

*Experiences of restorative justice in settings with children and young people: The accounts of professionals and young people.*

*Paper 1: Examining the views of restorative practitioners about the effects of their professional practices.*

*Paper 2: Examining the views of young people about their experiences of restorative justice-based practices.*

Submitted by Duncan Edward Gillard to the University of Exeter  
as a thesis for the degree of  
Doctor of Educational Psychology in Educational, Child & Community Psychology.  
In September 2011

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: .....

## Table of contents

<b>Paper 1</b>	<b>Page 6</b>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>Page 6</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
<i>Context</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	<i>Page 9</i>
<i>Literature review</i>	<i>Page 10</i>
<i>Evidence from youth justice settings</i>	<i>Page 10</i>
<i>Evidence from restorative practices in schools</i>	<i>Page 11</i>
<i>Method</i>	<i>Page 14</i>
<i>Aims and research question</i>	<i>Page 14</i>
<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Page 14</i>
<i>Design</i>	<i>Page 16</i>
<i>Participants</i>	<i>Page 16</i>
<i>Interview schedule</i>	<i>Page 17</i>
<i>Data collection procedures</i>	<i>Page 18</i>
<i>Data analysis</i>	<i>Page 18</i>
<i>Ethical issues</i>	<i>Page 21</i>
<i>Analysis and interpretation</i>	<i>Page 21</i>
<i>Theme 1: Supporting emotions</i>	<i>Page 21</i>
<i>Theme 2: Recognising your contribution to harm</i>	<i>Page 26</i>
<i>Theme 3: Increasing the value of relationships</i>	<i>Page 32</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Page 36</i>
<i>Responsive regulation</i>	<i>Page 37</i>
<i>Learning social responsibility</i>	<i>Page 40</i>
<i>Cognitive dissonance</i>	<i>Page 42</i>
<i>Contribution and significance</i>	<i>Page 44</i>
<b>Paper 2</b>	<b>Page 45</b>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>Page 45</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>Page 46</i>
<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Page 46</i>
<i>Context and rationale</i>	<i>Page 46</i>
<i>Overview of the paper</i>	<i>Page 46</i>
<i>Literature review</i>	<i>Page 47</i>
<i>The voice of young people in youth justice settings</i>	<i>Page 47</i>
<i>The voice of young people in school-based settings</i>	<i>Page 48</i>
<i>Method</i>	<i>Page 50</i>
<i>Aims and research question</i>	<i>Page 50</i>
<i>Methodology and design</i>	<i>Page 50</i>
<i>Participants</i>	<i>Page 50</i>
<i>Interview schedule</i>	<i>Page 51</i>
<i>Data collection procedures</i>	<i>Page 52</i>
<i>Data analysis</i>	<i>Page 52</i>
<i>Ethical issues</i>	<i>Page 54</i>
<i>Analysis and interpretation</i>	<i>Page 55</i>
<i>Theme 1: Open, honest enquiry</i>	<i>Page 55</i>
<i>Theme 2: Empowerment</i>	<i>Page 63</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Page 68</i>
<i>The EMRJ</i>	<i>Page 68</i>
<i>Responsive regulation</i>	<i>Page 70</i>
<i>The false dichotomy of restorative and punitive approaches</i>	<i>Page 71</i>
<i>Contribution and significance</i>	<i>Page 72</i>
<b>References</b>	<b>Page 74</b>

## **List of tables and figures**

---

### ***Paper 1***

<i>Table 1: Participant information</i>	<i>Page 17</i>
<i>Figure 1: Initial thematic map</i>	<i>Page 19</i>
<i>Figure 2: Developed thematic map</i>	<i>Page 20</i>
<i>Figure 3: Final thematic map</i>	<i>Page 20</i>
<i>Figure 4: Social control window</i>	<i>Page 39</i>

### ***Paper 2***

<i>Table 2: Participant information</i>	<i>Page 51</i>
<i>Figure 5: Initial thematic map</i>	<i>Page 53</i>
<i>Figure 6: Developed thematic map</i>	<i>Page 53</i>
<i>Figure 7: Final thematic map</i>	<i>Page 54</i>

---

## **List of appendices**

<b><i>Appendices</i></b>	<b><i>Page number</i></b>
<i>Appendix 1: Interview schedule (paper one)</i>	<i>Page 80</i>
<i>Appendix 2: Interview prompts (paper one)</i>	<i>Page 81</i>
<i>Appendix 3: Coding examples (paper one)</i>	<i>Page 82</i>
<i>Appendix 4: Participant information sheet (paper one)</i>	<i>Page 83</i>
<i>Appendix 5: Participant consent form (paper one)</i>	<i>Page 84</i>
<i>Appendix 6: Interview schedule (paper two)</i>	<i>Page 85</i>
<i>Appendix 7: Information sheet (paper two)</i>	<i>Page 86</i>
<i>Appendix 8: Parent consent form (paper two)</i>	<i>Page 87</i>
<i>Appendix 9: Initial literature review</i>	<i>Page 88</i>

## **Paper 1:**

### **Examining the views of restorative practitioners about the effects of their professional practices.**

#### **Abstract**

The Youth Justice Board and the Department for Education share the common goal of reducing offending and harmful behaviour in children and young people (Ministry of Justice, 2010; DfE, 2011). In both sectors, evidence for the effectiveness of practices based upon the principles of restorative justice (RJ) is mounting, yet there is a distinct lack of theoretical clarity regarding the psychological mechanisms through which such practices work. Moreover, the voice of RJ practitioners is not found in current theoretical propositions. In this paper, eight RJ practitioners, from a mixture of school and youth justice backgrounds, are interviewed about their professional practices. Interview transcripts are thematically analysed in an inductive manner, according to the guidelines set out by Braun & Clarke (2006). Analysis is interpreted in terms of responsive regulation (Braithwaite, 2002; Morrison, 2003), the social learning perspective of Macready (2009) and in terms of cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). It is suggested that RJ-based practices, according to the views of professionals, are effective because a) they respond to harm flexibly and after the incident, b) they engage young people in a process of learning social responsibility and c) they provide young people with ways of reducing cognitive dissonance based upon acknowledging and repairing harm, rather than through blaming and denying responsibility.

## **Paper 2:**

### **Examining the views of young people about their experiences of restorative justice-based practices.**

#### **Abstract**

The Youth Justice Board and the Department for Education share the common goal of reducing offending and harmful behaviour in children and young people (Ministry of Justice, 2010; DfE, 2011). In both sectors, evidence for the effectiveness of practices based upon the principles of restorative justice (RJ) is mounting, yet there is a distinct lack of theoretical clarity regarding the psychological mechanisms through which such practices work. Whilst the voice of young people can be heard in the literature, these have come primarily through surveys and other closed-question response formats. Thus, there is a lack of an in-depth characterisation of young people's experiences of RJ. In this paper, six young people are interviewed about their experiences of RJ-based practices. Interview transcripts are thematically analysed in an inductive manner, according to the guidelines set out by Braun & Clarke (2006). Analysis is interpreted in terms of Barton's (2000) Empowerment Model of Restorative Justice (EMRJ) and in terms of responsive regulation (Braithwaite, 2002; Morrison, 2003). It is suggested that RJ-based practices, according to the views of young people, are effective because a) they empower young people in the process of responding to harm and b) they involve responding to harm flexibly and after the incident, providing emotional support and enabling all stakeholders to be open and honest. The implications of both these findings and those from paper 1 are discussed in the context of Aug 2011 riots.

