

Project Restore NZ



ACHIEVING OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS OF PROJECT RESTORE'S RESTORATIVE PROCESSES: THE PERSPECTIVES OF PARTICIPANTS

JUNE 2013

PROJECT RESTORE NZ INC.

DR. SHIRLEY JÜLICH
AND
FIONA LANDON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Method	1
Findings	3
The Survivor Survey	3
Satisfaction.....	3
Justice Interests – Participation	3
Justice Interests – Having a Voice	4
Justice Interests – Accountability – Putting Things Right	6
Justice Interests – Validation – Acknowledging the Harm.....	7
Justice Interests – Vindication – Accepting Responsibility	9
Experiencing a Sense of Justice.....	10
Revictimisation.....	10
Wellbeing Indicators	12
Impacts of Restorative Processes	14
Feedback on the Evaluation Process.....	15
Final Thoughts.....	16
The Offender Survey	17
Satisfaction.....	17
Justice Interests – Participation	17
Justice Interests – Having a Voice	18
Justice Interests – Accountability – Putting Things Right	19
Justice Interests – Validation – Acknowledging the Harm.....	21
Justice Interests – Vindication – Accepting Responsibility	22
Experiencing a Sense of Justice.....	23
Reoffending.....	25
Wellbeing Indicators	26
Impacts of Restorative Processes	26
Feedback on the Evaluation Process.....	28
Final Thoughts.....	28
The Other Participants Survey	29
Satisfaction.....	29
Justice Interests – Participation	29

Justice Interests – Having a Voice	30
Justice Interests – Accountability – Putting Things Right	32
Justice Interests – Validation – Acknowledging the Harm.....	33
Justice Interests – Vindication – Accepting Responsibility	35
Experiencing a Sense of Justice.....	36
Revictimisation.....	36
Wellbeing Indicators	38
Impacts of Restorative Processes	38
Feedback on the Evaluation Process.....	41
Final Thoughts.....	42
Summary of Results	43
Satisfaction.....	43
Justice Interests	43
Participation.....	43
Having a Voice.....	44
Accountability – Putting Things Right	45
Validation - Acknowledging the Harm	45
Vindication - Accepting Responsibility.....	46
Experiencing a Sense of Justice.....	46
Revictimisation/Reoffending	47
Wellbeing Indicators	48
Impacts of Restorative Processes	49
Feedback on the Evaluation Process	50
Final Thoughts.....	50
Conclusions	51
Reference List.....	53

INTRODUCTION

This report documents the second part of the work completed for the Ministry of Justice in December 2012. The first phase¹ was to extend our understanding of the outcomes of specialist restorative justice processes in cases where sexual harm has occurred. This was a desk based review of 12 case files that were reviewed to identify the outcomes victim-survivors and other participants had hoped to achieve out of a restorative process. Relevant data were recorded on case summary sheets and desired outcomes were coded. Data were also gathered from relevant reports prepared by Project Restore and judges' sentencing notes.

The second phase of this work was to explore the experiences of those who participated in restorative processes delivered by Project Restore. A series of surveys were used to capture their experiences and investigate outcomes, as perceived or occurring, at some time distance from the restorative justice process itself. This allowed for a different focus on defining "outcomes"; from considerations of post-experience satisfaction to health, life and social changes that may improve participant wellbeing, and has the potential for a flow effect to the broader community and the taxpayer. Participants were asked a number of questions across the following four areas:²

1. How satisfied they are with the service they received,
2. How well they felt the process met a series of "justice" related needs, such as having a voice, accountability, validation (acknowledging the harm), vindication (accepting responsibility) and experiencing a sense of justice,
3. Whether they have experienced psychological or behavioural changes that have been correlated with resilience against revictimisation or reoffending (as appropriate),
4. Whether they have experienced any changed circumstances that are potential indicators of improved life outcomes.

METHOD

A series of three surveys were designed targeting victim-survivors, offenders and other participants of Project Restore's restorative processes. Other participants included family members or friends of the victim-survivor or the offender. The surveys were very similar, with some minor changes in wording to allow the surveys to specifically address the three groups of participants. Logic was applied in various places throughout the survey so that participants saw relevant questions depending on their responses. Each of the three surveys were tested with dummy data prior to "going live". The surveys were designed to be administered on line using a professional account with a provider hosting on line surveys.

Participants in the surveys were drawn from the 12 cases reviewed in the first phase and an additional four cases referred to Project Restore since the desk based review of case files. As cases are accepted by Project Restore, participants can either agree or not agree to be contacted at a later

¹ See Jülich, S., & Landon, F. (2012). *Achieving outcomes for participants of Project Restore's restorative processes*. Auckland: Project Restore.

² The full questionnaires are in the Findings section

date for evaluation purposes. Of these 16 cases, some 70 people had given such permission. They were contacted by Fiona Landon, the Programme Director of Project Restore, and asked if they wanted to share their experience of the restorative process and the impact it had on their lives. Some 25 (36%) participants agreed to participate and were offered three ways to do so. The first was to complete the survey on line, the second was a telephone interview with either Fiona Landon or Jennifer Annan, Project Restore's survivor specialist, and the third was a face-to-face meeting with Jennifer Annan. In the telephone interviews and face-to-face meetings the participant the interviewer asked the participant the questions in the survey and recorded the responses either in hard copy or directly on line.

Of the 25 participants who indicated their willingness to be involved in the project a total of 14 participants completed or partially completed the survey. That is, 56% of the 25 who agreed to participate or 20% of the 70 who originally indicated they were willing to participate. The 14 participants included 3 victim-survivors, 2 offenders completed or partially completed the survey, and 9 other participants.

The response rate was disappointing and impacts on the results of the surveys which cannot be considered as statistically significant. This particular population has not been asked previously to take part in any surveys or evaluation of any of Project Restore's processes. Therefore, they have not been over researched. However, as the surveys were administered sometime after the restorative processes took place, those in the potential participant population (the 50 who declined Project Restore's to participate in the research project) may have "moved on" and may have been reluctant to revisit a difficult time in their lives. The same could be said perhaps for the 9 participants who indicated their willingness to participate but chose not to complete a survey. Similar difficulties recruiting participants were found in an earlier evaluation conducted on Project Restore (Jülich, Buttle, Cummins, & Freeborn, 2010).

An information sheet was provided on all surveys, and participants were informed that:

- Participation was voluntary,
- They did not have to answer every question,
- Beginning the survey indicated their consent to participate,
- Reporting of the results, either in a report to the Ministry of Justice, or any subsequent journal articles, would be done in such a way that others could not identify the participants.

We did not gather information on demographics. However, we can say that as yet Project Restore has not received any referrals for cases with female offenders and so it can be assumed that offenders in this research are male. The victim-survivors in this study include both male and female.

Project Restore staff gathered the data either by survey on line, telephone interview or face-to-face meeting, and provided it to Dr Shirley Jülich for analysis and report preparation.

FINDINGS

In this section the questions are itemised for each survey with the associated responses.

THE SURVIVOR SURVEY

Three victim-survivors acknowledged consent and began the survey.

SATISFACTION

The first set of questions (question 1) was seeking opinions regarding procedural fairness - that is how the restorative process was run. The victim-survivors who completed this survey indicated that from their perspective, they felt safe, the process was fair, they understood what was happening throughout the process, they were treated with respect, felt listened to, and did not feel scared to say how they really felt. One victim-survivor said s/he understood how the restorative process was run; two victim-survivors “mostly” felt that they understood.

1. Did you:					
Answer Options	Yes	Mostly	Not Really	No	Response Count
Feel safe	3	0	0	0	3
Understand how the restorative process was run?	1	2	0	0	3
Feel the restorative process was facilitated in a fair way?	3	0	0	0	3
Understand what was happening during the restorative process?	3	0	0	0	3
Feel you were treated with respect?	3	0	0	0	3
Feel listened to?	3	0	0	0	3
Feel too scared to say how you really felt?	0	0	0	3	3
answered question					3
skipped question					0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – PARTICIPATION

The next set of questions (questions 2 to 4 inclusive) was designed to gather information about the preparation or pre-conferencing stage and whether the preparation helped victim-survivors to participate in the restorative process. Responses indicate that all three victim-survivors were satisfied with their level of participation.

2. Were you satisfied with the level of participation you had?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

Two victim-survivors felt they had the opportunity to say what they wanted to say, and one felt s/he was “mostly ready”.

