

ROUTLEDGE FRONTIERS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Victims and Restorative Justice

Edited by Inge Vanfraechem,
Daniela Bolívar
and Ivo Aertsen



Victims and Restorative Justice

**Edited by Inge Vanfraechem,
Daniela Bolívar
and Ivo Aertsen**

First published 2015
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Selection and editorial matter, Inge Vanfraechem, Daniela Bolívar
and Ivo Aertsen; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Ivo Aertsen, Inge Vanfraechem and Daniela Bolívar to be
identified as authors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance
with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or
registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation
without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Victims and restorative justice / edited by Inge Vanfraechem, Daniela
Bolívar, and Ivo Aertsen.

pages cm. – (Routledge frontiers of criminal justice ; 26)

ISBN 978-0-415-81066-1 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-203-07082-6 (ebook)

1. Victims of crimes—European Union countries. 2. Restorative justice—
European Union countries. I. Vanfraechem, Inge. II. Bolívar, Daniela.
III. Aertsen, Ivo.

HV6250.3.E85V554 2015

364.6'8—dc23

2014046016

ISBN: 978-0-415-81066-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-07082-6 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Wearset Ltd, Boldon, Tyne and Wear



Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

This book is highly recommended to victimologists and to service providers in the field. In the avalanche of publications on the theme of victims and restorative justice, this one stands out because it offers more in-depth chapters on empirical data and underlying theories, both on a micro level as well as the macro level. This is state-of-the-art victimology, providing thought-provoking material that exposes the challenges that we still have to face.

Dr. Marc Groenhuijsen, *Professor, Department of Criminal Law and Professor at INTERVICT, Tilburg University, the Netherlands*

This volume focuses on the victim's viewpoint and offers a fresh and original perspective on Restorative Justice. Drawing on evidence from a European restorative justice project aimed specifically at understanding victims' experiences, as well as other research findings, it concludes that RJ can indeed be implemented in a victim-sensitive way, lending weight to the arguments supporting enhanced use of RJ to meet victims' needs.

Heather Strang, *Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, UK*

A wonderful book and very timely as well. This book is a must-read for anyone working with victims of crime – whether they be in victim support or in criminal justice. This evidence-based book tackles many of the key questions facing victims with respect to restorative justice. In doing so, it debunks many of the pervasive myths and misperceptions about restorative justice for victims.

Jo-Anne Wemmers, *PhD, Professor, School of Criminology, Université de Montréal, Canada*

Restorative justice is about fulfilling victims' needs, as well as those of society. This book thoughtfully examines victims' points of view about restorative justice. Stemming from an EU grant focusing on victims of crime and considering several European countries, it looks in detail at victims' roles and also at the extent to which restorative justice programmes are being run to be responsive to victims' needs. It will be key for restorative justice practitioners and all those intending to develop such services.

Joanna Shapland, *Director of the Centre for Criminological Research, University of Sheffield, UK*

Routledge frontiers of criminal justice

- 1 Sex Offenders: Punish, Help, Change or Control?**
Theory, policy and practice explored
Edited by Jo Brayford, Francis Cowe and John Deering
- 2 Building Justice in Post-Transition Europe**
Processes of criminalisation within Central and Eastern European societies
Edited by Kay Goodall, Margaret Malloch and Bill Munro
- 3 Technocrime, Policing and Surveillance**
Edited by Stéphane Leman-Langlois
- 4 Youth Justice in Context**
Community, compliance and young people
Mairead Seymour
- 5 Women, Punishment and Social Justice**
Human rights and penal practices
Margaret Malloch and Gill McIvor
- 6 Handbook of Policing, Ethics and Professional Standards**
Edited by Allyson MacVean, Peter Spindler and Charlotte Solf
- 7 Contrasts in Punishment**
An explanation of Anglophone excess and Nordic exceptionalism
John Pratt and Anna Eriksson
- 8 Victims of Environmental Harm**
Rights, recognition and redress under National and International
Matthew Hall
- 9 Doing Probation Work**
Identity in a criminal justice occupation
Rob C. Mawby and Anne Worrall
- 10 Justice Reinvestment**
Can the criminal justice system deliver more for less?
Chris Fox, Kevin Albertson and Kevin Wong
- 11 Epidemiological Criminology**
Theory to practice
Edited by Eve Waltermaurer and Timothy A. Akers
- 12 Policing cities**
Urban securitization and regulation in a 21st century world
Edited by Randy K. Lippert and Kevin Walby
- 13 Restorative Justice in Transition**
Kerry Clamp

