

Restorative Justice: The Need for Awareness Within the Law Enforcement Community

Samuel Trudeau

Bachelor Degree of Law Enforcement Studies

March 27, 2017

Instructor: Florence Daddey

Project Advisor: Phil Eastwood

Table of Contents

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>BACKGROUND</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>PURPOSE OF STUDY</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>RESEARCH QUESTION</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>RATIONALE</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	<u>9</u>
IMAGE OF JUSTICE	9
AVAILABILITY	11
FUNDING	13
<u>DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS</u>	<u>14</u>
IMAGE OF JUSTICE	14
AVAILABILITY	16
A SOLUTION FOR AVAILABILITY	17
FUNDING	18
COLLABORATION IS KEY	19
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>APPENDICES</u>	<u>23</u>
APPENDIX I: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	23
<u>REFERENCES</u>	<u>24</u>

Executive Summary

This study examined the current limitations faced by restorative justice. Specifically, this project was undertaken to find out the current limitations of restorative justice practices and to provide solutions/opportunities to those limitations. Secondary data coming from various articles has been analyzed in order to determine existing gaps and trends that were consistent and repetitive from one article to another. After analysis of the data, main limitations such as, the need to change the image of justice, the lack of availability of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices and the lack of funding have been identified. This research also examines the link between the limitations faced by restorative justice programs and restorative justices practices to the lack of awareness within the community, but, more importantly, with law enforcement practitioners. This study can provide law enforcement practitioners with the information they need to increase the use of restorative justice practices and to acknowledge that restorative justice is an effective way to address criminal behaviours.

Key words: Restorative justice, Diversion programs, availability, effectiveness

Background

Knowledge of the concept of restorative justice is growing among law enforcement agencies, although many people still do not have substantial knowledge about the topic. While traditional justice focuses specifically on the offenders, restorative justice shows that there are other crucial parties involved in the commission of crime and these parties are critical to the success of restoration (Fox, 2014). “Restorative justice’s focus is squarely on repairing

relationships between victims, offenders, and the community in a way that is responsive to considerations of justice” (Fox, 2014, p. 246).

In recent years, research has shown a considerable lack of awareness among law enforcement practitioners in regards to restorative justice programs and practices. According to research conducted by Ipsos Mori, one of the leading survey companies in the United Kingdom (UK). Only 30% of people that participated in the survey had heard about restorative justice in 2015 whereas 77% of the participants were in support of restorative justice practices and thought that victims should have the right to meet with their offender (Restorative Justice Council, 2015). Moreover, in 2015-2016, a crime survey for England and Wales conducted by the Office for National Statistics, the largest independent producer of statistics in the UK (Office for National Statistics, 2017), determined that “only 4.2% of victims of crime where the offender was known to the police recall being offered restorative justice.” (Collins, 2016, p.1). Studies have shown trends and consistency in regards to lack of awareness by both the public and law enforcement agencies, which confirmed the existence of common limitations in the restorative justice world. According to a 2011-2012 Victim Services Survey (VSS) based on 760 victim service providers in Canada, only 30% of the victim service providers reported having provided services related to restorative justice (Statistics Canada, 2012).

Police officers, law enforcement officers and the community as a whole must know and understand the principles and objectives of restorative justice in order to apply it. Previous research studies have shown a critical lack of awareness coming from both the community and law enforcement agencies. The analysis of current limitations faced by restorative justice is an important subject to research since restorative justice has been shown to have positive impacts on

both the community and the different parties involved in the process. For instance, “a review of restorative justice conferencing using face to face meetings of offenders and victims showed that, on average, this approach can cause a modest but highly cost-effective reduction in repeat offending, with substantial benefits for victims.” (Plecas, 2014, p.13).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the limitations encountered by restorative justice programs and practices in order to determine solutions and opportunities, which could potentially influence the awareness of stakeholders regarding restorative justice. By conducting research on essential aspects of restorative justice, such as the results and impacts of restorative justice initiatives, it will be possible to have a clear understanding of how effectively restorative justice has been used and could be better used in the near future. Not only do all those involved with the criminal justice system, including police officers, lawyers, and judges need to better understand the purpose of restorative justice; but more importantly, they need to understand the benefits. This research is relevant because it provides the reader with a better understanding of restorative justice practices and a clear idea of what the current limitations are. Additionally, increased awareness among law enforcement practitioners regarding both the benefits and the limitations of restorative justice will allow the community at large to assist with the development of restorative justice initiatives which will, in turn, have a positive impact on the community in the future. Secondary data gathered among previous studies will be compared using a qualitative design method. The data will be analyzed in order to better understand the challenges faced by restorative justice programs and the possible solutions and opportunities available to address those challenges will be provided.