3. Did you feel ready to say what you wanted to say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

All three victim-survivors felt ready to ask the questions they wanted to ask.

4. Did you feel ready to ask the questions you wanted to ask?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – HAVING A VOICE

This section (questions 5 to 7 inclusive) focussed on the restorative process itself and whether victim-survivors felt as though they could talk about their experience, that is, to tell their story. Having a voice is identified as a necessary component to experiencing a sense of justice. All three

survivors said they had the opportunity have their say and were able to tell their story about what happened to them (question 6).

5. Did you have the opportunity to have your say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

6. Were you able to tell your story about what happened?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

Two victim-survivors said they were able to ask all they questions they wanted, and one said s/he was “mostly” able to ask desired questions.

7. Did you ask all the questions you wanted to ask?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – ACCOUNTABILITY – PUTTING THINGS RIGHT

This section (questions 8 to 10 inclusive) focussed again on the restorative process on the particular justice interests and whether the offender demonstrated accountability by making an attempt to put things right. Two victim-survivors said they believed the offender had made attempts to put things right (make amends). One victim-survivor was “not sure”.

8. Did the offender make any attempts to put things right (make amends)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

All three victim-survivors said the offender had agreed to do things that would help to put things right.

9. Did the offender agree to anything that helped to put things right (make amends) for you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

One victim-survivor said that her/his needs were taken into consideration as agreements were made; two responded that their needs were “mostly” taken into consideration.

10. Were your needs taken into consideration as agreements were made?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	1
Mostly	66.7%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not Really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VALIDATION – ACKNOWLEDGING THE HARM

This section (questions 11 to 16 inclusive) investigated the justice interests of validation – acknowledging the harm. The questions focussed on the restorative process itself and whether victim-survivors thought their victimisation had been validated, that is the harm acknowledged or a sense of justice experienced. All three victim-survivors said that the harm had been acknowledged.

11. Was there any acknowledgement that you had been harmed?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

Two victim-survivors said this acknowledgement provided them with a sense of satisfaction, and one responded “mostly” to this question.

12. Did this acknowledgement provide you with a sense of satisfaction?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

One victim-survivor felt that this was acknowledged by those present. Two victim-survivors felt this was “mostly” acknowledged.

13. Did the other people who were there acknowledge that what the offender did to you was wrong?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

While one victim-survivor still felt blamed by the offender, two said they did not feel blamed.

14. Did you feel blamed for what the happened to you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	66.7%	2
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

One victim survivor said that her/his questions were answered, and two said they were “mostly” answered.

15. Did your questions get answered?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	1
Mostly	66.7%	2
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

One victim-survivor said that s/he was “unsure” if the answers provided helped her/him to understand why the offender sexually assaulted her/him, two responded “not really” to this question.

16. Did these answers help you to understand why the offender sexually assaulted you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	0.0%	0
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	33.3%	1
Not really	66.7%	2
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VINDICATION – ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY

This section (questions 17 to 20 inclusive) continued to focus on the restorative process itself asking about justice interests concerning vindication as it might be demonstrated by the offender accepting responsibility for his behaviour. Two victim-survivors said the offender admitted that what he did was wrong. One answered “mostly” to this question.

17. Did the offender admit that what he/she did was wrong?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

Two victim-survivors felt that the offender took responsibility for the harm he caused, but one responded “no” to this question.

18. Do you feel that the offender took responsibility for the harm he/she caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	0.0%	0
Mostly	66.7%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

All three victim-survivors said the offender apologised for the harm he caused, but in relation to the harm the offender might have caused others, two victim-survivors said that the offender apologised and one was “unsure” (question 20).

19. Did the offender apologise for the harm he/she caused you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

20. Did the offender apologise for the harm he/she caused others?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

EXPERIENCING A SENSE OF JUSTICE

Question 21 asked victim-survivors to reflect back on the whole process – the preparation, the process itself, any agreed outcomes, and the time since the restorative process. All three victim-survivors said that the restorative process helped them to experience a sense of justice.

21. Has the restorative process helped you to experience a sense of justice?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well	100.0%	3
Reasonably well	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Not that well	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

REVICTIMISATION

This section of the survey (questions 22 to 26 inclusive) focussed on the period of time following the restorative process. The more control people have over their lives and the less alcohol or drugs that they use the more protection they might have against sexual victimisation. Two victim-survivors said they felt that the restorative processes had helped them have more control over their lives, one responded “reasonably well” to this question.

22. Do you feel the restorative processes helped you have more control over your life?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well	66.7%	2
Reasonably well	33.3%	1
Neutral	0.0%	0
Not that well	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

One victim-survivor said s/he had stopped blaming her/himself for the sexual assault since the restorative processes, one answered “mostly” and the third said s/he had never blamed her/himself.

23. Have you stopped blaming yourself for the sexual assault since the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	1
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
I never blamed myself	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

In relation to drug and alcohol use (questions 24 to 26 inclusive), two victim-survivors noticed a change in their usage since the restorative process. One responded that this issue does not apply to her/him.

24. Since the restorative processes, have you noticed any changes in the amount and frequency that you use alcohol or drugs?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
No	0.0%	0
Does not apply to me	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

One victim-survivor noticed that s/he was using more, one said s/he was using about the same, and one victim-survivor skipped the question as it did not apply to her/him.

25. Do you use more or less alcohol or drugs since the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More	50.0%	1
Less	0.0%	0
The same	50.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		1

In terms of amount used in one session both victim-survivors said they were using the same.

26. Are you using alcohol or drugs more or less in one session since the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More	0.0%	0
Less	0.0%	0
The same	100.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		1

WELLBEING INDICATORS

Questions 27 to 30 inclusive focussed on wellbeing indicators. Victim-survivors responses across the wellbeing indicators suggested that they were somewhat or much improved since the restorative process. Two victim-survivors indicated that their general sense of wellbeing and mental health was “much improved” since the restorative process. Two said that their relationships within their families were “much improved,” one said that relationships with other social contacts were “much improved” and one responded “somewhat improved” for this question. One victim-survivor said that her/his ability to work had “much improved” since the restorative process and two responded “somewhat improved”. Similarly, one victim-survivor said that her/his ability to be more productive at work was “much improved” and two responded “somewhat improved” for this question. One victim-survivor said that her/his physical health was “much improved” since the restorative process and two responded “somewhat improved” to this question.

27. Do you think that being part of a restorative process has improved your:						
Answer Options	Much Improved	Somewhat Improved	Neutral	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse	Response Count
General sense of wellbeing	2	1	0	0	0	3
Mental health	2	1	0	0	0	3
Relationships within your family	0	2	1	0	0	3
Relationships with other social contacts	1	1	1	0	0	3
Ability to work	1	2	0	0	0	3
Ability to be more productive at work	1	2	0	0	0	3
Physical health	1	2	0	0	0	3
<i>answered question</i>						3
<i>skipped question</i>						0

Since the completion of restorative processes one victim-survivor said s/he has taken “less time off work,” and another said “about the same amount”. One victim-survivor did not work.

28. Since the completion of restorative processes, have there been any changes in the amount of time you have taken off work because of health issues?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More time off work	0.0%	0
Less time off work	33.3%	1
About the same amount	33.3%	1
I do not work	33.3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

One victim-survivor said s/he visited health care professionals (excluding counsellors) “less frequently,” two said “about the same” for this question.

29. Since the completion of the restorative processes, have you noticed any changes in the frequency of visits to your health care provider (excluding counsellors)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More frequently	0.0%	0
Less frequently	33.3%	1
About the same	66.7%	2
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

One victim-survivor said s/he needed additional ACC sessions, one needed no more, and for third, this question did not apply to them.

30. Since the completion of the restorative processes, have you needed any more sessions with an ACC registered counsellor?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	1
No	33.3%	1
Does not apply to me	33.3%	1
answered question		3
skipped question		0

IMPACTS OF RESTORATIVE PROCESSES

The next three questions (questions 31 to 35 inclusive) focussed on the impacts of restorative processes. All three victim-survivors reported “mostly positive impacts” and went on to describe these impacts.

31. In general, how do you think the restorative processes have impacted on your life?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Mostly positive Impacts	100.0%	3
Some positive impacts	0.0%	0
Some negative impacts	0.0%	0
Mostly negative impacts	0.0%	0
Some negative and some positive impacts	0.0%	0
No impacts	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

32. Can you share the most important impacts restorative processes have had on your life?

The first victim-survivor noted that most important impact that restorative processes had on her/his life was “The opportunity for the process to say out loud that I was not at blame.”

