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Abstract

This study is a quantitative examination of Restorative Justice and Garda perceptions towards Restorative Justice in Ireland.

The introduction of restorative justice practice was first implemented in 2001 as a method of redress for offenders by The Commissioner of An Garda Síochána. Restorative Justice Initiatives were originally implemented by the Juvenile Diversion Programme and have now progressed into the Adult Diversion Programme with the establishment of the Higher Tariff Offender Reparation Programme (HTORP).

The Literature review illustrates the theories and principles behind the process of restorative justice, Garda involvement in restorative justice initiatives, international perspectives and programmes. The primary method of data collection was the use of questionnaires containing qualitative and quantitative components which examined the mentioned variables and list of fifteen qualitative questionnaire. It is evident that more investment needs to be made into the promotion restorative justice initiatives within An Garda Síochána, as 51% of participants indicated that there is not a high value place on restorative justice in Ireland.
Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis examines Restorative Justice and Garda perceptions of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland. In recent years, restorative justice is a paradigm that has been catapulted onto an international platform with many criminal justices systems adopting various forms of restorative justice practices. The process of restorative justice presents an alternative to traditional court sentencing procedure. This process promotes the concepts of restitution and reparation rather than incarceration as, it aims to restore the harm done by the offender to the victim and the communities involved (Kenny, 2008).

Consedine (1999) suggests that the philosophy of restorative justice is to embrace a number of human attributes such as, healing, compassion, forgiveness, mercy mediation reconciliation and when necessary the implementation of sanctions. Through this process the victim is given the opportunity to meet with the offender giving them the ability to express the emotional and physical distress caused as a result of the offenders actions (Graef, 2000). The victim is given a voice throughout the whole process, allowing the offender to face the consequences of their actions. The offender is given opportunity to take responsibility for their behaviour and actions and try to make amends for the distress they have cause the victim and their community. The types of criminal offences which could be considered for restorative justice programme are, assault, public order, theft, possession of drugs and possession of a weapon (Kenny, 2008). First time offenders and offences which may not attract a custodial sentence but could result in the offender facing a conviction, make up the majority of the referrals to this programme.
1.1: Defining Restorative Justice:

While there is no single definition of restorative justice, and many varied definitions are offered by the literature, the fundamental principles of the concept of restorative justice are similar. Kenny (2008) suggests that the primary goal of restorative justice is not to punish the perpetrator for the offending act, but to make good the harm done to the victim, the community and the offender it is argued that the process of restorative justice seeks to ‘empower both victims and offenders to redress rather than reprove criminal activity’ (Kenny, 2008, pg7).

The Nation Commission for Restorative Justice Defines the Process as:

‘Restorative justice is presented as a forward-looking, problem-solving approach to crime, which involves the parties themselves and the community generally in an active relationship with various agencies. Restorative justice brings victims and offenders into contact with each other and it gives victims an opportunity to get answers to questions that are of direct concern to them. It also gives them a chance to tell offenders the real impact and consequences of their wrongdoing. Accordingly, it can be a significant experience that may provide the victim with a degree of closure.’(Nation Commission of Restorative Justice p11) (NCRJ)

1.2 Perceptions for the use of Restorative Justice:

‘Restorative Justice is a victim sensitive response to criminal offending, which, through engagement with those affected by crime, aims to make amends for the harm that has been caused to victims and communities and which facilitates offender rehabilitation and integration into society’ (National Commission on Restorative Justice 2009 p9 para7) (NCRJ).
Kenny (2008) suggests that the interest in restorative justice initiative originates from international advocates in America and Europe, who recognise that traditional forms of punishment such as detention and incarceration is failing to extend, a sense of fairness, satisfaction and security from the justice system. It is argued that the Irish justice system excludes the victim from the system and it is centrally concerned with punishment (Kenny, 2008). The development of restorative justice initiatives provides a viable alternative to incarceration, thus assisting in the decrease of the prison population in Ireland. It emphasises the need for an outcome for the victim and community rather than, immediately punishing the offender (Liebmann, 2007).

On the 3rd of December 2015 the Irish Penal Reform Trust published statistics on the Irish prison population. On this date Irish prisons held 3,777 people in custody. (Irish Penal Trust Reform, 2015). This figure portrays Ireland’s culture of high levels of incarceration existing as a first resort to deal with criminal convictions. The Irish Penal Reform Trust has further proposed a ‘de-carceration strategy’ to the government whereby the prison population would be reduced by one third over a period of ten years. In March 2007 the Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform announced the establishment of the National Commission on Restorative Justice. The Probation Service Strategy Statement (2012-14,p8) states that restorative justice initiatives aim to reduce re-offending by identifying three strategic goals, to reduce re-offending and victimisation through promoting and managing Community Sanctions. To build and develop strategic alliances and partnerships. To enhance our organisational capability, excellence and innovation’.

John Braithwaite (1989) who is described as being one of the most influential figures in the evolution of the concept of restorative justice advocated that the idea of restorative justice requires a different way of thinking towards traditional aspects such as deterrence, rehabilitation, incapacitation and crime prevention. Braithwaite contends that restorative
justice is a more victim centred approach within the criminal justice system, as its main aim according to Braithwaite is to restore the victim (Braithwaite, 1989). Braithwaite (1989) advocates that restorative justice as a process aims to show the offender the error of their ways, making them responsible for of their actions and to apologise with sincerity to the victim for any harm they may have caused. Braithwaite further proposed the concept of ‘integrative shaming’ proposed that stigmatisation of offenders is a large part of why criminal justice systems are failing. Braithwaite’s theory of reintegration suggests that societies with the lowest crime rates that have the ability to shame criminal conduct most effectively (Braithwaite, 1989). He believes that it is of utmost importance to differentiate between shaming a person and stigmatising them. Braithwaite believed that integrative shaming prevents crime, while stigmatisation a form of shaming can make the issue of crime worse. Braithwaite’s theory emphasises the importance of disapproving of the criminal act but not the person, while allowing offenders to take responsibility for their actions and attempt to make amends for the wrong they have committed (Braithwaite, 1989). The overall aim of restorative justice is to restore the dignity of the victim by making good the harm cause by the offender (Kenny, 2008). Sharp (1996) suggests that restorative justice involves the consideration of the impact of the offender’s actions on the victim and others involved such as peer groups, community, families and friends.