Research Question

The research question for this project is composed of the following two questions:

- a. What are the current limitations faced by restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices?
- b. What are the opportunities and potential solutions for these limitations?

Once the limitations of restorative justice have been determined from the literature review, those limitations will be analyzed to determine potential solutions. The information necessary to answer the second piece of the research question will also be part of the literature review; however, most of the information regarding the opportunities and potential solutions will be provided in the recommendation portion of this project.

Rationale

Restorative justice is a great process that considers the harm experienced by all the parties involved in the offence including the victim, the offender and the community. However, even with its positive impacts, restorative justice is not as accessible as it should be (Wilson, Huculak & Mcwhinnie, 2002). “Yet accessibility issues persist, hindering a greater number of cases from being dealt with through restorative justice approaches.” (p.35). A research study on *Accessibility and Initiation of Restorative Justice* identified eight different factors that represent barriers for greater accessibility of restorative justice. Among these barriers are availability, awareness, cooperation and cost. (Wilson, Huculak & Mcwhinnie, 2002). If we look at those specific factors from a broader perspective, they are all interrelated to each other. Awareness is at the source of every factor faced by restorative justice. It is then important to increase

awareness among law enforcement practitioners. Reducing the impact of those limitations will positively impact the criminal justice system because restorative justice has shown high satisfaction rates coming from both the victims and the offenders and seems to considerably reduce the probability of recidivism. (Wilson, Huculak & Mcwhinnie, 2002). The objective of this project is to increase the awareness among law enforcement practitioners, regarding the current limitations/challenges of restorative justice and provide them with clear information regarding the opportunities and potential solutions. It is crucial for law enforcement practitioners to be aware of the limitations of restorative justice because they are an inevitable piece of the potential solutions.

The scope of this project is to:

- Identify the current limitations/challenges faced by restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices.
- Determine the reasons of the limitations/challenges.
- Identify available opportunities/solutions.
- Provide recommendation for the future of restorative justice.

Research Design and Methodology

The information collected through this research is mainly coming from the database of the Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC) from January 19, 2017 to March 30, 2017. Other sources of information have been used for this project such as, academic research coming from google search, books, and journal articles from different databases, restorative justice organization websites and surveys. Preliminary research has been done in the EBSCO database

with the search term “Restorative Justice”. Considering that more than 10,000 articles came out from the search, inclusion and exclusion criteria’s were used to reduce the amount of hits. The term “Restorative Justice” was put between quotation marks and the term “Canada” was added which provided 495 articles. The number of articles was once again too high which is why “Full text” and “Scholarly Journals” were added to the search.

Other key terms used through this research included:

- Accessibility of restorative justice.
- Limitations of restorative justice.
- Effectiveness of restorative justice.
- History of restorative justice practices.
- What is restorative justice?

The articles selected for this research were chosen based on their relevant content and consistency regarding the research topic and themes (Image of Justice, Availability, and Fundings). Eight articles among the several articles selected for abstract review were selected for complete review. These articles provided the information required to determine the limitations of restorative justice along with different perspectives regarding the research topic. It will help law enforcement practitioners to have a more complete picture of what are the current challenges faced by restorative justice and this way, increase the chances of interest towards this research. Aspects like titles, years of publication, as well as quality of the data were criteria used in the selection process of articles to increase reliability and value of the data provided through this research. The data collected through this research has been analyzed with a comparative methodology. Secondary data coming from various articles has been analyzed in order to

determine existing gaps and trends that were consistent and repetitive from an article to another. This method increases the reliability of the data since it provides trends that have been noticed from different perspectives, which increase the probability of accuracy.