The second noted s/he had been given the “opportunity to hold him accountable for what he did and given [her/him] the power to follow through on everything , ensuring the judge had all information about what [the offender] did to make a decision re sentencing as opposed to just what [the offender] was charged with.”

The third victim-survivor noted that the Project Restore staff “have made me feel comfortable and safe about what I say to others and how to approach [them] and I be honest with myself. Just letting others and myself know that we shouldn’t carry things within ourselves and feel at fault.”

The next two questions (questions 34 and 35) focussed on what victim-survivors had hoped to achieve. Two victim-survivors said they had achieved what they wanted. One responded “mostly” to this question. Two went on to describe what they had achieved.

33. Did you achieve what you had hoped to achieve out of the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	2
Mostly	33.3%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

34. What did you achieve?

The first victim-survivor noted that her/his achievement was “Justice, I feel I’ve experienced a sense of justice being done.”

The second victim-survivor noted that her/his achievement was “How to respect myself, others having a say and being open, fronting the problem.”

35. What would you have liked to achieve?

Participants only saw this question if they answered “no” to question 34.

FEEDBACK ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This section (questions 36 to 38 inclusive) focussed on the delivery of the survey and discomforts it might have caused. Victim-survivors said they experienced no discomfort answering the questionnaire and felt it was helpful.

36. Have you experienced any discomfort while you answered this questionnaire?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	0.0%	0
No	100.0%	3
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		3
skipped question		0

37. What part of the questionnaire did you find uncomfortable?

Participants only saw this question if they answered “yes” to question 36.

All three victim survivors said answering the questionnaire was helpful.

38. Was answering this questionnaire helpful to you in any way?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		3
<i>skipped question</i>		0

FINAL THOUGHTS

This last question gave victim-survivors the opportunity to share any final thoughts.

39. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

All three participants skipped this question.

THE OFFENDER SURVEY

Two offenders acknowledged consent and began the survey.

SATISFACTION

The first set of questions (question 1) was seeking opinions regarding procedural fairness - that is how the restorative process was run. Offenders indicated they felt safe in the process, that it was facilitated fairly, that they were treated with respect and felt listened to. They did not feel scared to say how they really felt. One offender said that he understood how the restorative process was run, but one said he did not understand.

1. Did you:					
Answer Options	Yes	Mostly	Not really	No	Response Count
Feel safe	2	0	0	0	2
Understand how the restorative process was run?	1	0	1	0	2
Feel the restorative process was facilitated in a fair way?	2	0	0	0	2
Understand what was happening during the restorative process?	2	0	0	0	2
Feel you were treated with respect?	2	0	0	0	2
Feel listened to?	2	0	0	0	2
Feel too scared to say how you really felt?	0	0	0	2	2
<i>answered question</i>					2
<i>skipped question</i>					0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – PARTICIPATION

The next set of questions (questions 2 to 4 inclusive) was designed to gather information about the preparation or pre-conferencing stage and whether the preparation helped offenders to participate in the restorative process. Both offenders said they were satisfied with the level of participation they had (question 2) and that they felt ready to say what they wanted to say (question 3). Both offenders felt they had been sufficiently prepared to answer the questions put to them by the victim-survivor (question 4).

2. Were you satisfied with the level of participation you had?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

3. Did you feel ready to say what you wanted to say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

4. Did the preparation help you to answer the questions asked by the survivor?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – HAVING A VOICE

This section (questions 5 to 7 inclusive) focussed on the restorative process itself and whether offenders felt as though they could talk about their experience, that is, to tell their story. Having a voice is identified as a necessary component to experiencing a sense of justice. Both offenders said they had the opportunity to have their say (question 5), that they were able to tell their story about what had happened (question 6) and were able to answer any questions they were asked (question 7).

5. Did you have the opportunity to have your say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

6. Were you able to tell your story about what happened?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

7. Were you able to answer any questions that were asked?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – ACCOUNTABILITY – PUTTING THINGS RIGHT

This section (questions 8 to 13 inclusive) focussed again on the restorative process on the particular justice interests and whether the offender demonstrated accountability by making an attempt to put things right. Both offenders said they were able to acknowledge accountability for their actions (question 8) and attempt to put things right (question 9). They both felt that the agreements went some way towards meeting the needs of those they harmed (question 10).

8. Did you have the opportunity to acknowledge that you are accountable for your actions?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

9. Did you have the opportunity to put things right (make amends)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

10. Do you think the agreements reached go some way towards meeting the needs of those who were harmed?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

One offender felt that the agreement reached was fair and in proportion to the harm caused, while one was “unsure”.

11. Did you think the agreements reached were fair and in proportion to the harm caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	50.0%	1
answered question		2
skipped question		0

One offender thought that there was nothing more he could have done to put things right and the other thought he could have done more.

12. On reflection, was there anything else you could have done to put things right?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	50.0%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

13. Please tell us what that might have been.

The offender who responded “yes” to question 12 indicated that he was not sure what that might have been but if there was something he could have done he would have.

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VALIDATION – ACKNOWLEDGING THE HARM

This section (questions 14 to 16 inclusive) investigated the justice interests of validation – acknowledging the harm. The questions focussed on the restorative process itself and whether offenders thought they had validated the victimisation they had caused, that is, whether they had acknowledged the harm acknowledged. Both offenders had the opportunity to acknowledge the harm they caused (question 14), and thought this was appreciated by the victim-survivor (question 15) and others present (question 16).

14. Did you have the opportunity to acknowledge the harm you caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

15. Do you think the survivor appreciated your acknowledgement?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

16. Did the other people there acknowledge that the survivor had been harmed?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VINDICATION – ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY

This section (questions 17 to 20 inclusive) continued to focus on the restorative process itself asking about justice interests concerning vindication as it might be demonstrated by the offender accepting responsibility for his behaviour. Both offenders said they admitted that what they did was wrong (question 17), and said they took responsibility for the harm they caused (question 18). Both said they apologised (question 19) and felt that the victim-survivor accepted their apology (question 20).

17. Did you admit that what you did was wrong?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

18. Did you take responsibility for the harm you caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

19. Did you apologise for the harm you caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

20. Do you think the survivor accepted your apology?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

EXPERIENCING A SENSE OF JUSTICE

This section (questions 21 to 25 inclusive) asked offenders to reflect back on the whole process – the preparation, the process itself, any agreed outcomes, and the time since the restorative process. Both offenders said they did not feel pressured to agree to any outcomes.

21. Did you feel pressured to agree to any outcomes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	0.0%	0
No	100.0%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

One offender said that he did not regret anything he had agreed to the other indicated he had regrets.

22. Do you regret anything you agreed to?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	50.0%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

The same offender who had regrets in question 22, said that he agreed to something that he thought was unfair. The other offender did not think he agreed to anything unfair.

23. Do you think anything you agreed to was unfair?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	50.0%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

Both offenders said that they understood more about the harm they caused (question 24) and that they had developed some insights into how the victim-survivor might be feeling (question 25).

24. Do you understand more about the harm you caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

25. Have you gained any insights into how the survivor might be feeling?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

REOFFENDING

This section (questions 26 to 29) asks questions about how the offender felt after the restorative process. Both offenders said the restorative processes helped them move on “very well” from what they had done (question 26). They said the restorative processes had helped them address the underlying causes of their offending (question 27).

26. Have the restorative processes helped you to move on from what you have done?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well	100.0%	2
Reasonably well	0.0%	0
Neutral	0.0%	0
Not that well	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

27. Did the restorative processes help you to address the underlying causes of your offending?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

One offender thought that his participation in Project Restore’s processes would assist him to not reoffend in the future. However, one did not think his participation would help in the future. This offender was the same as the offender who said he had agreed to something that was unfair (question 23).

28. Do you think that your participation in the Project Restore processes will assist you to not reoffend in the future?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	50.0%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		2
<i>skipped question</i>		0

29. What part of the process makes the most difference to the likelihood of you reoffending in the future?

The participant who responded yes to previous question answered this question as “Hearing and seeing the confidence and strength of the survivor to speak the truth. Having the opportunity to speak the truth to the survivor.”

WELLBEING INDICATORS

Question 30 focussed on wellbeing indicators. Both offenders said their general sense of wellbeing and relationships with family since the restorative process “much improved”. One offender said that his relationships with other social contacts was “somewhat improved” since the restorative process, the other answered “neutral” to this question.