1.3: The Organisation of An Garda Síochána:

In 1822 an organised policing began in Ireland with the foundation of the *Irish Constabulary*. 1867 this police force was given the title of the *Royal Irish Constabulary*. In 1922 the Royal Irish Constabulary was disbanded upon the foundation of the Irish Free State and *An Garda Síochána* was then formed in the same year. The Dublin Metropolitan Police and An Garda Síochána where then amalgamated in 1925. According to figures published by the Commissioners Annual Report in 2001 there was approximately 11,814 service men and
women, in 2015 An Garda Síochána stated that there was currently 12,882 active service men and women, 120 of which are classified as specially employed Juvenile liaison officers.(An Garda Síochána., 2015)

1.4: An Garda Síochána and Restorative Justice Pilot Programmes:

An Garda Síochána recognised the potential in the restorative approach and initiated a programme of restorative cautions and conferences on a pilot basis in 1999 (Kenny, 2008). An Garda Síochána are involved in restorative justice initiatives at both adult and a juvenile level, The Higher Tariff Offender Reparation Programme (HTORP) is the restorative justice initiative which is involved with the persecution of adult offenders while, the Juvenile Diversion programme which is an initiative concerned with the juvenile aspect of restorative justice (NCRJ, 2009). In 2010 the Minister for Justice issued a statement in Dail Eireann detailing the implement of restorative justice schemes around Ireland ‘The objective of the scheme is to build the foundation for the implementation of a robust restorative justice model of practice providing an alternative to a prison sentence of less than 12 months’ duration’ (McCarthy, 2011). Anyone can volunteer take part in a restorative justice meeting or conference, participants may include the offender, the victim, and the casework members of the panel, a member of An Garda Síochána or a juvenile liaison officer. Anyone who can influence the offender in a positive way and contribute to the process may be invited by either the offender or the victim.
1.5: The Juvenile Diversion Programme:

'It is recognised that the delay in entry of a young person into the formal criminal justice system may help prevent entry into that system altogether' (An Garda Síochána H.Q. Directive 91/1991)

With the introduction of the Part 4 of the Children Act 2001, the Garda Diversion Programme was established to replace the pre-existing Juvenile Liaison Officer Scheme which deals with juveniles under the age of 18, who have committed an offence. Section 18 of Children act 2001 states that 'any child who has committed a criminal act and accepts responsibility for the criminal behaviour will be considered for admission to a diversion programme, unless the interests of society would not be served by the diversion'. (NCRJ.,2009 p 43 ). This programme aims to divert the juvenile from the traditional punishments of the criminal justice system by way of a caution, providing that they have accepted the consequences for their criminal behaviour. The Juvenile may be issued with a formal or informal caution which is evaluated upon the degree of criminal act for example minor theft, assault, public disturbance. They will then be placed under the supervision of a Juvenile Liaison Officer (JLO) for a period of 12 months (NCRJ, 2009). In order for the juvenile to be an eligible candidate for a caution within the Diversion Programme they must meet a number of criteria as outlined in the Children Act 2001 'the juvenile is under 18 years of age at the time of the offence, the juvenile must admit involvement in the offence, the juvenile has not been cautioned previously or, if cautioned previously, it would be deemed
appropriate to administer a further caution, the parents, guardians or persons acting in loco parentis agree to the terms of the caution (NCRJ, 2009 p44).

The Director of the diversion programme is the Garda Superintendent at the Garda Youth Diversion Office decides whether a caution is a feasible option for the offender or to prosecute. The most appropriate course of action to be taken based on a number of factors, the nature of the crime, the impact caused by the crime to the victim and the community, the previous history of the juvenile. (Diversion Programme for Young Offenders, 2015). If granted an informal caution the offender is cautioned in the presence of their parents/guardians to refrain from participating in criminal activity in the future. In the case were the juvenile office recommends a formal caution, the Juvenile Liaison officer under the Children Act 2001 sets up a family conference which serves as a restorative caution to address the offender’s behaviour and draw up an action plan to avoid the re-occurrence of offence. The restorative justice conferencing process allows the offender, their family and the victim and their support to come together depending on the nature of the offence. In some instances after the conference the offender may not face any other form of prosecution or no further action taken by An Gardaí against them (Kenny, 2008)

1.6: The Higher Tariff Offender Programme (HTORP):

The Higher Tariff Offender Programme is the Adult Restorative Justice Initiative in Ireland introduced into the Criminal Justice Courts in 2012 on a pilot basis. The establishment of this programme followed on from the success of two plot programme the Nenagh Community Reparation Project in 1999 and the victim or offender mediation project in located in Tallaght in 2000. The HTORP is a restorative justice initiative which members of An Garda Síochána participant in voluntarily however, it is not operated by An Garda Síochána (Kenny, 2008). The programme targets offenders who are set to face a one year
custodial sentence for an offence they have committed or for their participation in criminal activity. Offenders must attend a series of meetings with a case coordinator from the Restorative Justice Service, followed by a meeting with a panel of four members. The panel is made up of a case coordinator, a chair person, a member of An Garda Síochána and a probation officer (ACJDS, 2013).

An example of a restorative justice programme is The Nenagh Community Reparation Project a plot scheme introduced in 1999 located in Nenagh Co. Tipperary. It is a community based reparation project funded by the probation service. It is a year-long project managed by local communities, representing the interests of the community while working in association with the Probation Welfare Service (Kenny, 2008).

1.7: International perspectives of Restorative Justice:

New Zealand made some of the first international changes to their judicial system in 1989, with the introduction of restorative justice initiatives. Maguire et al (1997), suggest that internationally there is a difference in the method of restorative justice implemented, New Zealand and Canada differ from counties such as the US and Britain by choosing to rediscover ancient practices and incorporating them into their justice systems (Kenny, 2008). According to Graef (2000), the New Zealand Government passed the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act, which was introduced at an intermediate stage between arrest and sentencing. Based on the principles of restorative justice family group conferencing invites, juvenile offenders, the victim and any supporters of either the victim or the offender to attend. The professionals involved in the conferencing process are police, youth aid officers the international equivalent of a Juvenile Liaison officer in Ireland and the offender’s teacher or a social worker. During the conferencing process the facilitator explores the actions and behaviour of the offender that lead to the offence and the effects of the offenders
actions on others for example the victim and the community. The focus of the conference is on trying to repair the damage, prevent further offending and create an action plan to make good on the harm done with the appropriate guidance from the youth aid officer (Kenny, 2008).

Graef (2000) findings indicate that,

1. *Eighty per cent of less serious cases are diverted from court to informal measures, often restorative in nature. The remaining twenty per cent Family Group Conferencing is used instead of the court process, or in more serious cases, the conferencing model is used to develop recommendations made to court during in the pre-sentencing report. If the judge accepts the plan it will normally form the basis for a three-month court order. If all conditions of the plan are completed, the case is discharged. Justice is deemed to have been done.* (Graef, 2000, p.25)

1.8 Previous Research:

Many international restorative policing studies have been carried out to examine relationships between police forces and restorative justice initiatives in different contexts. The police play an essential role as gatekeepers in restorative justice program as Braithwaite and associates have shown with their work with the Australian Group Conferencing (AGC) police forces regarding restorative policing (Braithwaite’s, 1997; Sherman et al., 1998). The Bethlehem Restorative Policing Program is a police-based family group conferencing imitative. McCold and Wachtel (1998) study endorses the essential role that police play in the implementation of correct restorative procedures which exemplifies a union of community and problem-oriented policing re-integrative shaming and restorative justice—a
union which could be termed “restorative policing.” As an operational philosophy for policing, restorative policing seeks to: “Encourage accountability, reparation, and reintegration and healing. Reduce recidivism. Resolve conflict and eliminate ongoing problems. Provide communities with a satisfying experience of justice. Reduce reliance on the criminal justice system and formal processes. Transform police attitudes, organizational culture and role perceptions.” (McCold and Wachtel., 1998).