Literature Review

Image of Justice

Canada has a long established background in terms of restorative justice. Restorative justice began to emerge in the 1970s with the influence of Aboriginal people, the work of faith communities and the community-based movement and efforts to rehabilitate offenders (Tompsonski, Buck, Bagen & Binder, 2011). Restorative justice considerably evolved over the years and is now supported by law and policies. Both the *Criminal Code of Canada* and the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) are supporting restorative justice practices while defining the criteria to follow for adult alternative measures and youth extrajudicial sanctions (Tompsonski, Buck, Bagen & Binder, 2011). However, studies seem to show that restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices not only need the support of government with laws and policies, but most importantly, need the support of law enforcement practitioners.

Traditional justice practices hold offenders accountable for their actions, without encouraging offenders to gain an understanding of the effects of their actions on the victims. On the other hand, restorative justice sees crime as damaged relationships among the community. In order to raise awareness among the community, people, including law enforcement agencies must understand the definition of restorative justice. As mentioned by Kathleen Daly, “A lack of agreement on definition means that RJ has not one, but many identities and referents; and this can create theoretical, empirical, and policy confusion.” (2005, p.2). Traditional approaches to

crime uses a retributive framework that focuses on punishment such as punitive sanctions (Lokanan, 2009).

Restorative justice is often seen as a softer approach to crime and a way to avoid prison (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, 2011). This false assumption erases the punishment aspect of restorative justice and makes people believe that no punishment is involved in the process. In fact, “as for being ‘soft on crime,’ many offenders who have participated in these programs, particularly those where they have met the victim, say it was tougher than the punishment they would normally receive.” (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, 2011, p. 12). Punishment is both part of retributive and restorative justice approaches. An important point has also been highlighted by the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, which argued that some cases do not need a sentence that includes prison, while in some others, participating in restorative justice might not be sufficient and the need of prison sentencing can be required due to different reasons (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, 2011, p. 12). Examples of the reasons include the past records of the offender or the high risk to re-offend (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, 2011, p. 12). Referring to the previous statement, taking part in one approach does not automatically eradicate the other one, it can also be a combination of both.

As mentioned by Mark Lokanan in *An Open Model for Restorative Justice: Is There Room for Punishment?*, the term “punishment” has different meanings for different people. Punishment is defined as “the ‘intentional’ or ‘deliberate imposition of pain on the offenders’.” (Lokanan, 2009, p.293). However, referring to this definition, punishment is strictly equated to retributive approaches such as punitive sanctions, which would explain why people do not link

punishment to restorative approaches. The public must understand the different approaches used between retributive justice and restorative justice and reinvent the image of restorative approaches. According to Zehr, “Real world justice might also best viewed as a continuum.” (Zehr, 2002, p. 60). On the one end is the traditional (Western) legal or Criminal justice system model and on the other are the restorative alternatives. According to Zehr, the realistic goal would be to move as far as we can in the direction of restorative alternatives while keeping the foundation of traditional justice.

Availability

Throughout the course of this research, another important theme was identified as part of the main limitation encountered by restorative justice. Several studies and surveys coming from different countries including the United Kingdom, and most importantly, Canada have shown a trend regarding the availability of restorative justice in the criminal justice system. The lack of awareness plays a big role in that particular area. Awareness is a fundamental piece of the puzzle when it comes to consideration of sanctions. As specified in “Accessibility of Restorative Justice: Attitudes as Barriers to Greater Referrals” research conducted in 2015 by Malini Laxminarayan and Annemieke Wolthuis, “Culture may change to become more restorative through greater awareness, cooperation and trust.” (Laxminarayan, & Wolthuis, 2015). In order for offenders and victims to have accessibility to restorative justice programs and sanctions, people in charge of the application of justice must be aware of restorative possibilities. Availability of restorative justice has been among the limitations of restorative justice practices for a long period of time. As mentioned earlier in this research by Wilson, Huculak & Mcwhinnie, availability is one of the factors obstructing the expansion of restorative justice. In

support to that statement, Laxminarayan and Wolthuis stated in their research that availability was still a limitation in 2015, fifteen years after Wilson, Huculak & Mcwhinnie's statement. According to Laxminarayan and Wolthuis, "*availability* largely refers to having sufficient criminal justice resources and establishing equal access (Shapland et al., 2004)." (2015, p. 36). Unfortunately, it is not the case for most of the cases. In fact, as the results showed in a Victim Services Survey conducted in Canada in 2011-2012, few victim service providers refer victims to restorative justice. According to the survey conducted on 760 victim service providers, only 30% of them declared having been offered restorative justice services (Allen, 2015). These numbers lead to the conclusion that there is a lack of awareness among victim service providers. "Knowing more about the benefits of restorative justice, often through party narratives or restorative justice practitioners, is more likely to lead legal bodies to engage in referrals" (Laxminarayan, & Wolthuis, 2015, p.37).