- 14 International perspectives on police education and training**
Edited by Perry Stanislas
- 15 Understanding Penal Practice**
Edited by Ioan Durnescu and Fergus McNeill
- 16 Perceptions of Criminal Justice**
Vicky De Mesmaecker
- 17 Transforming Criminal Justice?**
Problem-solving and court specialization
Jane Donoghue
- 18 Policing in Taiwan**
From authoritarianism to democracy
Liqun Cao, Lanying Huang and Ivan Y. Sun
- 19 Reparation for Victims of Crimes against Humanity**
The healing role of reparation
Edited by Jo-Anne M. Wemmers
- 20 Victims of Violence and Restorative Practices**
Finding a voice
Tinneke Van Camp
- 21 Long-Term Imprisonment and Human Rights**
Edited by Kirstin Drenkhahn, Manuela Dudeck and Frieder Dünkel
- 22 Working within the Forensic Paradigm**
Cross-discipline approaches for policy and practice
Edited by Rosemary Sheehan and James Ogloff
- 23 Positive Criminology**
Edited by Natti Ronel and Dana Segev
- 24 Inmates' Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison**
Rewriting personal histories through cognitive behavioral programs in prison
Jennifer A. Schlosser
- 25 Municipal Corporate Security in International Context**
Kevin Walby and Randy K. Lippert
- 26 Victims and Restorative Justice**
Edited by Inge Vanfraechem, Daniela Bolívar and Ivo Aertsen

To our families and communities

**Who give us the reasons to continue, the strength to persist and
the hope to believe**

Contributors

Ivo Aertsen is Professor of Criminology at the University of Leuven (Belgium). He holds degrees in psychology and law from the same university. His main fields of research and teaching are victimology, penology and restorative justice. At present, he is the Director of the Leuven Institute of Criminology (LINC), where he also coordinates the Research Line on Restorative Justice. He has been chair of the European Forum for Restorative Justice from 2000–4 and has coordinated COST Action A21 on Restorative Justice research in Europe from 2002–6. He is Editorial Board member of several journals and is involved in various practice and policy oriented projects and partnerships, both at the national and international level. He is the Editor-in-chief of *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*.

Leo Matteo Bachinger studied Sociology at the University of Vienna and the University Basel. Between 2009 and 2013 he was research assistant at the Institute for Sociology of Law and Criminology. Since 2013 he has been teaching assistant at the Department of Science and Technology Studies at the University of Vienna and was also Conference Organizer at the Changing Worlds Conference (Vienna 2014).

Daniela Bolívar is a lecturer and research fellow at the University of Chile. She holds degrees on psychology, community-psychology (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile) and criminology (Leuven Institute of Criminology, KU Leuven, Belgium). Daniela is the author of a number of publications in the field of victimology and restorative justice, and has worked as a researcher at the European Forum for Restorative Justice, University of Leuven (KU Leuven, Belgium) and National Institute of Criminalistics and Criminology (NICC, Belgium).

Päivi Honkatukia is Professor of Youth Studies in the School of Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Tampere, Finland. Her research interests include criminality, social control, ethnic and gender relations, young people and intersectional analysis. She has authored several research reports, journal articles and book chapters concerning violence and crime.

Katrien Lauwaert works as a senior researcher at the Leuven Institute of Criminology (University of Leuven) and the European Forum for Restorative

Justice. She is the chair of the non-profit victim–offender mediation service Suggnomè Forum voor herstelrecht en bemiddeling. She studied law and criminology at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, l'Université Catholique de Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve), the Rijksuniversiteit Leiden and the American University (Washington, DC) and obtained a PhD from the University of Maastricht for her dissertation on 'Procedural Safeguards in Restorative Justice'. She taught courses on restorative justice, victimology, youth delinquency, criminology and criminal procedure at Maastricht University (the Netherlands) and the University of Liège (Belgium).