30. Do you think that being part of a restorative process has improved your:						
Answer Options	Much Improved	Somewhat Improved	Neutral	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse	Response Count
General sense of wellbeing	2	0	0	0	0	2
Relationships within your family	2	0	0	0	0	2
Relationships with other social contacts	0	1	1	0	0	2
<i>answered question</i>						2
<i>skipped question</i>						0

IMPACTS OF RESTORATIVE PROCESSES

This section (questions 31 to 35 inclusive) focussed on the impacts of restorative processes. Both offenders indicated that the impacts of restorative processes on their lives was “mostly positive,” and went on to share the most important impacts. Both offenders said they achieved what they had wanted to achieve out of the restorative processes.

31. In general, how do you think the restorative processes have impacted on your life?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Mostly positive Impacts	100.0%	2
Some positive impacts	0.0%	0
Some negative impacts	0.0%	0
Mostly negative impacts	0.0%	0
Some negative and some positive impacts	0.0%	0
No impacts	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

32. Can you share the most important impacts restorative processes have had on your life?

Both participants provided important impacts on their lives that they attributed to the restorative process. The first reported that “Admitting what I had done has helped me a lot, made a big difference, whole change of my life, if you can't admit anything you are dead.”

The other participant noted that he “Can move on with life knowing that the survivor has strength to move on also. Having forgiveness from the survivor. Taking responsibility is empowering. The process corrected a wrong and allowed healing for both that was so crucial but could likely never happen without the process of communication.

33. Did you achieve what you had hoped to achieve out of the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	2
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

34. What did you achieve?

The first participant indicated that he could work through his feelings of being ashamed.

The second participant noted that he had “The chance to share my story and give the survivor a different perspective. The chance to take responsibility and speak that to the survivor - verbalising this was key. A sense of peace about the past and healing for myself.”

35. What would you have liked to achieve?

Both participants answered yes to question 34 and so the logic of the survey moved them past question 35 on to question 36.

FEEDBACK ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This section (questions 37 to 39 inclusive) focussed on the delivery of the survey and discomforts it might have caused. Both offenders said they experienced no discomfort while answering the questionnaire.

36. Have you experienced any discomfort while you answered this questionnaire?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	0.0%	0
No	100.0%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		2
skipped question		0

37. What part of the questionnaire were you uncomfortable with?

Both offenders answered no to the previous question and so this question was not asked.

One offender found answering the questionnaire helpful, one was unsure.

38. Was answering this questionnaire helpful to you in any way?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	1
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	50.0%	1
answered question		2
skipped question		0

FINAL THOUGHTS

This last question gave offenders the opportunity to share any final thoughts.

39. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

One participant responded to the question. He said that “The work of project restore in my life was invaluable. I truly hope that others can benefit from the process/opportunity as much as I did. Regardless of outcomes, the process itself, its intentions and basis are fundamental to coping with offending. Accountability and forgiveness are hard wired into human nature - if we ignore this there is no moving on, no healing, just covering-up. Please keep Project Restore going strong.”

THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

Nine other participants (those who attended the restorative process as a family member or supporter of the victim-survivor or offender) acknowledged consent and began the survey.

SATISFACTION

The first set of questions (question 1) was seeking opinions regarding procedural fairness - that is how the restorative process was run. Other participants felt safe (seven participants) or “mostly” felt safe in the restorative process. Similarly seven other participants said that they understood how the restorative process was run, and two said they “mostly” understood. Eight felt the restorative process was facilitated fairly, and one felt it was “mostly” facilitated fairly. Seven other participants said they understood what was happening during the restorative process, and two said they “mostly” understood. All nine other participants said they felt they were treated with respect and listened to. Eight said they did not feel scared to say how they really felt, and one said “not really”.

1. Did you:					
Answer Options	Yes	Mostly	Not really	No	Response Count
Feel safe	7	2	0	0	9
Understand how the restorative process was run?	7	2	0	0	9
Feel the restorative process was facilitated in a fair way?	8	1	0	0	9
Understand what was happening during the restorative process?	7	2	0	0	9
Feel you were treated with respect?	9	0	0	0	9
Feel listened to?	9	0	0	0	9
Feel too scared to say how you really felt?	0	0	1	8	9
<i>answered question</i>					9
<i>skipped question</i>					0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – PARTICIPATION

The next set of questions (questions 2 to 4 inclusive) was designed to gather information about the preparation or pre-conferencing stage and whether the preparation helped other participants to participate in the restorative process. Seven other participants said they were satisfied with the level of participation they had, one answered “mostly” and one answered “not really”.

2. Were you satisfied with the level of participation you had?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	7
Mostly	11.1%	1
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	11.1%	1
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Seven other participants felt ready to say what they had wanted to say, two answered “mostly”.

3. Did you feel ready to say what you wanted to say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	7
Mostly	22.2%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Six other participants said they felt ready to ask their questions, three answered “mostly”.

4. Did you feel ready to ask the questions you wanted to ask?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	6
Mostly	33.3%	3
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – HAVING A VOICE

This section (questions 5 to 7 inclusive) focussed on the restorative process itself and whether other participants felt as though those participating in the restorative process could talk about their experience, that is, to tell their story. Having a voice is identified as a necessary component to experiencing a sense of justice. All nine other participants said that those participating in the restorative process had the opportunity to have their say.

5. Did all those affected have the opportunity to have their say?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	9
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Six said that those affected were able to tell their stories about what happened, and three said those affected were “mostly” able to tell their stories.

6. Were all those affected able to tell their stories about what happened?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	6
Mostly	33.3%	3
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Five other participants said they were able to ask their all of their own questions, two said they could “mostly” ask all their questions, one was “not sure” and one said he was unable to ask all of his/her own questions.

7. Did you ask all the questions you wanted to ask?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	55.6%	5
Mostly	22.2%	2
Not sure	11.1%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	11.1%	1
answered question		9
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – ACCOUNTABILITY – PUTTING THINGS RIGHT

This section (questions 8 to 10 inclusive) focussed again on the restorative process on the particular justice interests and whether the offender demonstrated accountability by making an attempt to put things right. Eight other participants said that the offender made attempts to put things right, one was “not sure”.

8. Did the offender make any attempts to put things right (make amends)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.9%	8
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	11.1%	1
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Six said that the offender agreed to do things that would put things right for them, 2 were “not sure,” and one skipped this question.

9. Did the offender agree to anything that helped to put things right (make amends) for you?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	75.0%	6
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	25.0%	2
answered question		8
skipped question		1

Four said that the needs of those affected were taken into consideration as agreements were made, and five said they were “mostly” taken into consideration.

10. Were the needs of those affected taken into consideration as agreements were made?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.4%	4
Mostly	55.6%	5
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VALIDATION – ACKNOWLEDGING THE HARM

This section (questions 11 to 14 inclusive) investigated the justice interests of validation – acknowledging the harm. The questions focussed on the restorative process itself and whether other participants thought that the victimisation had been validated, that is whether the harm experienced by the victim-survivor had been acknowledged. Seven other participants said that there was an acknowledgement of the harm caused, and two said there was no acknowledgement.

11. Was there any acknowledgement of the harm caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	7
No	22.2%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Five other participants agreed that this acknowledgement gave them a sense of satisfaction; one said that it did so “mostly,” and one said s/he was “not sure”.

12. Did this acknowledgement provide you with a sense of satisfaction?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	71.4%	5
Mostly	14.3%	1
Not sure	14.3%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		7
skipped question		2

Seven said that others participating in the restorative process acknowledged what the offender did was wrong, and two said they “mostly” acknowledged the wrong.

13. Did the other people who were there acknowledge that what the offender did was wrong?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	7
Mostly	22.2%	2
Not sure	0.0%	0
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

One other participant said that one offender blamed someone else for the harm he caused, three were “not sure,” one responded “not really”, and four said the offender did not blame anyone else for the harm he caused.

14. Do you think the offender blamed anyone else for the harm he/she caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	11.1%	1
Not sure	33.3%	3
Not really	11.1%	1
No	44.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Seven other participants believed that the offender answered questions as honestly as he could, one said “mostly,” and one said “not really”.

15. Do you think the offender answered the questions as honestly as he/she could?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	7
Mostly	11.1%	1
Not really	11.1%	1
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		9
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Two other participants said that the offender’s answers helped them to understand why the offender sexually assaulted the victim-survivor, two answered “mostly,” one was “not sure,” two said “not really” and one said that answers did not help with their understanding.