Moreover, according to "Reflections on the Past, Present, and Future of Restorative Justice in Canada", research conducted by Tomporowski, Buck, Bagen and Binder in 2011, there is a considerable number of restorative justice practitioners who want to increase the number of criminal cases referred to restorative approaches. "Information from provincial and territorial government officials suggests that restorative justice tends to be used more with youth matters and property crimes" (p.826). Tomporowski, Buck, Bagen and Binder also specified that the lack of awareness among members of the public and justice officials was contributing to the "relatively modest" use of restorative justice in the criminal justice system. Even if some restorative justice agencies are making extensive efforts in order to include victims into restorative justice, the availability of programs for victims is not consistent throughout the

country (Tompsonowski, Buck, Bagen and Binder, 2011), which is why awareness regarding the definition and impact of restorative justice has to be increased.

Funding

Funding is a fundamental aspect for the success of restorative justice. As mentioned in “Restorative Justice in the States: An Analysis of Statutory Legislation and Policy”, funding is critical for the implementation of restorative justice policy. The provision of adequate resources increases the chances of implementation and success of policies (Pavelka, 2016). According to the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, “a significant amount of funding is required to develop and sustain restorative justice programs” (2011, p. 4). Unfortunately, as mentioned by The Fairview Community Restorative Justice Program (FCRJ), one of the programs that spoke up after experiencing a cut in funding for the Alberta Community Restorative Justice Grant program in August 2011. “It is difficult for non profit RJ groups to continue to provide the services, develop new approaches and expand the program with no assurances of consistent funding.” (Fairview Community Restorative Justice, 2012, p.1).

Lack of funding is consistent and restrains the majority of community based programs and non-profit organizations. It was also a limitation discussed in the 2014 Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel of Crime Reduction. According to the report, British Columbian prevention programs including community based restorative justice programs could not expand due to monetary issues. The panel heard cases where pilot projects with good results could not build and improve once again due to a lack of financial support (Plecas, 2014). Even if the Ministry of Justice confirmed that several hundreds of programs have been provided with funding, the report

specified that “they have typically been supported via time-limited or one-time funding” (Plecas, 2014, p. 7).

Law enforcement practitioners must acknowledge that the limitations faced by the majority of the restorative justice programs are fixable. In regards to funding, law enforcement practitioners have to encourage the utilization and communicate positive outcomes among law enforcement agencies. By doing so, restorative justice programs could gain the support of police agencies and government and this way increase the credibility of restorative justice (Fairview Community Restorative Justice, 2012). As mentioned by the Fairview Community Restorative Justice, “credibility is in large part determined by the support of our Police and government. Cuts or lack of funding to Restorative Justice programs creates the impression that Restorative Justice is not a government priority.” (Fairview Community Restorative Justice, 2012, p.1).

“Restorative justice in itself lacks the active engagement in research development in the broad context of the justice system and thus falls short on its ability to fully integrate into the justice system” (Eastwood, 2016, p. 18). This statement clearly defines the need for engagement in regards to restorative justice. In other words, it is important for law enforcement practitioners to support and promote restorative justice practices in order to help its full integration in the criminal justice system.

Discussion and Findings

Image of Justice

In relation to the first piece of the research question, the purpose of which was to identify the current limitations of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices, there are

three different themes which stand out from the literature. The themes in question were the need to change the image of justice, the availability of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices and finally the lack of funding. While conducting my research, and reviewing the literature, I found a correlation between the lack of awareness of law enforcement practitioners and the current limitations faced by restorative justice.