Anne Lemonne is researcher at the Belgian National Institute for Criminalistics and Criminology (NICC). She is also teaching assistant at the criminological school of the ULB (Free University of Brussels, Belgium). Her main research topics are developed in the fields of victimology and restorative justice. During her career, she also acquired a particular expertise in comparative studies.

Christa Pelikan is a researcher at the Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology in Vienna. She has been working in the field of criminal law, especially victim–offender mediation and in the field of family law. She has chaired the 'Committee of experts on mediation in penal matters' of the Council of Europe. She is a founding member of the European Forum for Restorative Justice.

Antony Pemberton is a political scientist and criminologist and is currently Full Professor of Victimology at the International Victimology Institute Tilburg, (INTERVICT), Tilburg University in the Netherlands. He has published over 70 articles, books and book chapters on the subject of victimology. His main research interests concern victims in justice processes, the position of victims within society and the role of victimological processes in political violence.

Inge Vanfraechem is senior researcher at the Leuven Institute of Criminology (University of Leuven, Belgium) where she manages a European FP7 project on restorative justice and conflicts in intercultural settings. She has published extensively in the areas of restorative justice, victimology and youth delinquency, including *Justice for Victims* (co-edited with Pemberton and Ndahinda, Routledge 2014) and *Conferencing and Restorative Justice* (co-edited with Zinsstag, Oxford University Press 2012). She has (co)supervised multiple European research projects in those areas. She is a founding member of the European Forum for Restorative Justice.

Acknowledgements

This book is based on victims' experiences, all candid, open and complex stories thanks to which we are now able to contribute to a better understanding of the role of restorative justice in people's lives. Our gratitude therefore in the first place goes to those victims who agreed to take part in this study and generously shared their thoughts and emotions with us.

We would like to thank the practitioners in European countries who contributed to our research, either by referring cases or by participating as respondent. Their kind support and effort, sometimes under difficult circumstances, made this research possible.

We are grateful to our colleagues who played a key role in the implementation of the research project as member of the steering group: Karolien Mariën and Monique Anderson (European Forum for Restorative Justice), Anne Lemonne (National Institute of Criminalistics and Criminology, Belgium), Juhani Iivari (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland), Raimo Lahti (University of Helsinki, Finland), Walter Fuchs (Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology, Austria), Christoph Koss (Neustart, Austria), Jaap Smit and Sven Zebel (Slachtoffer in Beeld, the Netherlands) and Sonja Leferink (Victim Support Europe).

The project was carried out in close cooperation with Christa Pelikan (with colleague Leo Matteo Bachinger, Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology, Austria), Päivi Honkatukia (National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Finland) and Antony Pemberton (with colleagues Malini Laxminarayan and Kim Lens, INTERVICT, the Netherlands). They formed a magnificent research team.

Finally, this book could have not been realized without the support of the European Commission, who funded this 2-year research project (JUST/2009/JPEN/AG/0628).

The editors
November 2014

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	xiii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xvi
 General introduction	 1
DANIELA BOLÍVAR, INGE VANFRAECHEM AND IVO AERTSEN	
 PART I	
Victims in restorative justice literature	13
 1 Victims' victimization experiences and their need for justice	15
ANTONY PEMBERTON AND INGE VANFRAECHEM	
 2 Restorative justice and victims of crime	48
INGE VANFRAECHEM AND DANIELA BOLÍVAR	
 PART II	
Victims in mediation and conferencing: European research	77
 3 Methodology of a comparative European research	79
INGE VANFRAECHEM AND DANIELA BOLÍVAR	
 4 Victims' experiences in victim–offender mediation in Austria: the ‘real’ story	83
LEO MATTEO BACHINGER AND CHRISTA PELIKAN	
 5 Restorative justice and partner violence: victims' views of Finnish practice	107
PÄIVI HONKATUKIA	