16. Did these answers help you to understand why the offender sexually assaulted the survivor?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	25.0%	2
Mostly	25.0%	2
Not sure	12.5%	1
Not really	25.0%	2
No	12.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		8
<i>skipped question</i>		1

JUSTICE INTERESTS – VINDICATION – ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY

This section (questions 17 to 19 inclusive) continued to focus on the restorative process itself asking about justice interests concerning vindication as it might be demonstrated by the offender accepting responsibility for his behaviour. Eight other participants said that the offender admitted what he did was wrong, and one was “unsure”.

17. Did the offender admit that what he/she did was wrong?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.9%	8
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	11.1%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Five other participants thought the offender took responsibility for the harm he caused, and three were “not sure”.

18. Do you think the offender took responsibility for the harm he/she caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.5%	5
Mostly	0.0%	0
Not sure	37.5%	3
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		8
skipped question		1

All nine other participants said the offender apologised for the harm he caused.

19. Did the offender apologise for the harm he/she caused?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	9
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

EXPERIENCING A SENSE OF JUSTICE

Questions 20 and 21 asked other participants to reflect back on the whole process – the preparation, the process itself, any agreed outcomes, and the time since the restorative process. They were asked to comment on whether they had experienced a sense of justice and if they thought the victim-survivor had experienced a sense of justice. Four other participants said the restorative process had helped them “very well” to experience a sense of justice, four said “reasonably well,” and one indicated that s/he was “neutral”.

20. Has the restorative process helped you to experience a sense of justice?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well	44.4%	4
Reasonably well	44.4%	4
Neutral	11.1%	1
Not that well	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Four other participants thought that the victim-survivor experienced a sense of justice, one said “mostly,” and four were “not sure”.

21. Do you think the survivor has experienced a sense of justice?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.4%	4
Mostly	11.1%	1
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
Not sure	44.4%	4
answered question		9
skipped question		0

REVICTIMISATION

This section of the survey (questions 22 to 26 inclusive) focussed on the period of time following the restorative process. The more control people have over their lives and the less alcohol or drugs that they use the more protection they might have against sexual victimisation. Other participants were asked to provide answers for these questions from the perspective of the victim-survivor. Four other participants felt that the restorative processes have helped the victim-survivor have more control over her/his life, two answered “reasonably well,” and three answered “neutral”.

22. Do you feel the restorative processes have helped the survivor have more control over his/her life?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very well	44.4%	4
Reasonably well	22.2%	2
Neutral	33.3%	3
Not that well	0.0%	0
Not at all	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

One other participant said that s/he noticed since the restorative processes that the victim-survivor has stopped blaming her/himself for the sexual assault, one said “mostly,” one said “not really,” and six responded “does not apply”.

23. Have you noticed if the survivor has stopped blaming him/herself for the sexual assault since the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	11.1%	1
Mostly	11.1%	1
Not really	11.1%	1
No	0.0%	0
Does not apply	66.7%	6
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Since the restorative processes, four other participants have noticed a change in the amount and frequency that the survivor used alcohol and drugs. Five said this question “does not apply”.

24. Since the restorative processes, have you noticed any changes in the amount and frequency that the survivor uses alcohol or drugs?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.4%	4
No	0.0%	0
Does not apply	55.6%	5
answered question		9
skipped question		0

Two other participants said the survivor was using alcohol and drugs more often, but two said less often.

25. Is the survivor using alcohol or drugs more or less often?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More	50.0%	2
Less	50.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		4
<i>skipped question</i>		5

Three other participants said the victim survivor was using more alcohol and drugs per session, and one said less per session.

26. Is the survivor using more or less alcohol or drugs per session?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More	75.0%	3
Less	25.0%	1
<i>answered question</i>		4
<i>skipped question</i>		5

WELLBEING INDICATORS

Questions 27 focussed on wellbeing indicators. Other participants were asked to answer this question from their own perspective. Three other participants thought that their general sense of wellbeing and relationships within their families were “somewhat improved,” and six were “neutral” about these two indicators.

27. Do you think that being part of a restorative process has improved your:						
Answer Options	Much Improved	Somewhat Improved	Neutral	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse	Response Count
General sense of wellbeing	0	3	6	0	0	9
Relationships within your family	0	3	6	0	0	9

IMPACTS OF RESTORATIVE PROCESSES

This section (questions 28 to 32 inclusive) focussed on the impacts of restorative processes. Five other participants said that the impacts of restorative processes on their lives were “mostly positive”, three said there were “some positive impacts,” and one said there “some negative and some positive impacts”.

28. In general, how do you think the restorative processes have impacted on your life?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Mostly positive Impacts	55.6%	5
Some positive impacts	33.3%	3
Some negative impacts	0.0%	0
Mostly negative impacts	0.0%	0
Some negative and some positive impacts	11.1%	1
No impacts	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		0

29. Can you share the most important impacts restorative processes have had on your life?

The following comments were made by eight other participants.

“Watching survivors be restored in faith (spirit) mankind. Watch survivors be revived in strength and purpose for future goals and plans. Watch survivors voice their pain and suffering. Watch survivors challenge and confront there issues and concerns, fear and frustration. Watch survivors re-establish trust and hope. Watch survivors regain confidence.”

“I feel at peace, we are getting on well, feeling a lot better, helped me understand my feelings about what happened, I'm able to forgive, better communications and feelings of good will, more at ease. If we hadn't have done this it would have sat at the back of my mind and bugged me. He – the offender – is more open with me now.”

“I did believe that the bottom line was that the offender needed to make a public confession of wrong and apologies to the parents (in this case) of the survivors. This provided me with a sense that justice had been done in regard to this area, It took me further down the path of facing what the offender did, and some of its direct effects in regard to the survivors.”

“The opportunity to tell the offender how much his actions affected the victim and victim’s family. How disgusted and betrayed we felt because of his behaviour. The legal system is not always fair and that offenders get "discounts" to pleading guilty and for offering to pay reparation.”

“The way you prepared us to deal with issues without losing control, we can use these skills in other aspects of family life. My sister being able for the first time to speak her mind, she now has voice in other things as well.”

“[A] really fair process and encourage those involved to engage. From a victim support perspective I feel really positive about this opportunity being available - this is the first time [for] this service to be available to my area. [A] collective approach is done really well by Project Restore. Outcomes [are] positive for [the] survivor - in being heard and taken seriously, improved trust in services provided and we meant what we said and valued her as a person, not judging her.”

“Providing a vehicle by which victims and their families can face their fears and confront someone who has abused them.”

“Having meet and communicated with the team at Project Restore made me feel supported in a lot of ways. Prior to meeting the team, I felt like no-one wanted to listen and no-one was on my side and did not understand me. This was a mind blowing / stressful experience for me. I felt like my whole world came crashing down on me all at once and I had no control over anything, including the victim. I was working with Jennifer, who I had a good rapport with. She listened/advised and if I had an opinion about something, she acknowledged it. Project Restore has given me [the] support and guidance I needed and I am very thankful to the team for being understanding and making it less stressful for me. I was able to carry-on with my everyday life with my children as time passed and everything has slowly but eventually gone back to normal - I understand the long term affects that this experience may pose on the victim and being a mum I will continue to support my child and monitor her moods and changes should it [the impacts of sexual violence] occur in the victim’s mature life.”

Three other participants achieved what they had hoped to achieve out of the restorative process, three said they “mostly” achieved what they wanted to achieve, and three skipped the question.

30. Did you achieve what you had hoped to achieve out of the restorative processes?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50.0%	3
Mostly	50.0%	3
Not really	0.0%	0
No	0.0%	0
answered question		6
skipped question		3

31. What did you achieve?

Potentially there were three other participants who could have responded to this question, all three provided the following comments:

“Sense of easiness between us, [the] family is better, more open now, made us bring it out.”

“See sister overcome her issues, face the offender and tell him what he did was wrong and to see his remorse towards her, how to intervene with other people.”

“I was given, prior to the session with the survivor’s parents (pre-conference preparation), opportunity to vent anger that I hadn't fully been aware of. I also found on several occasions a listening ear that was helpful as I struggled to come to terms with what was and still is a long and painful journey. I was able to support the offender and tried to reach out to those that were present.”