As mentioned above, the need to change the image of justice was the first theme that stands out from the literature. As specified by Kathleen Daly, there is a lack of agreement regarding the definition of restorative justice. Definitions differ from one person to another and according to Daly, it can create theoretical, empirical and policy confusion. (Daly, 2005). This being said, leads us to another issue regarding the image of restorative justice. The Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime states that restorative justice is often seen as a softer way to deal with crime. However, with a clear understanding of restorative justice practices, people would potentially not come to this conclusion. In fact, the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, also specified that offenders having had the opportunity to participate in restorative justice programs found it more difficult than their usual retributive sanction (Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, 2011). Restorative justice is a real clash for offenders since restorative justice focuses on reconciliation and rehabilitation, things that are not priorities in retributive practices (Dhami, Joy, 2007). Throughout the literature, I noticed that the fact that people do not see restorative justice as a real punishment, makes it hard to fully integrate the criminal justice system and gain credibility. As highlighted by the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, punishment is part of both retributive and restorative approaches. In *An Open Model for Restorative Justice: Is There Room for Punishment?*, Mark Lokanan talks about the

different meanings that people attribute to punishment. Lokanan suggest that punishment is often attributed to retributive justice specifically (Lokanan, 2009). Lokanan defined punishment as “the ‘intentional’ or ‘deliberate imposition of pain on the offenders’.” (Lokanan, 2009, p.293). The correlation that I noticed through the literature is that the lack of awareness among law enforcement practitioners regarding the punishment process and the real image of restorative justice, decreases the chances of the integration of restorative justice within the criminal justice system. If law enforcement practitioners had more knowledge of the process and they would be aware that restorative justice is not a “softer” but rather “different” way to address criminal behaviours. Restorative justice programs could gain support and credibility that would benefit and help restorative justice to grow and spread.

Availability

The second theme that stands out from the literature portion of this research was the availability of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices. Wilson, Huculak and Mcwhinnie identified in 2015, 8 limitation factors that are currently faced by restorative justice. One of the factors in question was the availability of restorative justice programs. Laxminarayan and Wolthuis defined availability as “having sufficient criminal justice resources and establishing equal access (Shapland et al., 2004).” (2015, p. 36). Unfortunately, the literature confirmed Laxminarayan and Wolthuis’s statement and showed a lack of availability that was consistent from one country to another. In fact, a Victim Services Survey conducted in Canada in 2011-2012, showed that few victim service providers refer victims to restorative justice. According to the survey conducted on 760 victim service providers, only 30% of the victim service providers declared having been offered restorative justice services (Allen, 2015). These

numbers lead to the conclusion that the lack of awareness among victim service providers decreases the availability of restorative justice programs for victims of crime. Additionally, in 2015-2016, a crime survey for England and Wales conducted by the Office for National Statistics, the largest independent producer of statistics in the UK (Office for National Statistics, 2017), determined that “only 4.2% of victims of crime where the offender was known to the police recall being offered restorative justice.” (Collins, 2016, p.1)

These numbers show a consistency regarding the lack of availability between two different countries and increases the probability that lack of awareness does effect the accessibility of restorative justice. As mentioned in research conducted by Malini Laxminarayan and Annemieke Wolthuis, “culture may change to become more restorative through greater awareness, cooperation and trust.” (Laxminarayan, & Wolthuis, 2015). Referring to this statement, awareness would then be the source and reason for the lack availability of restorative justice within the criminal justice system. Tomporowski, Buck, Bagen and Binder also specified that the lack of awareness among members of the public and justice officials was contributing to the “relatively modest” use of restorative justice in the criminal justice system. Even if some restorative justice agencies are making extensive efforts to make restorative justice accessible, the availability of programs for victims is not consistent yet (Tompsonowski, Buck, Bagen and Binder, 2011).