Another renowned study is the Winfree (2004) study, examining the New Zealand Police and their restorative justice Philosophy a sample group of sworn police officers serving in the New Zealand Police and a subsample of youth aid officers were used for the duration of this study. Winfree’s (2004) study examined the difference between the restorative justice philosophy of youth aid officers and sworn police. A similar study conducted by Abramson (2003), examined the relationships and competing values of restorative justice initiatives and the police. Abramsons (2003) study was designed to explore the relationship between the police and the community-based youth justice program in British Columbia, in relation to the restorative justice initiatives operating within the areas. It became evident that the overall police opinion of restorative justice initiatives currently in operation practices differed between the police and the youth aid programme.

Braithwaite, Wilgrave & Harris (2004) have suggested that there is a number of emotional dynamics evident throughout the process of restorative justice. For instance it has been noted that throughout the hearing and conferencing process empathy and forgiveness are two emotion exhibited, from victim, offenders and members of the police. Moore, (1990) asserts that empathy is ‘an organiser and regulator of a variety of behaviours. Empathy is said to be a key component to human nature (Zahn et al., 1990) and as such it critical to normal development and justice. Harris, (2001); Maxwell and Morris, 2002, outline the importance of empathy and compassion as triggers for emotional process through restorative dynamics.
Empathy for victim’s suffering cause the offender to recognise the fault in their actions. Empathy is a key emotional dynamic which leads to remorse, guilt and shame. As a result it is vital to the activation of the potential for compassion in the offender. Sykes and Matza, (1957) however, suggest that empathy may not always be enough to trigger a reaction in an offender, because offenders often have the ability to neutralize their own guilt. (Harris et al., 2004). It is interesting to note that Toussaint and Webb (2005) suggest that in accordance with studies carried out by (Batson et al., 1996; Gault & Sabini, 2000; Lennon & Eisenberg, 1987; Macaskill et al., 2002; Schieman & Van Gundy, 2002) there is a clear relationship between the gender and levels of empathy.

Ethics as defined by Holmes (1984): ‘Ethics is about the good (that is, what values and virtues we should cultivate) and about the right (that is, what our moral duties may be).’ The college of policing in England and Wales (2014 p3 para 1) defined police ethical behaviour as ‘Ethical behaviour comes from the values, beliefs, attitudes and knowledge that guide the judgements of each individual. Everyone in policing has to make difficult decisions and complex choices every day of the week’ (p5, para 1).

This definition provides support for Sharp’s (1898) findings that people with apparent similar characteristic were making judgements regarding the same person can come to opposite conclusions, as the moral worth differs from one person to the next. Sharp’s study confirmed previous investigations into the difference in ethical ideologies (Hogan’s, 1970, 1973; Kelman & Lawrence 1972; Kohlberg, 1968,1977).

Brooks et al., (1993) proposes that what influences the behaviours of police officers cannot be empirically defined however, Frank & Brandl (1991) and Worden (1989) suggest that there is compelling evidence that there is a significant connection between attitudes and behaviour of police officers. Shernock (1992), speculates that police officers with a higher
level of education influence the expectation of behaviour. Worden (1989) asserted that community orientation and perceptions of the police service held by the community influences police officers attitudes. Community Hostility as noted by Westly (1956) perceived hostility towards police may also be a factor that influences attitudes of police officers. Shernock (1988) suggests that from his study that police solidarity, showed a negative relationship with the support for the service function. Brooks et al., (1993) concludes that attitudes of police officers can be influenced by an attitude towards crime control orientation, service orientation, perception of community, police discretion.

In a review of the literature it becomes evident that there is much still to be learned about restorative justice initiatives, empathy levels between male and females, ethics positions between JLOs and Garda officers has led to the development of these aims and objectives. The present research seeks to shed some light on the value placed on Restorative Justice Initiative in Ireland.
1.10 Aims and Objectives:

The aim of this study is to examine differences in attitudes towards the value of restorative justice initiative between members of An Garda Síochána who are specially employed as Juvenile Liaison Officers and other members of An Garda Síochána.

The objectives of this study are the following

- To gather knowledge on the operation of restorative justice initiatives in practice in Irish judicial system.
- To examine the attitudes of Juvenile Liaison Officers and other member of An Garda Síochána, in relation to Crime Control Orientation, Police discretion, Police Service Orientation, Police orientation towards force Service Orientation and Police Solidarity
- To examine the general attitudes of Juvenile Liaison Officers and members of An Garda Síochána to restorative justice.
- To assess the difference levels of empathy between Male and Female members of An Garda Síochána.
- To examine the differences in the ethical position of Juvenile Liaison officers and Other members of An Garda Síochána.
- To examine the opinions of JLOS and An Garda Síochána to the value of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland.
1.10: Hypothesis:

It is hypothesised that there will be significant differences in attitudes towards the value of restorative justice between members of An Garda Síochána who are specially employed as Juvenile Liaison Officers and other members of An Garda Síochána.

Sub Hypothesis:

- There will be a significant difference in the levels of empathy between male and female Garda.
- There will be a non-significant difference between the general attitudes towards restorative justice between Juvenile Liaison officers and other members.
- There will be a significant difference in the ethical position of Juvenile Liaison Officers and other members.
- That An Garda Síochána has significantly promoted the concept of restorative justice more to Juvenile Liaison Officers than other members of An Garda Síochána.
Chapter 2: Methods

2.1: Participants:

To fulfil the aims and answer the main research objective, a questionnaire was designed to be distributed to 100 members of An Garda Síochána. Firstly the researcher contacted two members of An Garda Síochána who the researcher had built up a rapport with prior to the study through previous work experience within the organisation of An Garda Síochána. These two members were contacted via email and they were given a detailed description of the study, the aims and procedure of dissemination for the study and were asked if they would act as gatekeepers of information through-out the duration of the study area. The gate keepers of information acted as a liaison for organisation of An Garda Síochána and the researcher. Participants were recruited through the use of random volunteer opportunistic sampling, they were given the opportunity to participate in the study by completing the questionnaire on a random volunteer basis within a number of Garda stations across the Dublin area. Both members of An Garda Síochána and JLO’s had the opportunity to volunteer to participate in the study as the gatekeepers of information disseminated the questionnaires in their Garda station from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to the 17\textsuperscript{th} of February. Any member meeting the research criteria within the station could participate in the study should they choose to volunteer. Participants were not incentivised or paid throughout the course of this
study and had the right to withdraw from the study at any stage. Anonymity was also provided to all participants who choose to participant in this study. Out of the 100 questionnaires distributed 72 where returned completed with 4 questionnaires were omitted from the study due to incompletion of every section. Participants were divided into two categories, the first by gender and the second by whether they were a specially employed JLO or a member of An Garda Síochána. Each participant was asked state their gender and whether they are a member of the specialised JLO unit or a member of An Garda Síochána by doing so the participants were granted anonymity throughout the process of the study. From the 72 questionnaires returned the researchers sample group consisted of 22 females and 50 males with a mean age of 39. It was also identified that the minimum age of participants was (SD=28) while maximum age of participants was identified as (SD=58) The number of JLO participants contained in the study was 32 and the number of Garda participants contained in the study was 39. To further clarify the demographics of the study, the category of JLO consisted of 9 females and 23 males, the category of members of An Garda Síochána consisted of 13 females and 26 males.