32. What would you have liked to achieve?

Potentially there were three other participants that could have responded to this question, two provided the following comments:

“Support for the offender along with a clear statement on how I viewed the offences without being present. I have come to this position for the following reasons:

- a. Too emotionally involved and very much still processing - not really conversant with all the facts through choosing not to read the transcripts (too painful)
- b. Too much added distress and pain so close to the sentencing, in going through face to face encounters,
- c. Too much likelihood of being accused of complicity, due to understandably angry reactions (this was as I was told)”

“That the offender fully accepts that he is just that the "offender". That he takes responsibility for his actions and that he lives up to his promises but as his home detention is nearly at an end he thinks that he's paid for his crimes.”

FEEDBACK ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This section (questions 37 to 39 inclusive) focussed on the delivery of the survey and discomforts it might have caused. Seven other participants said they had not experienced any discomforts while answering the questionnaire, but two indicated they had.

33. Have you experienced any discomfort while you answered this questionnaire?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	22.2%	2
No	77.8%	7
Not sure	0.0%	0
	<i>answered question</i>	9
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

34. What part of the questionnaire were you uncomfortable with?

Two other participants potentially could have answered this question. Their comments are as follows:

“Unsure who it [the survey] was about for a while and didn't know how to answer, was unclear.”

“Memories that surfaced while I was writing about what I would have liked to achieve.”

Five other participants said that answering the questionnaire was helpful, two found it unhelpful, and one was “not sure”.

35. Was answering this questionnaire helpful to you in any way?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.5%	5
No	25.0%	2
Not sure	12.5%	1
answered question		8
skipped question		1

FINAL THOUGHTS

This last question gave the other participants the opportunity to share any final thoughts.

36. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Five other participants took the opportunity to share thoughts. Their comments are as follows;

“I appreciate that the Project Restore facilitators have been professional in helping participants in the pre-conference preparation.”

“The way it's been done - for Māori was great having Tipene there, great counselling - allowed [for] Māori protocol and participation. Wouldn't have felt as at ease, mindful of other cultures.”

“I would like to add that the kindness of the survivor’s parents was quite remarkable and also the concern shown by them to the offender. It is true that this behaviour wasn’t shared by all those affected but that would be expected under the circumstances. Furthermore I would like to see a strengthening of the restorative justice processes. I think it is important that the survivors have a voice, that the offender be confronted should they wish for that, but that there should be no possibility of gain for the offender in regard to lowering of sentencing time etc., Otherwise apologies and the making of amends may not be genuine.”

“This was a very valuable experience and done with expediency.”

“No.”

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The responses of victim-survivors, offenders and other participants of restorative processes facilitated by Project Restore are generally very positive. There were very few negative responses. The surveys were anonymous, so we cannot make any comparisons across cases to identify if the perceptions of victim-survivors, offenders or other participants differ.

SATISFACTION

This section of the survey aimed to gather satisfaction with procedural fairness. Victim-survivors, offenders and other participants appeared satisfied with the way Project Restore facilitated restorative process. They felt safe, understood how the restorative process was run, and that it was facilitated in a fair way. They understood what was happening during the restorative process and felt they were treated with respect and listened to. They did not feel afraid to say how they really felt. Of note, one offender said he did not really understand how the restorative process was run.

JUSTICE INTERESTS

Kathleen Daly (In Press) in her most recent work constructed a Sexual Violence and Justice Matrix aimed at facilitating a comparison of conventional and innovative justice mechanisms across various countries. As part of this work, and of particular interest to the current study, Daly has undertaken to provide a “robust method of determining what is or is not an effective justice mechanism from a victim’s perspective” (p. 9).³ She argued that evaluations need to move beyond measures of satisfaction and behavioural or psychological measures that focus on therapeutic benefits for victims. Daly has challenged evaluators to ask victims whether a justice mechanism has “the capacity to address one or more of victims’ justice needs (or interests) and to what extent does it do so” (p. 10). She argued that justice interests are legitimate justice elements that should be distinguished from the effects they may have on a victim’s psychological state, and be assessed in their own right. The justice interests she identified are participation, voice, validation, vindication, and offender accountability. In this report we have used these justice interests to organise the findings from the perspective of victim-survivors.⁴

PARTICIPATION

Participation in the justice process contributes to an experience of justice (Jülich, 2006; Zehr, 1995). Daly (In Press, p. 11) described participation as “Discussing ways to address offending and victimization, asking questions and receiving information about a crime, and having information about developments in one’s case and potential justice mechanisms.”

³ Note that the page numbers to Daly’s essay are those of the original manuscript, they will be different in the final publication.

⁴ The sections in italics in this section originally appeared in the first report: Jülich, S., & Landon, F. (2012). *Achieving outcomes for participants of Project Restore’s restorative processes*. Auckland: Project Restore.

This section of the survey was designed to gather information about the preparation or pre-conferencing stage and whether participants felt they had sufficient preparation so that they could participate in the restorative process. Victim-survivors, offenders and other participants reported they were satisfied with their level of participation and felt prepared to say and ask what they wanted. Offenders reported they were prepared for answering questions.

HAVING A VOICE

Having a say in the process is central to an experience of justice for victim-survivors of sexual violence (Jülich, 2006; Zehr, 1995). Howard Zehr found that victims of crime wanted to find the answers to the following six questions.

What happened?

Why did it happen to me?

Why did I act as I did at the time?

Why have I acted as I have since that time?

What if it happens again?

What does this mean for me and for my outlook (my faith, my vision of the world, my future)?

Shirley Jülich (2001) reported that for each and every one of the victim-survivors she interviewed they wanted answers to questions similar to those outlined by Zehr above. She found that another essential element of justice is the ability to tell your story and to tell how the sexual violence has impacted on your life.

Daly's (In Press, p. 11) explanation of voice is:

Telling the story of what happened and its impact in a significant setting, where a victim/survivor can receive public recognition and acknowledgment. Voice is also termed truth-telling and can be related to participation in having a speaking presence in a justice process.

Having a voice in the process was explored by asking all participants if they were able to share their stories and talk about what happened. Victim-survivors, offenders and other participants reported that they had the opportunity to have their say and were able to tell their stories. Victim-survivors felt able to ask their questions, and offenders felt able to answer such questions. While most other participants (7) said they asked their desired questions, one was not sure and one said s/he didn't ask her/his desired question. There was a slight unintentional variation in the wording of this question for other participants which might have influenced the way it was answered. Victim-survivors and offenders were asked if they felt able to ask the questions they wanted to, other participants were asked if they did ask their questions.

ACCOUNTABILITY – PUTTING THINGS RIGHT

When asked their understandings of justice, victim-survivors usually say that they want to see or hear the offender accept responsibility and accountability (Jülich, 2006; Zehr, 1995).

Requiring that certain individuals or entities ‘give accounts’ for their actions (Stenning, 1995). It refers to perpetrators of offences taking active responsibility for the wrong caused, to give sincere expressions of regret and remorse, and to receive censure or sanction that may vindicate the law and a victim.

This section continued to focus on the process itself and aimed to gather information about accountability, that is, putting things right or making amends. Generally all participants agreed that offenders had demonstrated that they were accountable, and made attempts at putting things right.

Two of the three victim-survivors and most other participants (8) reported that the offender made attempts to put things right. One victim-survivor and one other participant were not sure. Both offenders felt they had the opportunity to acknowledge they were accountable and had the opportunity to put things right. All victim-survivors and most other participants (6) said that the offender agreed things that helped to put things right. Two other participants were not sure. Victim-survivors and other participants all agreed that the needs of those affected were taken into consideration. Both offenders thought that the agreements would go some way towards meeting the needs of those harmed, but while one thought the agreement was fair and in proportion to the harm done, the other was not sure. Both offenders felt they had done what they could to put things right, and one noted that if there was anything more he could have done, he would have.

VALIDATION - ACKNOWLEDGING THE HARM

All too often the realities of victim-survivors’ are challenged. Their understandings of what happened to them are undermined by prevailing rape myths that persist in our communities. Therefore, validating sexual victimisation is an important experience for many victim-survivors (Jülich, 2001). Jülich (2001) did not specifically define validation, but Daly (In Press, p. 11) defined it as:

Affirming that a wrong has occurred and a victim was hurt. It reflects a victim’s desire to be believed and to shift the weight of the accusation from their shoulders to others (family members, a wider social group, or legal officials). Admissions by a perpetrator, although desirable to a victim, may not be necessary to validate a victim’s claim.