A Solution for Availability

A solution for the lack of availability would be to develop and maintain community awareness regarding restorative justice programs and invite members of the public that have been affected by the offence to participate in the restorative justice process. Organizations such

as The Restorative Justice-Victoria program (RJVic), uses different techniques in order to involve the community in the restorative process. Examples of techniques are, determination of the community affected by the offence, who the community members are and especially if the victims, offenders or both resides in the community affected by the offence (Dhami & Joy, 2007). Another technique mentioned by Dhami and Joy was to “gain the support of local businesses and other organizations that share an interest in combating crime in the area.” (2007, p.14). Once the community served by the restorative justice program is identified, it is important to develop and maintain the community awareness and support for the program. “Education is important to gain acceptance of what some people consider an unusual and ‘soft’ response to crime.” (Dhami & Joy, 2007. P.14). As mentioned above, the support and creation of community based restorative programs are important and have to be utilized. By creating a public interest regarding restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices, law enforcement practitioners might increase their rate of referrals and utilization of restorative justice.

Funding

The third theme that stands out from the literature is the lack of funding for restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices. As mentioned earlier in the literature, the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime stated that “a significant amount of funding is required to develop and sustain restorative justice programs” (2011, p. 4). Unfortunately, as discussed by The Fairview Community Restorative Justice Program (FCRJ), “it is difficult for non profit RJ groups to continue to provide the services, develop new approaches and expand the program with no assurances of consistent funding.” (Fairview Community Restorative Justice, 2012, p.1). Lack of financial support was consistent through different research. In fact, in 2014,

the Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel of Crime Reduction showed that British Columbian prevention programs including community based restorative justice programs could not expand due to monetary issues (Plecas, 2014). The report also showed that hundreds of programs did get financial support; however, the report specified that “they have typically been supported via time-limited or one-time funding” (Plecas, 2014, p. 7). It is then clear that the financial support coming from the Ministry of Justice was not sufficient for the well-functioning and expansion of restorative justice programs. (Plecas, 2014).

Collaboration Is Key

Solutions regarding the lack of financial support have been provided by Dhami and Joy in their research called *Challenges to Establishing Volunteer- Run, Community-Based Restorative Justice Programs*. Dhami and Joy, prioritizes the collaboration between restorative justice programs and the local government, since they are key partners and stakeholders with regards to funds initiatives (Dhami & Joy, 2007, p.14). They also emphasis the collaboration between restorative justice programs and local businesses because “local businesses that are affected by crimes such as theft and vandalism may also wish to provide financial support to RJ programs, and thus may be useful partners.” (Dhami & Joy, 2007, p.14). Community-based programs are reliant on collaboration and partnerships for specific reasons. Referrals, financial support and promotion of restorative justice programs are dependent on collaboration. Agencies having an impact on restorative justice programs have to collaborate and work together in order to make a difference for future restorative justice initiatives and programs (Dhami & Joy, 2017).

Recommendations

After doing research and analyzing the data collected, I believe that current limitations faced by restorative justice are the lack of agreement regarding the definition of restorative justice (Image of Justice), the lack of availability of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices and finally, the lack of financial support (funding). The recommendations I have to improve access to restorative justice are the following:

Firstly, since there is no agreement regarding the definition of restorative justice practices and people still think that restorative justice is a softer way to address and deal with criminal behaviours it will be fundamental for the criminal justice system to agree on a definition. It will give a clear and consistent picture of the restorative justice process, and theoretical, empirical and policy confusion could be considerably reduced.

Secondly, the involvement of the community within the restorative justice process is critical for the well-functioning of restorative justice. As mentioned in the discussion portion of this project, partnership with members of the community like local businesses are fundamental for support. By increasing the involvement of the public in the restorative justice process, the public interest towards restorative justice could be increased. Public interest is crucial for government involvement. By increasing public interest, government could potentially consider bigger and more consistent funding for restorative justice programs. Additionally, law enforcement practitioners would be dragged into the restorative movement and more referrals and use of restorative justice programs and practices could be increased.

Finally, in order for restorative justice programs to have access to more financial support, it is once again important to increase awareness and communicate the benefits of implementing and supporting restorative justice programs. By collaborating with local businesses and by encouraging the use of restorative justice, awareness could be increase regarding the positives impacts of restorative justice and as mentioned by Malini Laxminarayan and Annemieke Wolthuis, “culture may change to become more restorative through greater awareness, cooperation and trust.” (Laxminarayan, & Wolthuis, 2015).