2.2: Research Design:

This study is design can be described as descriptive research design, as a questionnaire using a combined approach of quantitative and qualitative questions will be used. A questionnaire incorporating quantitative data will be used

The independent variables where identified as Gender, JLO and Garda while the dependent variables where identified as of Empathy Scale, Ethics, General attitudes towards restorative justice, general police attitudes, opinions of the value of Restorative justice initiatives in Ireland.

2.3: Materials (see Appendix 2):
The Empathy Quotient (EQ) is a 60 item questionnaire, however for this study a modified shorter 40 item version was used for the ease of the participants. Developed by Simon Baron-Cohen at the Autism Research Centre at the University of Cambridge the EQ measures empathy in Adults. The EQ is a suitable for use as a casual measure of temperament empathy by and for the general population. Participants were instructed to read a list of statements and indicated their preferred answer by placing an X in the appropriate box. The EQ consists of a 4 item Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The reliability analysis was carried out resulting in an Alpha score was identified as 0.825 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 60 items.

*The Ethics position Questionnaire:*

The Ethics position Questionnaire is a 20 item questionnaire developed by Forsyth (1980). It considers four ethical positions, situationism which analysis’s morally questionable actions, absolutism which uses unaltered universal moral principles to formulate moral judgments, subjectivism which argues that moral judgments are dependent on the individual’s personal views and exceptionism which identifies that exceptions must sometimes be made for moral absolutes. The Ethics Position Questionnaire operates under a 9 point Likert Scale ranging from 1 = completely disagree to 9 = completely agree. Participants were asked to read each question and place their answer in correlation to the Likert in the box provided on the right hand side. Idealism scores are calculated by summing responses from item 1-10 while relativism scores are calculated by summing responses from items 11 to 20. Reliability when tested for this study was identified that idealism scored an alpha score of 0.845 when testing idealism and an alpha score of 0.868 for relativism which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 20 items.

*Generalised Attitude Measure:*
The generalised attitude measure is a 6 question questionnaire, this is measure which can be used for any attitude topic an evaluation of any general idea. For the purpose of this study the participants were asked to indicate their answer by using Likert 7 Item scale and placing their chosen answer beside the answer column. Participants were asked to indicate their feeling on ‘The value of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland’. Numbers 1 and 7 indicated very strong feelings, number 2 and 6 indicated a strong feeling, 3 and 5 indicated a fairly weak feeling and 4 indicating that the participant is either undecided or did not understand the adjective pairs themselves. Due to the nature of the questions 1,4,5 were recoded upon the result of the reliability test, identifying an alpha value of .939 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 6 items once 1,4,5 were recoded. Prior to recording the alpha value of the 6 items was identified as 0.325.

*The Police Attitudes Scale:*

The police attitudes scales and items is a 24 item questionnaire adapted from the Bethlehem Restorative Policing Experiment carried out by McCord and Wachel (1998) It should be noted that the police attitudes scales and items used in the Bethlehem restorative policing experiment is an adaption of the police attitudes scales and items questionnaire used in the Brooks, et al., (1993) study. Participants were asked to read the list of statements and rate their feeling towards the statement using a 5 item Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strong Agree.

Questions 1 to 5 relates to Crime Control Orientation of the participants, the 5 item Likert scale measures. When tested the reliability score was identified as .728 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 5 items. Questions 6 to 10 relates to the service orientation of the participants, indicated on a 5 item Likert scale. Due to the nature of the questions 8 and 10 were recoded upon the result of the reliability test. Upon the recoding
of these questions the Alpha value was identified as 0.743 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 5 items.

Questions 11 and 12 relate to a belief in police discretion, it contains two question 5 item Likert scale. Upon conduction of reliability tests the Alpha value was identified as a value of 0.643 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among both items.

Questions 13 to 16 relates to participants orientation towards force, Due to the content of the question, question 14 was also recoded in correlation with the marking outline in the aforementioned studies. Upon the carrying out of reliability tests it was evident that these questions could not be added together due to poor reliability with an alpha value of 0.378.

Questions 17 to 20 relates to participants orientation towards police solidarity, using 5 item Likert scale these questions was also recoded in correlation with the marking outline in the aforementioned studies. Upon the conduction of reliability tests the alpha value was identified as 0.796 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 4 items.

Questions 20 to 24 are labelled as 1 to 4 as, the Likert scale is altered for the purpose of this section of questions. Participants are asked to right their belief in the Quality of Police Services by indicating their answer with an X in the appropriate box. The Likert scale for this section ranges from very poor to outstanding. Upon the conduction of reliability tests the alpha value was identified as 0.761 which shows that there is a high level of internal consistency among all 4 items.

Qualitative and Quantitative (See Appendix 3):

The last section of this questionnaire consist of 24 Qualitative and Quantitative questions assessing the opinions of the participants across 6 frames. This section is an adaptation of Harding 2014) study (See Appendix 2). These coding frames will be separated into six
sections: Benefits the offender, Benefits the victim, Knowledge and understanding, Perceptions of justice, Barriers towards participation. These frames coding frames became evident to the researcher through the analysis of the raw data as they represent the most important and repetitious factors discussed by the participants. Questions 8 – 24 contain quantitative questions with a qualitative component while, questions 1-7 evaluate the basic knowledge of the participant. For example question 8 asks if invited to participant in a restorative justice event would you, participants can indicate their answer as yes, no or not sure, they are then asked why the percentages are calculated through the use of SPSS and displayed in data tables.

2.4: Procedure:

The questionnaire consisted of 113 questions divided into five sections examining the empathy levels of both groups and genders, their ethical positions, their general attitudes towards restorative justice, their police attitudes and 24 qualitative questions examining their values towards the restorative process which was completed in approximately 15 minutes...