This section of the survey aimed to gather information on the acknowledgement of harm. Survivor-victims, offenders and other participants appeared confident that harm was acknowledged, and that the survivor was satisfied by this acknowledgment. One survivor felt blamed for what happened to him/her. One other participant thought the offender blamed someone else for the harm he caused, three were unsure about this, and one said “not really”.

Victim-survivors reported that their questions were answered, but two were unsure as to whether this helped them understand why the offender sexually assaulted them, and one was unsure. Further, other participants (2) said the answers help them to understand the sexual assault or to

mostly understand (2), but one said s/he was unsure, two said “not really” and one said “no”. Other participants (7) reported that offender answered the questions honestly or mostly did so (1).

Given that all the offenders in this study had not undertaken any treatment at the time of the restorative process, it is predictable that they were unable to provide answers that helped the victim-survivor to make sense of “why me”. This is one of the limitations of having the restorative process at this time. Post-treatment restorative processes might provide better results in this area.

VINDICATION - ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY

Victim-survivors often speak of vindication when asked their understandings of justice. Zehr (2002) noted that restorative justice theory argues that vindication is not only an acknowledgement of the harm caused and a recognition that the victim has needs that must be addressed, but also that there must be a recognition that the offender needs to take responsibility and demonstrate accountability.

Daly (In Press, pp. 11-12) discussed vindication in the following context:

Having two aspects of the vindication of the law (affirming the act was wrong) and the vindication of the victim (affirming the perpetrator's actions were wrong). It requires that others (family members, a wider social group, legal officials) censure an offence and affirm their solidarity with a victim. It can be expressed by symbolic and material forms of reparation (e.g., apologies, memorialization, and financial assistance) and standard forms of state punishment.

This section aimed to gather information about vindication as it might be realised by the offender accepting responsibility for his actions in the restorative process. Both offenders agreed they admitted they were wrong, took responsibility for the harm caused, apologised for their behaviour and thought their apology was accepted by the victim-survivor. Other participants tended to reinforce this understanding. All other participants said the offender apologised for the harm caused. Most (8) said the offender admitted what he did was wrong, one was unsure. Five other participants thought the offender took responsibility for the harm caused, three were unsure. Notably victim-survivors' perceptions were a little different. They all agreed that the offender apologised for the harm he caused them, and admitted what he did was wrong (2) or mostly did so (1), but one said the offender did not take responsibility for the harm he caused, two said he did so mostly.

EXPERIENCING A SENSE OF JUSTICE

Whether or not a sense of justice has been experience is not typically realised immediately following the restorative process. This takes time and requires reflection as participants of restorative processes go forward in their lives on their various journeys of recovery. In this part of the survey we asked participants to reflect back over the whole process including the preparation, the restorative process itself, any agreed outcomes, and the time since the restorative process. All three victim-survivors and all nine other participants said the restorative process helped them to experience a sense of justice. Questions of offenders did not ask directly about a sense of justice, but were

focused on the outcomes of restorative processes. Both offenders did not feel pressured to agree to any outcomes, but one regretted some agreements and considered what he agreed to as unfair. The negative responses in this series of questions were made by the same offender.

REVICTIMISATION/REOFFENDING

Indicators that focus on protective factors, those factors that help protect a victim-survivor from revictimisation have not previously been investigated in relation to restorative justice. This part of the survey focussed on the period of time since the restorative process. It aimed to gather information from victim-survivors and other participants as to how restorative processes might empower victim-survivors thereby enabling them to develop protection from revictimisation in other or future relationships. While is no intention to put the onus of keeping safe from sexual assault on victim-survivors, recent research undertaken by the Ministry of Women's Affairs (MWA) (2012) identified a number of risk factors associated with sexual revictimisation. These include among others, prior sexual victimisation and behavioural changes such as dating behaviour, sexual behaviour and alcohol use. No doubt drug use could be included as a risk factor. Increased use of alcohol and drugs following sexual assault is a common coping mechanism for victim-survivors, and is sometimes referred to as self-medicating. The MWA research acknowledged also that motivated offenders target vulnerable women. In relation to the prevalence of sexual revictimisation, MWA found that "at least 50% of girls and women who are sexually assaulted are likely to be sexually revictimised" (p. i). Any justice intervention aiming to address sexual violence must empower victim-survivors so that their vulnerability to sexual revictimisation is minimised.

Having a sense of control over one's life might indicate whether victim-survivors have developed or began to develop some protection against sexual revictimisation as they progress on their journeys of recovery. Victim-survivors and most other participants (of 6 other participants, 4 responded "very well" and 2 "reasonably well") felt that the restorative process helped victim-survivors to have more control over their lives. Self-blame can be counterproductive to recovery. Two survivors said they had or mostly had stopped blaming themselves. Six other participants said the question did not apply for them; the remaining three responses were spread equally over "yes", "mostly" and "not really".

Victim-survivors and other participants were asked questions regarding use of alcohol and drugs, in terms of frequency and amount. Two victim-survivors responded to these questions and said they had noticed changes in the amount and frequency they used alcohol and drugs. One victim-survivor said they used more alcohol and drugs, the other said less. The survivor who said her/his alcohol use had increased (question 24) mentioned later in the survey "that when s/he drinks now s/he does not go to a negative space but stays in an uplifted happy frame of mind which s/he described as being a big turnaround". Later in the survey this particular victim-survivor said s/he said that there were other family issues s/he was dealing with at the time and had not followed up on her/his referral to a Drug and Alcohol programme. This might indicate increased awareness of the need for on-going work beyond the restorative process to minimise vulnerability. Four other participants noticed changes in the victim-survivors' use of alcohol and drugs – two said they used more, two said they used less. In terms of amount used per session two victim-survivors said it was the same.

In regards to offenders, this section aimed to assess how restorative processes might contribute capacity building so that reoffending is minimised. Both offenders said the restorative processes had helped them to address the underlying causes of their offending, with one indicating that restorative processes will help him to not offend in the future. The second offender said that restorative processes would not stop him offending in the future. This was the same offender who said he had agreed to outcomes that were unfair. However, both said that they had developed insights into how the victim-survivor might be feeling. This knowledge might help an offender to keep himself safe in the future. If whānau⁵/family or important people in the offender's life are present at the restorative process they will have developed important insights to the offender's behavioural patterns or offending typologies. They will be valuable support people for the offender as he keeps himself safe in the future.

Project Restore requires all offenders to agree to an assessment for entering a treatment programme and, further, to enter into a treatment programme should the assessment indicate that it would be appropriate. Restorative justice is not a replacement for treatment or therapy; however, it could lead to more offenders accessing treatment programmes. It would be useful to ask treatment providers to explore the differences between those who have been engaged in restorative justice and those who have not. The same could be said for victim-survivors. Jülich (2001) argued that restorative justice would assist victim-survivors to progress their journeys of recovery. Therapists and counsellors working with victim-survivors who have participated in restorative processes might be in the position to identify differences between those who have experienced restorative processes and those who have not.

WELLBEING INDICATORS

Wellbeing indicators could reduce the risk of revictimisation. This is an area that restorative justice might have much potential and needs much more attention. This section of the survey focussed on wellbeing indicators for victim-survivors, offenders and other participants. Victim-survivors were asked to respond across a range of indicators including sense of wellbeing, mental health, relationships within and outside of the family, their ability to work and productivity while at work and finally their physical health. Victim-offenders responses to these indicators were mostly positive, in that they were "much improved," or "somewhat improved". In regards to time off work, one victim-survivor required less amount of time, one about the same and the third replied s/he did not work. One victim-survivor said s/he were visiting health professionals less, the other two said their frequency of visits was unchanged. Additional visits to ACC registered counsellors were increased for one victim-survivor, but frequency remained the same for the other two victim-survivors.

Offenders were asked about their sense of wellbeing and relationships both inside and outside of the family. Both offenders responded that their general sense of wellbeing and relationships within their families was "much improved". Relationships for one offender outside of the family were "somewhat improved". Other participants were asked about their sense of wellbeing and relationships within families. Three responded that both of these wellbeing indicators were "somewhat improved".

⁵ Māori term meaning extended family.

Of note in this series of responses is that the positive responses could indicate that protective factors have been strengthened or increased, resulting in financial savings for individuals, families and communities.