Conclusion

To conclude, the focus of this study was to identify the current limitations of restorative justice programs and restorative justice practices. After deciding to research the limitations of restorative justice, I conducted a qualitative research study in order to gather information to answer my research questions that was composed of two distinct pieces. I did a thorough analysis of the existing literature, regarding restorative justice and the challenges faced by programs throughout different geographical locations. After analyzing the literature, I determined that the most researched limitations of restorative justice were, the need to change the image of restorative justice, the lack of availability of restorative justice practices and finally, the lack of funding. Analysis of the limitations brought me to the second piece of the research question which was to identify potential opportunities/solutions for the limitations. Information gathered among reports, research documents and surveys provided me with information necessary for the determination of future opportunities and solutions that have been provided in the discussion and recommendations portion of this project. The literature showed a critical lack of awareness regarding restorative justice. I decided to focus on increasing awareness among law enforcement

practitioners because they are the ones who have the power to apply it. Law enforcement practitioners are directly involved in the criminal justice system and have the potential to fully integrate restorative justice in the criminal justice system. Awareness is the key for the success of restorative justice and law enforcement practitioners must understand the benefits and impact of restorative justice on their community.

Appendices

Appendix I: Research Methodology

Databases	All the resources, JIBC Library system
Initial Search Terms	Restorative justice
Number of hits	10 350
Limits	Scholarly (Peer reviewed) journals, Full text, Available in the library collection, between 2000 and 2017
Number of hits	4801
Refined Search Terms	"Canada"
Number of hits	313
Selected for Abstract Review	25
Selected for full Review	8

References

- Allen, M., (2015). Victim services in Canada, 2011/2012. *Juristat*, 34(1). Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-x. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2014001/article/11899-eng.htm>
- Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime. (2011). *Restorative justice in Canada: What victims should know*. Retrieved from <https://crcvc.ca/docs/restjust.pdf>
- Centre for Justice and Reconciliation. (2017). *Introduction to restorative justice*. Retrieved from <http://restorativejustice.org/restorative-justice/about-restorative-justice/>
- Collins, J. (2016, August 15). How can more victims access restorative justice? [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/blog/how-can-more-victims-access-restorative-justice>
- Daly, K. (2005). The limits of restorative justice. Retrieved from Antoniocasella: http://www.antoniocasella.eu/restorative/Daly_2005.pdf
- Dhami, M. K., & Joy, P. (2007). Challenges to establishing volunteer-run, community-based restorative justice programs. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 10(1), 9-22.
doi:10.1080/10282580601157455
- Eastwood, A. (2016). *Widening the circle: An exploration of the challenges and opportunities for restorative justice in British Columbia* (Bachelor's thesis). Burnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University

- Fairview Community Restorative Justice. (2012). *The fight for restorative justice funding continues*. Retrieved from <http://www.fcj.ca/home/2012/5/14/the-fight-for-restorative-justice-funding-continues.html>
- Fox., K. J. (2014). Restoring the social: Offender reintegration in a risky world. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 38(3), 235-256, doi: 10.1080/01924036.2013.848221
- Laxminarayan, M., & Wolthuis, A. (2015). Accessibility of restorative justice: Attitudes as barriers to greater referrals. *Social Work Review*, 14(4), 35-45. Retrieved from <http://www.revistadeasistentasociala.ro/>
- Lokanan, M. (2009). An open model for restorative justice: Is there room for punishment? *Contemporary Justice Review*, 12(3), 289-307. doi:10.1080/10282580903105806
- Plecas, D. (2014). *Getting serious about crime reduction: Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Crime Reduction*. Retrieved from Government of British Columbia website: <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/law-crime-and-justice/criminal-justice/police/publications/government/blue-ribbon-crime-reduction.pdf>
- Restorative Justice Council. (2015). *New polling demonstrates overwhelming support for restorative justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/news/new-polling-demonstrates-overwhelming-support-restorative-justice>
- Tomprowski, B., Buck, M., Bagen, C., & Binder, V. (2011). Reflections on the past, present, and future of restorative justice in Canada. *Alberta Law Review*, 48(4), 815-829. Retrieved from <https://www.albertalawreview.com/index.php/ALR>

Wilson, R. J., Psych, C., Huculak, B., & Mcwhinnie, A. (2002). Restorative justice innovations in Canada. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 20(4), 363-380. Retrieved from

[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1099-0798](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1099-0798)

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books