As the participants volunteer to take part within the February 2nd and February 17th of 2016 all completed questionnaires will be kept in a locked drawer during the creation of this report and will be destroyed after use. The questionnaires were distributed across a number of Garda Stations within the Dublin City area through the co-ordination of dissemination between internal members of on Garda Síochána. JLO acted as the Gate keepers of information within the organisation of An Garda Síochána, the questionnaires were distributed and collected while keeping the information within a locked box upon collection by the researcher. In accordance with these ethical guidelines, the questionnaires will be accompanied by a participant information sheet which will outline the procedure considering a participants right to withdraw, the purpose of the study, contact details of the researcher and support options for any participant who may have been exposed to any emotional distress due to the contents of the questionnaire. The sample size of 100 participants made interviewing impractical dues
to time constraint therefore the use of a questionnaire was more practical for sampling throughout members of An Garda Síochána

2.5: Ethical Considerations:

Prior to the conduction of the study the researcher had to first complete an application of consent, which completed and submitted to the An Garda Síochána research unit and The Board of Ethics of the Dublin Business School. Both applications forms stated that throughout the course of the research study, any information gathered by the researcher must be in obtained in accordance with ethical guidelines as set out by both The Dublin Business School and the An Garda Síochána research unit. Firstly the researcher applied to the Board of Ethics of The Dublin Business School through the submission of a research proposal form. This form outlined the hypothesis of the study, the method, procedure, the number of participants and a literature review of previous studies that had been conducted in this area of research. Ethical approval was granted by the Board of Ethics of The Dublin Business School prevision that a number of small changes be made prior to the distribution of the surveys. Upon receiving Ethical approval from the Dublin Business School the research than applied for ethical approval from the An Garda Síochána research unit as the study could not be conducted without the permission of the Garda Research unit. The researcher contacted a member of the research unit via email which can be found of the An Garda Síochána website. The researcher was then advised that in order to gain ethical approval for the study, the researcher must first complete a series of application form. Detailing the aims and objects of the study, the procedure, the number of participants and details for gatekeeper of information within the organisation. Ethical approval was granted by the Garda research unit for the conduction of the study.

In accordance with the ethical guidelines as issued by the An Garda Síochána research unit, it was advised that acting as gatekeepers for dissemination process provided more anonymity to
participants rather than the issuing of the questionnaire via email or other forms of electronic distribution therefore, this was the dissemination procedure utilised by the researcher as, it was the most ethical approved form of dissemination. Upon acceptance of the guidelines stated in the information sheet the participants were asked to complete the survey and place it within an envelope issued by the researcher and handed back to the gate keepers. The questionnaires were then stored in a locked box provided by the researcher prior to collection by the researcher in two locations in Dublin City

**Chapter 4: Results**

*Data Analysis:*

100 Participants were survey with a return rate of 72%. 22 females making up (30%) of the sample population and 50 males making up 70% of the sample population. JLOs made up 46% of the sample population and Garda made up the remaining 54%. The overall population of JLO was 33 participants and the Garda group was made up of 39 participants.

*Group Distribution Table 1: Distribution of Gender and JLO, Garda*
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism scale</td>
<td>68.85</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realitivism scale</td>
<td>56.22</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Control</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service orientation</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Discretion</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Solidarity</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD*= Standard Deviation

**Inferential Statistics:**

A number of statistical tests were employed to measure for statistical significance between variables identified in the study. An independent t-test was used to measure for a significant statistical difference between the independent variables of Gender, JLO and member of An Garda Síochána in relation to the dependent variables of empathy, ethics, and general police attitudes towards restorative justice and general police attitudes.
Normality for Empathy between JLO and Garda. The results indicate that the variables are normally distributed (p > .05). Outliers were checked for with the boxplot and no outliers were observed in the boxplot (See Table 3)

**Independent Samples T-test:**

An independent samples t-test was carried out to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in empathy between male and female participants. The assumptions of normality and equality of variances were both met and visual observation of a boxplot (table 2) showing that there was evident no outliers. The result of this analysis shows that there is a statistically significant difference in empathy between the two groups (t (70) = -3.338, p = .001) with the female participants (M = 53.36, SD = 10.02) having a statistically significantly higher level of empathy compared to the male participants (M = 45.16, SD =
Ethic Questionnaire: Relativism and Idealism:

JLO and Garda relativism scores are both normally distributed so an independent samples t-test will be used. Only JLO Idealism was normally distributed as only one outlier was evident, as a result a non-parametric test the Mannwhitney U test will be used in order to compare the two groups.

Table 4: Test of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolgorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Sharpiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>JLo</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garda</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativism</td>
<td>JLO</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garda</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Samples T-test

The result of the independent samples t-test shows that there is no significant difference in relativism between JLO and Garda (p > .05). Several outliers were evident in the idealism scale as shown in (Table 4) which justified the use of non-parametric statistic test Mannwhitney u. Mann-Whitney U test was used to test Idealism between JLOs and Garda. The result of the Mannwhitney u test indicated that there is no significant difference in Idealism scores between the JLO and the Garda (p > .05)
Mann Whitney U test, JLO vs. Garda General Attitude:

Mann Whitney u test was carried out to investigate whether there is a statistically significant difference in general attitude between Garda and JLO. The result of the analysis indicates that there is no significant difference in general attitude score (p > .05).

Service Orientation and Police Solidarity between JLO and Garda:

Difference in service orientation and police solidarity between JLO and Garda was examined using an independent samples t-test as both variables were normally distributed while the other variables within this section were no, there were no outliers present. The result of the analysis showed that service orientation and police solidarity did not differ statistically significantly between JLO and Garda (p > .05).
Crime Control Orientation, Police discretion, Police Service Orientation, Police orientation towards force:

Crime Orientation, Police Discretion, Police Service and Police Force Differences between Garda and JLO. These variables did not meet the assumption of normality as observed with Shapirowilks statistics (p < .05). Mann Whitney u test was carried out to examine the difference in crime orientation, police discretion, police service and police force between JLO and Garda. The result of the analysis did not reach the level of statistical significance (p > .05).

Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis:

As previously mentioned the participants were split into two categories, JLO and Garda as a result all data was analysed in accordance to these two categories. In order to analysis this data all responses were calculated in forms of percentages due to the differing number of JLO and Garda. The quantitative data was evaluated and placed into pie charts, bar chats as appropriate while, the qualitative data was assessed and ensemble into word maps for the ease reader.

The coding frames became evident to the researcher through the analysis of the raw data as most important and repetitious factors discussed by the participants.

These coding frames will be separated into 5 sections: Who Benefits from RJ Offender or victim, Knowledge and Understanding, Perceptions of justice, Barriers towards participation, the value placed on Restorative Justice in Ireland. As a result of this coding the questions may not be analysed in order but will be clearly indicated.

Knowledge and Understanding:

Table 6: Percentages of answers for Q5 Q6 and Q7
Questions 5, 6 and 7 aimed to form a foundation for the study, it assess participants knowledge and understanding regarding the concept of restorative justice, whether or not they had participated in restorative justice training, whether or not they had ever attended a Restorative justice conference. As shown in table 6, 98% of people were aware of the concept of restorative justice, while 2 participants indicated that they did not know about restorative justice or they were not sure. Question 6 asked if the participants had ever taken part in restorative justice training as shown in table 6 more than half of the participants had not taken part in some form of RJ training. Question 7 explored whether or not the participants would attend a RJ event if invited with 54% saying yes.

**Barriers to Participation:**

*Table 6: Word map to Q 8*  
*Table 7: Percentage of answer for Q 11*
Question 8 asks participants whether, if given the opportunity, they would participate in a restorative justice event and why they might consider it. The word cloud in Table 8 displays the most common responses given by participants, with the majority indicating that they would attend a restorative justice event for educational experience, for professional development, because it was their duty or they had an interest in the concept of restorative justice and wanted to learn more. Question 11 poses that if the participant were the victim of a crime and asked to participate in a restorative justice event, would they? These questions provide a comparison to each other, as the participants in one circumstance will be participating as a Garda while on the other they will be participating as a victim. As shown in Table 7, 44% of the participants said that they would willingly take part in a restorative justice event if invited as invited as a, providing a contrast to the way some participants see restorative justice and how they think it will benefit them personally.

