoming the challenges faced by Restorative Justice practices.

Conclusion

Restorative Justice represents a fundamental shift in the way justice is conceived and practiced, moving away from traditional retributive models that prioritize punishment towards approaches that emphasize healing and restoration. This paradigm shift acknowledges the complex and multifaceted nature of crime, focusing on the needs of victims, offenders, and the broader community. Emphasizing the repair of harm and fostering the active participation of all parties involved, Restorative Justice offers a comprehensive and inclusive approach to justice.

One of the most significant benefits of Restorative Justice is its potential to promote reconciliation and healing. Providing a space for victims to express their feelings and needs, and for offenders to take responsibility and make amends, Restorative Justice facilitates a process of mutual understanding and empathy. This approach not only helps to heal the emotional and psychological wounds caused by crime but also strengthens social bonds and promotes community cohesion.

Moreover, Restorative Justice has demonstrated considerable effectiveness in reducing recidivism rates. Numerous studies have shown that offenders who participate in Restorative Justice programs are less likely to reoffend compared to those who go through traditional punitive systems. This reduction in recidivism is attributed to the focus on addressing the underlying causes of criminal behaviour, promoting personal accountability, and supporting the reintegration of offenders into society. Reducing the cycle of reoffending, Restorative Justice contributes to safer and more stable communities.

The implementation of Restorative Justice also fosters a more humane and equitable justice system. Traditional retributive models often fail to address the needs of victims and may perpetuate cycles of violence and retribution. In contrast, Restorative Justice seeks to balance the scales by giving voice to victims, providing opportunities for offenders to make meaningful reparations, and involving the community in the justice process. This holistic approach ensures that justice is not only served but also perceived as fair and just by all parties involved.

As more research continues to support the benefits and effectiveness of Restorative Justice, it is increasingly evident that this approach has the potential to transform criminal justice systems worldwide. Embracing Restorative Justice allows societies to move towards a more compassionate and just future, where the focus is on healing and restoration rather than punishment and retribution. The adoption of Restorative Justice principles and practices can lead to profound changes in how justice is administered, fostering environments where reconciliation and peace are prioritized, and the dignity and humanity of all individuals are respected.

References

- DeVaughn-Goodwin, A. B. (2022). Restorative Justice and Recidivism in Formerly Incarcerated Women (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Fulham, L., Blais, J., Rugge, T., & Schultheis, E. A. (2023). The effectiveness of restorative justice programs: A meta-analysis of recidivism and other relevant outcomes. Criminology & Criminal Justice, 17488958231215228.
- Gavrielides, T. (2020). Restorative justice theory and practice: Addressing the discrepancy. RJ4All Publications.
- González, T. (2020). The state of restorative justice in American criminal law. Wis. L. Rev., 1147.
- Han, S., Valdovinos Olson, M., & Davis, R. C. (2021). Reducing recidivism through restorative justice: An evaluation of bridges to life in Dallas. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 60(7), 444-463.
- Hwang, A. (2020). Restorative Justice: A Better Alternative for Reducing Recidivism?. The Sociological Imagination: Undergraduate Journal, 6(1).
- Islam, M. S., Li, B., & Anderson, J. (2023). An assessment of the potential outcomes in practising restorative justice in

criminal settings in Australia and the United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Contemporary Justice Review, 26(3), 262-298.

- Jiménez, J.M. (2019). El impulso de Europa a la justicia restaurativa: un derecho para la víctima y una oportunidad para el infractor.
- Jones, A.D. (2007). Restorative Justice in Caribbean Contexts.
- Kimbrell, C. S., Wilson, D. B., & Olaghere, A. (2023). Restorative justice programs and practices in juvenile justice: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis for effectiveness. Criminology & Public Policy, 22(1), 161-195.
- Lamas Meza, S.A., & Cervantes Bravo, I.G. (2023). La construcción socio-jurídica de la cultura de paz y de la justicia restaurativa en México. Análisis crítico y propuestas de viable implemento. Intersticios Sociales.
- Lin, T., Chen, H., & Wu, J. (2023). Research on the Impact of Restorative Justice Implementation on the Social Reintegration of Offenders and the Reduction of Recidivism Rates. Law and Economy, 2(11), 25-36.
- Lloyd, A., & Borrill, J. (2020). Examining the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing victims' post-traumatic stress. Psychological injury and law, 13(1), 77-89.
- Mahardhika, V. (2021, May). The Restorative Justice: A Better Alternative to Reduce Recidivism. In 1st International Conference on Law and Human Rights 2020 (ICLHR 2020) (pp. 124-129). Atlantis Press.
- Myers, A. (2020). Is Restorative Justice Possible In The United States?.
- Richner, K.A., Pavelka, S., & McChargue, D.E. (2022). A Restorative Justice Intervention in United States Prisons: Implications of Intervention Timing, Age, and Gender on Recidivism. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 67, 1193-1210.
- Rolim, M. (2022). Restorative Justice and Recidivism. Rev. Just. Direito, 36, 60.
- Romero Seseña, P. (2023). EL DESARROLLO DE LA JUSTICIA RESTAURATIVA EN ESPAÑA Y SU PROHIBICIÓN EN CASOS DE VIOLENCIA SEXUAL Y DE GÉNERO: REFLEXIONES A PARTIR DE LA LO 10/2022 Y LA NUEVA LEY FORAL 4/2023 DE NAVARRA. Revista de Derecho Penal y Criminología.
- Ross, K., & Muro, D. (2020). Possibilities of prison-based restorative justice: transformation beyond recidivism. Contemporary Justice Review, 23(3), 291-313.
- Scholl, M. B., & Townsend, C. B. (2023). Restorative justice: A humanistic paradigm for addressing the needs of victims, offenders, and communities. The Journal of Humanistic Counseling.
- Shem-Tov, Y., Raphael, S., & Skog, A. (2024). Can Restorative Justice Conferencing Reduce Recidivism? Evidence From the Make-it-Right Program. Econometrica, 92(1), 61-78.
- Singla, S. (2024). Reforming Criminal Justice: Evaluating the Efficacy of Restorative Justice Practices in Reducing Recidivism Rates. Indian Journal of Law, 2(2), 32-35.
- Smith, P. A. (2020). Progression of Restorative Justice Programs and Their Effectiveness on Recidivism and Being Cost Efficient (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
- Tantaleán-Olano, J.R., Rojas-Luján, V.W., Yache-Cuenca, E.J., & Recalde-Gracey, A.E. (2023). Justicia restaurativa y la resolución de conflictos comunitarios. Caso: Cajamarca, Perú. IUSTITIA SOCIALIS.
- Van Ness, D. W., Strong, K. H., Derby, J., & Parker, L. L. (2022). Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice. Routledge.

- Vooren, M., Rud, I., Cornelisz, I., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2023). The effects of a restorative justice programme (Halt) on educational outcomes and recidivism of young people. Journal of experimental criminology, 19(3), 691-711.
- Wager, N.M., O'Keeffe, C., Bates, A.J., & Emerson, G. (2015). Restorative Justice and Recidivism: Investigating the impact of victim-preference for level of engagement. Ljetopis Socijalnog Rada, 22, 61-80.