6	Changing frames? Restorative justice in the Netherlands	126
	ANTONY PEMBERTON	
7	Victims and conferencing	153
	INGE VANFRAECHEM	
8	Victims and restorative justice: towards a comparison	172
	DANIELA BOLÍVAR, CHRISTA PELIKAN AND ANNE LEMONNE	
PART III		
	Victims and restoration in policy-making	201
9	The local practice of restorative justice: are victims sufficiently involved?	203
	DANIELA BOLÍVAR	
10	European criminal justice policies on victims and restorative justice	239
	KATRIEN LAUWAERT	
	<i>Index</i>	273

General introduction

Daniela Bolívar, Inge Vanfraechem and Ivo Aertsen

Posing questions

One may argue that Europe is witnessing the birth of a new era for victims of crime. The EU Victims Directive (2012/29/EU) has entailed an important new step obliging EU member states to implement minimum standards in terms of victim services before the end of 2015. These standards are related to different aspects of victims' rights such as provision of information and support, participation in criminal proceedings, protection of victims and recognition of victims with special needs. Interestingly, this renewed interest in the victim expressed through the Directive does leave restorative justice out of the list of the basic supplies that victims should have access to, even though it does recognize restorative justice as a service that could be beneficial for victims (Lauwaert, 2013). As noted by van Dijk (2013), the Directive has situated restorative justice not as a service that should be always offered, but rather as an option that has to be implemented with caution given the possibility of secondary victimization. In the EU's view, aspects such as the type of crime, degree of trauma and power imbalances should be taken into consideration not only when carrying out restorative justice processes but also when referring cases (victims) to restorative justice services. In other words, restorative justice gets the status of a service that is potentially harmful to victims. Behind these statements the preconception seems to prevail that restorative justice uses a dangerous methodology and/or that it is mainly oriented towards serving offenders' interests.

The EU Directive thus seems to mirror very well the general concern that victims' advocates, as well as other professionals and scholars working in the field, usually have. On the one hand these concerns are understandable, given the fact that some relevant issues related to victims' involvement in restorative justice remain unclear. For example, can we assure that restorative justice practices in Europe are serving victims' and offenders' interests alike? Is restorative justice always offering positive experiences for victims, regardless of the institutional context in which programmes are implemented? On the other hand (as also expressed by Koss, 2014), reliable empirical data rather than a pure theoretical or principal debate should be taken into account in order to further develop restorative justice practices and policy-making.

The motives that originated this book are twofold. First, as highlighted by Vanfraechem and Aertsen (2010), the time has come for a better and more nuanced understanding of the experiences of those participating in restorative justice. Our main intention has therefore been to explore and comprehend the key issues that are determining victims' experiences within restorative justice processes. Second, this book echoes the need to comprehensively discuss the position of the victim in the European implementation of restorative justice practices by sharing empirical findings that may highlight a way forward to develop a more victim-sensitive implementation of restorative justice.

Offering answers

Research has extensively documented how restorative justice may constitute a positive experience for victims of crime. It is a well-known fact that victims' satisfaction rates have been found to be high after participation in victim-offender mediation or conferencing (Coates and Gehm, 1989; Netzig and Trenzczek, 1996; Kilchling and Löschnig-Gspandl, 1998; Strang, 2002; Wemmers and Canuto, 2002; Umbreit, Coates and Vos, 2004; Dignan, 2005; Shapland *et al.*, 2007).¹ According to the literature review done by Umbreit, Coates and Vos (2004), victims' satisfaction with victim-offender mediation has been highly consistent across sites, cultures and seriousness of offences.