Question 19 is a qualitative question which provides a more in-depth analysis of question 11, as participants are asked their opinions on why victims may refuse to participate in RJ events are assessed. Participant indicated that the majority of both JLO and Garda, considered ‘Victim’s Feelings of anger, fear and not being interested’ were the main deterrents for victim accepting a restorative justice event.

*Perceptions of Justice:*
Questions 16 and 17 evaluates the opinions of the participants with regards to whether or not the restorative justice process should depend on crime committed by the offender. While question 17 acts as the qualitative component of question 16. As the participant are asked to comment on what sort crimes they deem to be acceptable for consideration for the restorative justice process. (See Table 8 & 9). The results of this section clearly indicate that 62% of the participants advocate that the option of restorative justice should be dependent on the severity of the crime committed by the offender while, an over whelming majority recommend that only ‘Minor’ crimes should be advised for the use of restorative justice, examples of these minor crimes are represented in the form of a word map (See table 9).

Questions 13 assess whether or not the participants consider restorative justice programmes to be a lenient approach for punishment of a crime 48.61% of participants said yes it is a lenient approach while 40.28% answered No it is not lenient and 11.11% answered not sure. Question 23 goes on to ask, if participants consider restorative justice as an effective alternative incarceration, 29.17% of participants said yes while, 37.50% said No and 33.33% answered not sure.

Who Benefits from Restorative Justice Practice?
Question 18 is a quantitative in nature, it explored the opinions of both Garda and JLOs with regards to who they would consider to benefit for restorative practices. Adults and Juveniles, it should be noted that with regards to this questions there was an error in the design. This error was exposed as 21% of participants indicated that both adults and juveniles can benefit from restorative justice practices. While 24% indicated that adults would benefit and 55% indicating the juveniles benefit must during the restorative process. Question 22 similarly asked the participants to indicate if they consider the process of restorative justice to be beneficial to both victims and offenders collectively 41% answered sometimes while 13% answered never 22% answered not really 20% answered mostly and 4% answered always.

*Table 10: Distribution of percentages for Q22*

*Does the Victim benefit from Restorative justice:*

![Pie chart showing distribution of percentages for Q22]
Question 12 examines the opinions of the participants with regards to whether or not they see restorative justice as a process that helps the victim move on from the impact the crime. Question 15 asks the opinion of participants with regards to the process of restorative to justice being beneficial to the victim impacted by crime. As shown in table 10 the 38.89% of participants indicated that only sometimes does restorative justice enable the victim to move on from the incident. Table 10 also shows that out of the 72 participants 41.67% indicate that restorative justice benefits the victim.

Question 20 asks participants if they believe that the process of restorative justice produces a sincere apology from the offender to the victim. 37.50% of people indicated that it does produce sincere apologies for the actions of the offender while 23.61% indicate not really and 26.39% indicated that it mostly did.

Does the offender benefit from restorative justice Initiatives
Does the offender benefit?

Questions 9, 10, and 14 all relate to the offender and the restorative justice process. Question 9 asked the participant whether or not they think restorative justice can help prevent the offender from reoffending. As shown in Table 11, 61% of participants said yes. Question 10 asks how far did the participants think that restorative justice initiatives go to stop offenders from committing further crimes. 48.61% of participants indicated that the initiative go far to stop the offender reoffending. Question 14 asks the participants opinion regarding the offender and whether or not they benefit from the initiatives. 44.44% indicated that Offenders do benefit as seen in Table 12.

Question 21 asked that if offenders were offered an incentive such as a reduction in sentence would they believe that offenders be more likely to consider participating in a restorative justice event. 64% indicated that offenders would be more likely to take part as it is it was suggested that offenders will do anything to not have to do jail time.
Table 14: Percentage for answers to Question 24

Table 14: Percentage of answers to Question 24

Question 24 asks if participants think that there is a high value placed on the role of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland. As displayed in Table 12, 51% of participants said no there is not a high value placed on restorative justice initiatives in Ireland while 16.67% said there yes there was. 31.94% said that they were not sure of the value.

Chapter 5: Discussion
The purpose of the current study was to examine differences in attitudes towards the value of restorative justice initiative between members of An Garda Síochána who are specially employed as Juvenile Liaison Officers and other members of An Garda Síochána. In addition there was an investigation into the operation of restorative justice initiatives in practice in the Irish Judicial System, the difference in empathy levels between male and female members of An Garda Síochána. The difference in attitudes towards police solidarity, crime control orientation, police discretion and an orientation towards force find between the two groups of officers, to investigate ethical positions, to assess the general attitudes of officers towards restorative just initiatives examine the opinions of JLO’s and An Garda Síochána to the value of current operating of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland. The results from this study support the premise that there would be a statistically significant difference in the value place of restorative justice initiatives between JLO’s and other members of An Garda Síochána. Results also supported the premise that when tested there was statically significant difference in the levels in empathy between Male and Female participants. The results demonstrated that under the conditions tested, there was no statistical significant difference between the ethical orientation of JLO’s and members of An Garda Síochána. The result of the analysis further indicated that an attitude towards service orientation and police solidarity did not differ statistically significantly between JLO and Garda. Difference in crime orientation, police discretion, police service and police force between JLO and Garda, were in conclusive as the variables did not reach the level of statistical significance for the study.
Review of results:

Qualitative Themes:

The results of the qualitative questionnaire outlined 5 themes, who Benefits from RJ Offender or victim, Knowledge and Understanding, Perceptions of justice, Barriers towards participation, the value placed on Restorative Justice in Ireland. The results indicated that almost all the participants in this study were aware of the concept of restorative justice. More than half of the participants said that they have not taken part in any form of restorative justice training or have never been to a restorative justice meeting. The results also indicated that most participants would attend a restorative justice in a professional capacity for the experience, to learn more about the process and for professional development. It is interesting to note that less than half of the participant said that they would attend a restorative justice event as a victim.

The majority of participants also expressed the concern that restorative justice should be evaluated on the severity on the crime, with most participants mentioning that it should only be used for minor offences. It was evident that participants considered the restorative justice practice to be more beneficial to juveniles rather than adults. The result further indicate that the restorative just process only benefits and helps the victim move on in some cases. The participants considered the process to be beneficial to the offender as they become accountable for their actions when faced with the victim, it is also a belief that the process helps prevent the offender from reoffending as they can see first-hand the impact their actions have had on the victim. More than half or the participants indicated that the process of restorative justice is a lenient approach to criminal justice and that most offenders will do anything possible to avoid jail time.
Restorative Justice Values and Attitudes.