IMPACTS OF RESTORATIVE PROCESSES

This section of the survey focussed on the impacts restorative processes have had on participants' lives. All victim-survivors, offenders and most other participants (8) said the impacts were mostly positive or that there were some positive impacts. One other participant said that there were some negative and some positive impacts. Most respondents went on to describe the impacts and are reported in full in the findings section of this report.

All victim-survivors, offenders and most other participants (6) achieved or mostly achieved what they had hoped to achieve out of the restorative process. Three other participants skipped this question. Most went on to provide examples of what they had achieved and are reported in full in the findings section of this report. The three other participants who skipped this question were asked what they would have liked to achieve. Two responded and these have been reported in full in the findings section of this report. However, there is one response that is noteworthy:

Support for the offender along with a clear statement on how I viewed the offences without being present. I have come to this position for the following reasons:

- a. Too emotionally involved and very much still processing - not really conversant with all the facts through choosing not to read the transcripts (too painful)
- b. Too much added distress and pain so close to the sentencing, in going through face to face encounters,
- c. Too much likelihood of being accused of complicity, due to understandably angry reactions (this was as I was told).

One victim-survivor questionnaire was completed in a face to face interview. This enabled the interviewer, Jennifer Annan, to go beyond the questionnaire asking how s/he felt about the Project Restore staff (in particular Jennifer Annan and Fiona Landon) being pākehā.⁶ The victim-survivor responded that s/he's worked with a lot of Māori women who haven't helped her/him and that s/he got a lot out of working with Project Restore. S/he talked about getting back to her/his whakapapa⁷ and tikanga Māori⁸ and noted that now s/he spends a lot of time on the marae⁹ and has connected with other whānau in a positive way. A significant outcome for this particular victim-survivor and one that Project Restore might not have otherwise learned about.

The same victim-survivor also commented that "I felt a bit iffy about you guys at the start but you were good, you helped me to be honest and front up to my whānau. I learned that I didn't have to put up with all that shit. I didn't trust you guys at first but you did good stuff for me and I am grateful

⁶ A Māori term meaning a New Zealander of European descent.

⁷ A Māori term meaning genealogy.

⁸ A Māori term meaning information on Māori customs and traditions.

⁹ A Māori term meaning a sacred communal meeting place.

for that". Again, this is a significant outcome for this particular victim-survivor but also it is a significant comment regarding the potential of Project Restore to deliver cross-cultural services.

FEEDBACK ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Historically, Project Restore has found it difficult to evaluate their processes. Participants indicate that they agree to be involved in evaluations at the time of their initial referral. But as time goes on they appear to be reluctant to engage further. This series of questions was designed to gather information on the evaluation process. All three victim-survivors, both offenders and most other participants (7) indicated that they experienced no discomfort when answering the questionnaire. One other participant said they were unsure how to answer the questions, because it was unclear who it was about. The other participant indicated that memories of what they had wanted to achieve had surfaced while they were writing. All three victim-survivors, one offender and most other participants (5) said that answering the questionnaire was helpful. Two other participants said it was not helpful and one was unsure. One of the offender's surveys was completed by telephone interview with a Project Restore staff person. The interviewer was able to prompt a little to gather more information. One of these offenders was interviewed by telephone. This particular offender did have some reservations prior to answering the questionnaire because he thought the questions might be too difficult.

It would seem likely that the refinement of the questionnaire would eliminate most issues raised in the feedback section regarding the evaluation process. Project Restore, in future will be able to advise potential participants of evaluations that others have experienced no discomfort and found it helpful and easy to complete. This might go some way to encouraging potential participants to engage in evaluations.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Victim-survivors did not take up the offer of sharing any final thoughts. One offender and 5 other participants did take up the offer. These have been reported in full in the report. However, it is noteworthy that they are all positive comments about Project Restore and how they facilitate their processes.

CONCLUSIONS

There have been no surveys to date that have engaged with those who have participated in restorative processes addressing sexual violence. Given the difficulty of the work and the complexity of harm that has been caused, the findings in this report are significant. It was disappointing that the Project Restore team was unable to engage more participants of their services in this evaluation. The surveys were left open for more than three months; potential participants were given several reminders and several different ways to participate. While there are disadvantages with such a small population to report on there are some advantages, in that we could look across the participants and link responses thereby enabling an analysis by participant rather than just by question. Any conclusions made in this section are very tentative and cannot be generalised to a broader population. Although there can be no claims regarding any statistical significance there are some observations that can be made.

The responses to these surveys were generally positive, particularly those questions that interrogated satisfaction. This is predictable for satisfaction surveys as many commentators note most satisfaction surveys for restorative justice return positive results. Those who voluntarily choose to engage with restorative justice are likely to be highly motivated and may not be representative of those who are either victim-survivors or offenders of sexual violence. Nonetheless, the responses to all three surveys indicate that victim-survivors and offenders appeared to be more satisfied in all aspects of the processes than other participants. This could be because Project Restore has limited resources and invests this into the preparation of victim-survivors and offenders as opposed to other participants. There could be other variables that might impact on how the process is perceived by other participants and is worthy of further investigation. However, it should be noted that one other participant indicated lowered satisfaction throughout the survey.

Daly (In Press) called for evaluators to move beyond mere satisfaction surveys and this project has attempted that. The evaluation has asked questions about the justice indicators identified by Daly that correspond to her justice matrix. The results in this evaluation indicate that across all justice interests all or most participants indicated that the process had attended to their justice needs. They had a voice in the process, offenders had demonstrated accountability by attempting to make amends or put things right, the sexually harmful behaviour was validated by offenders acknowledging the harm, and vindication was realised by offenders accepting responsibility for their behaviour. An experience of a sense of justice appeared very real for these victim-survivors and their supporters. Responses by offenders in this section were not as clear. One offender felt that he had agreed to some things that now considered unfair. The few negative responses that appeared in the offender survey were made by the same offender. This is not necessarily an issue for concern, but is perhaps more reflective of the capacity of the offender to assume and maintain responsibility for his behaviour.

The MWA (2012) research raised the concept of protective factors in the context of sexual revictimisation. At least 50% of girls and women who are sexually assaulted go on to be sexually revictimised. This evaluation queried all participants Project Restore's restorative processes regarding protective factors, wellbeing indicators and the perceived impacts of restorative processes on the lives of all participants. The results indicated that protective factors might have been

enhanced thereby minimising the vulnerability of victim-survivors to sexual revictimisation and the potential of offenders to continue offending.

The surveys tested understandings of the impacts of restorative justice and how restorative processes might impact on longer term outcomes as opposed to a satisfaction survey immediately following the restorative process. Sections of the surveys were directly related to the protective factors and wellbeing indicators that might lessen sexual revictimisation. The surveys trialled questions on the justice interests as identified by Daly (In Press) and the justice needs of victim-survivors in Jülich's (2001, 2006) research.

A survey such as those completed in this project is an inexpensive method of gathering information for purposes of evaluations. The one face-to-face interview conducted in this evaluation appeared to provide information that might not have been collected by any other method. However, this method requires much resource. Project Restore could be better served by identifying ways that would encourage participants of their processes to engage with online surveys. Project Restore plans to refine the surveys and use them as an on-going tool for investigating the outcomes of the restorative processes they facilitate.

REFERENCE LIST

- Daly, K. (In Press). Reconceptualizing sexual victimization and justice. In I. Vanfraechem, A. Permberton & F. Ndahinda (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook of Victimology*. London: Routledge.
- Jülich, S. (2001). *Breaking the silence: Restorative justice and child sexual abuse*. PhD Thesis, Massey, Albany.
- Jülich, S. (2006). Views of justice among survivors of historical child sexual abuse: Implications for restorative justice in New Zealand. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(1), 125-138.
- Jülich, S., Buttle, J., Cummins, C., & Freeborn, E. V. (2010). *Project Restore: An exploratory study of restorative justice and sexual violence*. Auckland: AUT University.
- Jülich, S., & Landon, F. (2012). *Achieving outcomes for participants of Project Restore's restorative processes*. Auckland: Project Restore.
- Ministry of Women's Affairs. (2012). *Lightening does strike twice: Preventing sexual revictimisation*. Wellington: Ministry of Women's Affairs.
- Stenning, P. (1995). Introduction. In P. C. Stenning (Ed.), *Accountability for criminal justice: Selected essays*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Zehr, H. (1995). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottdale: Herald Press.
- Zehr, H. (2002). Journey to belonging. In G. M. Weitekamp & H. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative justice: Theoretical foundations*. Devon: Willan Publishing.