Let us point out some figures on the matter. In 2003, Rugge and Cormier reported that 89 per cent of victims of serious crimes that participated in the Collaborative Justice Project in Canada, were satisfied with the experience. Sherman *et al.* (2005) reported that 97 per cent of victims that took part in conferencing in London (UK) expressed satisfaction, while 62 per cent did so in Canberra (Australia). Interestingly, these percentages were obtained from victims whose cases were randomly assigned to conferencing. Other studies have also reported that an important percentage of victims considered restorative justice to be valuable, beneficial or useful.² Wemmers and Cyr (2005) observed that 90 per cent considered mediation as a good initiative, which even included those victims who experienced some degree of fear after their first contact with the programme. Shapland *et al.* (2007) concluded that victims (and offenders) of the three schemes in their evaluation in the UK were happy with their experiences in restorative justice. Such a degree of satisfaction remained in three-quarters of the victims and offenders who were interviewed 8–9 months later. Similar findings have been found in studies carried out in Canada, Belgium and Spain by Van Camp (2011, 2014), De Mesmaecker (2014) and Bolívar (forthcoming). Meta-studies such as these by Latimer, Dowden and Muise (2005), Sherman and Strang (2007) and McCold and Wachtel (2002) as well as literature reviews including Wemmers and Canuto (2002) and Umbreit, Coates and Vos (2004) have also concluded that most victims who participate in restorative justice practices are satisfied with the experience.

Why then is restorative justice satisfactory for victims? Victims appreciate the opportunity to participate in an informal process where their views are taken

into account (Strang, 2002). In fact, studies have shown that victims are content with several aspects of the process in which meeting the offender seems to be the most important aspect. The encounter with the offender allows victims to receive the offender's acknowledgement, to express their anger concerning the impact of the offence, to receive answers to questions and to see the offender being honest (both through words and body language). The encounter would provide victims with the possibility to find symbolic forms of reparation, such as apologies and remorse, or to see the offender changing or doing something about his/her problem (see Coates and Gehm, 1989; Roberts, 1995; Shapland *et al.*, 2006). Van Camp and Wemmers (2013) have argued that restorative justice offers a process that is not only considered fair by victims but also flexible, providing care and permitting the expression of victims' pro-social desires.

A restorative justice process usually (but not always) implies the elaboration of an agreement between parties. These agreements may take the form of apologies, financial or material compensation, training commitments or work for the community. The agreement may also include explanations about the offence or exchange of information about the circumstances of the incident. Evidence has shown that victims may be highly gratified with such outcomes (Umbreit, 1994; Aertsen and Peters, 1998; Shapland *et al.*, 2007). Perhaps more importantly, victims seem to feel not only satisfied with the agreement itself, but also with the emotional 'outcomes' obtained, such as having the chance to express themselves, impacting on the offender (Umbreit, 1994) and getting information about what had happened (Umbreit, 1998a, 1998b).

Satisfaction is not the only thing that victims may obtain from their participation in restorative justice. Several scholars have strongly argued that the involvement in restorative justice may produce important and positive psychological consequences for victims. Some of the outcomes described are the reduction of negative emotions such as fear, anxiety, anger and posttraumatic stress symptoms as well as the rise of positive emotions and feelings of well-being, such as closure, healing and the possibility to experience a process that reduces secondary victimization. Restorative justice may also constitute an empowering experience, because it gives the victim the opportunity to take part in the decision-making process, regaining victims' feelings of control over their lives (see for example Umbreit, 1994; Aertsen and Peters, 1998; Strang, 2002; Beven *et al.*, 2005; Gustafson, 2005; Wemmers and Cyr, 2005; Zebel, 2012; Bolívar, forthcoming).

Remaining issues

With such clear-cut positive evidence, some may wonder why we still need a better and nuanced understanding of victims' experiences in restorative justice practices. We see two main reasons.

Available evidence on victims' role in restorative justice processes is incomplete

This first reason mainly concerns methodological issues: in general, studies have been carried out on a diversity of practices and programmes. Programmes differ in the way their practices are implemented, the type of cases processed and the relationship that programmes have with the criminal justice system. As a consequence, we need to be aware of the limitations when comparing, drawing analogies or generalizing conclusions in such a diverse landscape (see also Dignan, 2005). For example, if most studies have been carried out on programmes dealing with young offenders and minor crimes, we need to be cautious about translating these findings to programmes that work with adult offenders (Wemmers and Cyr, 2005). Indeed, evidence suggests that victims may have different reactions depending on their perception of the offender's age and other characteristics (Bolívar, forthcoming).