The results of this study indicated that there was no significant difference between the attitudes towards the value of restorative justice initiative between members of An Garda Síochána who are specially employed as Juvenile Liaison Officers and other members of An Garda Síochána. These result contrast the results of Winfree’s (2004) study were it was evident that Youth Aid officers differed slightly from the sworn officers when tested with measures associated with restorative justice. The results of Abramson’s (2004) supports the common themes found in this study, as the results of this study further indicated that the majority of police officers did not have a clear understanding of the concept of restorative justice. Most officer’s indicated that the philosophy of restorative justice initiatives and their opinions differed with regards to how they deem conflict and criminality should dealt with. The fundamental premise of the restorative justice paradigm is that crime is a violation of people and relationships (Zehr, 1990). The most appropriate response to criminal behaviour, therefore, is to repair the harm caused by the wrongful act (Law Commission, 2000). As such, the criminal justice system should provide those most closely affected by the crime (the victim, the offender, and the community) an opportunity to come together to discuss the event and attempt to arrive at some type of understanding about what can be done to provide appropriate reparation. While the results of the Bethlem police study conducted by McCord et al., (1996) indicated that only with the right form of education and training will restorative justice be both effective and successful. This theme was common through-out the course of this study, with a majority of members of An Garda Síochána stating that the concept was not fully understood and more education was essential for the successful implementation of
restorative justice initiatives across different units within An Garda Síochána. The results of this section were expected as restorative justice is a relativity new concept in the Irish Judicial system it has. As previously stated in the literature review it widely used by the Juvenile diversion programme which JLO’s are heavily involved. While members of An Garda Síochána can be involved in the HTORP they do so on a volunteer basis outside of their working day.

**Empathy**

The results of the empathy questionnaire clearly indicated that there was a significant difference in the levels of empathy between Male and Female participants. These findings are consistent with the findings of Finchamam et al., (2002) who suggested a similar correspondence with a relationship between empathy and gender, with women showing an increased level of empathy when compared with men. Further support for these result are evident in the empirical studies which investigated the relationship between gender and levels empathy. (Batson et al., 1996; Gault & Sabini, 2000; Lennon & Eisenberg, 1987; Macaskill et al., 2002; Schieman & Van Gundy, 2002) these studies provide additional empirical support for the common observation, that gender is an influence on levels of empathy. Klein & Hodges (2001) suggest that there is a possibility that these differences may be a result of motivation rather than an ability. The results of this section were as the researcher expected, as many previous studies provided empirical evidence of a clear difference.

**Ethics**

Although there was an expected difference within the two groups this was not the case for this study. These results did not support Sharp’s (1980) finding, regarding the ability for two people with similar characteristics to make different moral judgements regarding the same issue. As members of An Garda Síochána are trained to base their judgement on an
ethical code of values and morality as outlined in there code of ethics, this may be a cause of a non-significant statistical difference.

*Attitudes:*

While some relationships between police officers attitudes differed slightly there was not statistically significant difference, the correlations between the questions were very weak explaining the low variance. It is apparent that there are many other factors that account for the influences of police behaviour than the ones tested here. As per Brooks et al., (1993) study similar issues occurred, regarding demographics or correlation between questions. The Bethlehem Restorative Justice Police Project produced similar results to the ones evident in this study as, their study concluded that there was no significant difference in police attitudes and organisational culture nor in the assessment of role perceptions. Therefore concluding that there was no obvious change in the attitudes of officers before and after restorative justice training.

*Weakness:*

It is evident through the evaluation of this study that a number of weakness are present. The first being the sample group, with only 120 JLO’s operating within the organisation of An Garda Síochána it is incredibly difficult to survey them all. The second being that due to the dissemination procedure the Garda and JLO’s within this survey were operating mainly in the Dublin Area, therefore the opinions of the Garda and JLO’s are largely consistent with the restorative justice initiatives operating in Dublin rather than over the whole country, but do provide an opinion for the majority of JLO’s within the country. It could be also be argued that the results were disproportionate as there was an uneven male to
female ratio however, this was expected due to the uneven ratio of males to females within
the organisation itself.

**Strengths:**

The greatest strength of this study lies in the originality of the concept of research
concept, as to date there has been no similar study carried out in Ireland. This study offers an
insight into the attitudes toward the values of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland from the
point of value of a sample group within organisation of An Garda Síochána. This allows a
foundation for further research from the organisation with regards to this area. The concept of
restorative justice is very evolving and with it further research need to be carried out with
regards to successful implementation of this initiative.

**Limitations:**

Two Obvious limitations arose during the completion of this study, it was the notion that
some participants may not have fully understood the concept some of the questions ,for
example the general attitude measure was perhaps in retrospect too vague or not as
descriptive as it should have been. Also question 15 in the qualitative section, asked whether
the participant thought that restorative justice benefited the victim well question there were a
few cases were participants indicated that they had already answered this question in question
12. Question 12 however, asked participants if they thought restorative justice helped victims
move on from the incident. As these questions are similar it may have caused some form of
confusion

**Recommendations for further research:**
From the results of this study it is clear that further research in this area is essential. As this study focused on the attitudes of member of An Garda Síochána solely, it could advised that victims and offenders could also be examine with regards to their attitudes the restorative justice procedure. An area that could be examined in the future would whether victims, their attitudes differ before and after a restorative justice conferencing. Victim can be exposed to a series of emotional dynamic before during and after a conferencing as, for many victims meeting their offender can cause increased levels of fear, anxiety and stress due to the incident. While the offenders could be examined in relation to guilt and shame before and after a restorative justice conference.

**Conclusion:**

This thesis examined *Restorative Justice* and *Garda perceptions* of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland. It clear from the results of this that more investment need to be made into the promotion restorative justice initiatives within An Garda Síochána. As members outlined an essential need for more training and education with regards to the concept and process of restorative justice.
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Appendices

Appendix : 1

My name is Aishling Moore and as part of my final year in Dublin Business School I am carrying out the following research. This project has been approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee and the An Garda Siochana research unit. This study is of minimal risk to participants. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and involves the completion of some standardized tests, routinely used in various psychology studies you the participants involved have the right to withdraw from this study at any stage. Participants will be asked to complete a series of questions which will assess the attitudes towards the value of restorative justice initiatives between Garda Juvenile Liaison officers and other members of An Garda Siochana The study typically takes 10-15 minutes to complete.

Your input is confidential to the researcher involved, and all results will be published anonymously in their dissertation. If you would like a copy of the finished report or for any other information about the results of the research conducted once it is completed, you can contact the researcher, Aishling Moore Contact can be made at or supervisor Cathal O’Keeffe at

Thank you for participating in this survey. The researcher would be grateful if you could return your survey to the designated distributors by the 17th of February.

If you have been affected by the content of this questionnaire, please contact any of the following organisations

Samaritans phone: 116 123 or email jo@samaritans.org
URL: http://www.thesite.org/
Aware phone: 1890 303302 or email mailto:wecanhelp@aware.ie
Appendix 2

How to fill out the questionnaire

Below are a list of statements. Please read each statement very carefully and rate how strongly you agree or disagree with it by placing an X in the appropriate box to indicate your answer. There are no right or wrong answers, or trick questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I can easily tell if someone else wants to enter a conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to explain to others things that I understand easily, when they don’t understand it first time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I really enjoy caring for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I find it hard to know what to do in a social situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>People often tell me that I went too far in driving my point home in a discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It doesn’t bother me too much if I am late meeting a friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Friendships and relationships are just too difficult, so I tend not to bother with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I often find it difficult to judge if something is rude or polite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In a conversation, I tend to focus on my own thoughts rather than on what my listener might be thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>When I was a child, I enjoyed cutting up worms to see what would happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. It is hard for me to see why some things upset people so much.