Second, victims have generally not been the main interest of restorative justice scholars (Dignan, 2005). There are very few studies that focus exclusively on victims' experiences.³ Research has addressed victims (but also offenders) in order to evaluate and therefore validate restorative justice as a method of intervention instead of searching for an in-depth understanding of dynamics within the restorative justice process (Vanfraechem and Aertsen, 2010). As can be expected, even less information is available about victims who either decline to take part in restorative justice processes or who have negative experiences. With very few exceptions (see for example Morris, Maxwell and Robertson, 1993; Hill, 2002; Hoyle, 2002; Wemmers and Cyr, 2005; Vanfraechem, 2007; and Bolívar, 2013), non-participating victims are close to absent in studies on restorative justice practices. As a consequence, we have very little evidence on the consequences, if any, that the mere offer of mediation or conferencing may have on this group. In addition, studies usually document a small but still significant number of victims who are not happy with their experiences. For example, Morris, Maxwell and Robertson (1993) found that some victims felt worse after the conference, expressing feelings of depression, fear, anger and distress. Negative evaluations have been related so far to a lack of follow-up (Coates and Gehm, 1989; Shapland *et al.*, 2007), an insufficient preparation process (Strang, 2002), bias by the mediator (Strang, 2002) and the victim's perception of an insincere offender (Wemmers and Canuto, 2002). This evidence although relevant is still insufficient to ensure that we are not ignoring other aspects that could be affecting victims' experiences.

Doubts have been raised on the degree to which restorative justice services have been responsive to victims' needs

Academics, practitioners and policy-makers are still debating the extent to which restorative justice programmes can be successful in terms of victims' inclusion. On the one hand, some critics argue that restorative justice programmes tend to

be offender oriented (European Forum for Victim Services, 2003; Dignan, 2007; Pemberton, Winkel and Groenhuijsen, 2007), partly because an important number of such practices emanate from probation services and partly given the close relationship that sometimes exists between restorative justice practices and the criminal justice system. When the latter happens, the outcome of the restorative justice process may be taken into account by public prosecutors or judges in order to dismiss the case or reduce the sentence. In practice, this means that offenders will receive judicial benefits for their participation in restorative justice, which could lead to the victim perceiving restorative justice to be in the sole interest of the offender.

On the other hand, there is no agreement on which victims may be best helped by restorative justice programmes. While there are restorative justice practices that have proved positive results when dealing with serious crimes (see for example Aertsen and Peters, 1998; Umbreit *et al.*, 2003; Gustafson, 2005), it is evident that cautiousness has been dominating the policy agenda, resulting in European national legislation that has tended to restrict the use of restorative justice to less serious offences (Miers and Aertsen, 2012). In addition, some academics have warned about the problematic effect that restorative justice may have on certain type of cases, such as vulnerable victims (Strang, 2002; Wemmers and Cyr, 2005) and cases where victim and offender had a prior relationship, for instance in cases of domestic violence (Young and Hoyle, 2003) or other cases involving a power imbalance (Strang, 2002). Finally, concerns regarding certain risks, such as possible manipulations by the offender, pressures on victims and the promotion of un-adapted attributions have also been mentioned (Pemberton, Winkel and Groenhuijsen, 2007).

This volume

This book aims at bringing new insights into the position of the victim within restorative justice processes and programmes, by presenting theoretical developments and sharing original findings of a research project carried out in Europe. The study, led by the European Forum for Restorative Justice in cooperation with Victim Support Europe and co-funded by the EU,⁴ aimed at studying two main issues: how can we describe and understand victims' experiences in restorative justice (mostly victim-offender mediation), and how are European restorative justice programmes being run with regard to the inclusion of victims?⁵ The study thus contributes to answering some of the unanswered questions that remain in relation to victims' participation in restorative justice.

a Victim-focused research

This research is victim focused because our main interest is to understand the position and experiences of victims in how restorative justice programmes are implemented in Europe. Therefore, we not only interviewed victims extensively, but also interviewed and surveyed restorative justice and victim support practitioners throughout Europe in order to investigate