13. I find it easy to put myself in somebody else’s shoes.

14. I am good at predicting how someone will feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. I am quick to spot when someone in a group is feeling awkward or uncomfortable.

16. If I say something that someone else is offended by, I think that that’s their problem, not mine.

17. If anyone asked me if I like their haircut, I would reply truthfully, even if I didn’t like it.

18. I can’t always see why someone should have felt offended by a remark.

19. Seeing people cry doesn’t really upset me.

20. I am very blunt, which some people take to be rudeness, even though this is unintentional.

21. I don’t tend to find social situations confusing

22. Other people tell me I am good at understanding how they are feeling and what they are thinking.

23. When I talk to people, I tend to talk about their experiences rather than my own.

24. It upsets me to see animals in pain.

25. I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people’s feelings.

26. I can easily tell if someone else is interested or bored with what I am saying.

27. I get upset if I see people suffering on news programmes.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Friends usually talk to me about their problems as they say I am very understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I can sense if I am intruding, even if the other person doesn’t tell me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>People sometimes tell me that I have gone too far with teasing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Other people often say that I am insensitive, though I don’t always see why.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>If I see a stranger in a group, I think that it is up to them to make an effort to join in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I usually stay emotionally detached when watching a film.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I can tune into how someone else feels rapidly and intuitively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I can easily work out what another person might want to talk about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>strongly agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>slightly agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>slightly disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I can tell if someone is masking their true emotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I don’t consciously work out the rules of social situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I am good at predicting what someone will do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend’s problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I can usually appreciate the other person’s viewpoint, even if I don’t agree with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference:**

Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following items. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your reaction to such matters of opinion. Rate your reaction to each statement by writing a number to the right of each statement in the box provided where:

1 = Completely disagree
2 = Largely disagree
3 = Moderately disagree
4 = Slightly disagree
5 = Neither agree nor disagree
6 = Slightly agree
7 = Moderately agree
8 = Largely agree
9 = Completely agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>People should make certain that their actions never intentionally harm another even to a small degree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Risks to another should never be tolerated, irrespective of how small the risks might be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The existence of potential harm to others is always wrong, irrespective of the benefits to be gained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>One should never psychologically or physically harm another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One should not perform an action which might in any way threaten the dignity and welfare of another individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If an action could harm an innocent other, then it should not be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deciding whether or not to perform an act by balancing the positive consequences of the act against the negative consequences of the act is immoral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The dignity and welfare of the people should be the most important concern in any society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is never necessary to sacrifice the welfare of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moral behaviors are actions that closely match ideals of the most “perfect” action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There are no ethical principles that are so important that they should be a part of any code of ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What is ethical varies from one situation and society to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Moral standards should be seen as being individualistic; what one person considers to be moral may be judged to be immoral by another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Different types of morality cannot be compared as to “rightness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Questions of what is ethical for everyone can never be resolved since what is moral or immoral is up to the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moral standards are simply personal rules that indicate how a person should behave, and are not be applied in making judgments of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ethical considerations in interpersonal relations are so complex that individuals should be allowed to formulate their own individual codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rigidly codifying an ethical position that prevents certain types of actions could stand in the way of better human relations and adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No rule concerning lying can be formulated; whether a lie is permissible or not permissible totally depends upon the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Whether a lie is judged to be moral or immoral depends upon the circumstances surrounding the action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference:

Adoptions of General Attitude Measure

**Directions:** On the scales below, please indicate your feelings about *The value of Restorative Justice initiatives in Ireland* "Numbers "1" and "7" indicate a very strong feeling. Numbers "2" and "6" indicate a strong feeling. Numbers "3" and "5" indicate a fairly week feeling. Number "4" indicates you are undecided or do not understand the adjective pairs themselves. There are no right or wrong answer. Please only choose one number per line, the participants should identify their answer by placing their number beside the answer section.

1) Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad Answer =
2) Wrong 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Right Answer =
3) Harmful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Beneficial Answer =
4) Fair 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unfair Answer =
5) Wise 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Foolish Answer =
6) Negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Positive Answer =

**Reference**


How to fill out the questionnaire

Below are a list of statements. Please read each statement very carefully and rate how strongly you agree or disagree with it by placing an X in the appropriate box to indicate your answer. There are no right or wrong answers, or trick questions.

SD=Strongly Disagree
Dis=Disagree
N-O=No Opinion
AG=Agree
SA=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>N-O</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If police officers in high crime areas had fewer restrictions on their use of force, many of the serious crime problems in those neighborhoods would be greatly reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Police officers would be more effective if they didn’t have to worry about “probable cause” requirements for searching citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police officers must sometimes use unethical means to accomplish enforcement of the law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Many of the decisions by the Supreme Court interfere with the ability of police to fight crime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sometimes police are justified using “questionable practices” to achieve good ends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Police should assist sick or injured person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Police should handle public nuisance problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>If police officers act in a service capacity, this detracts from their ability to fight crime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>Policing should be seen as service organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Police officers should not have to handle calls that involve social or personal problems where no crime is involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>Police officers should be able to decide whether or not to enforce laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Patrol officers on the street are more effective if they are able to decide on their own when to enforce particular laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>Police officers should be allowed to use chokeholds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>Police officers should only able to use deadly force when someone’s life is in danger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>When a police officer is accused of using too much force, only other police officers are qualified to judge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>Police officers should be allowed to use stun guns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>I would report a fellow officer for violating a citizen’s civil rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>I would report a fellow officer for using unnecessary force (e.g. hitting, kicking, punching) when making an arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>I would arrest a fellow officer for driving while intoxicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>I would give a fellow officer a speeding ticket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please Place and X in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How would you rate the support of the local courts for your police department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How would you rate the cooperation of the Director of Public Prosecutions with your department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How would you rate the quality of police services provided by your police department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How would the residents rate the quality of police services provided by your police department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference:

Police officer attitudes concerning their communities and their roles: A comparison of two suburban police departments. American Journal of Police, 12, 115 – 139

Appendix 3
Qualitative Questions-Questionnaire (Please indicate your answer by placing an X)
1. Age ____________________
2. Gender ____________________
3. JLO (please indicate with an X) ________
4. None JLO ________

5. Before this study were you aware of the concept of Restorative justice?
   Yes                     No                      Not Sure

6. Have you ever taken in part in restorative justice training?
   Yes                     No                      Not Sure

7. Have you ever been to a restorative justice conference?
   Yes                     No                        Not Sure

8. If offer to attend a restorative justice meeting would you attend?
   Yes                     No                        Not Sure
   Why?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. Do you think restorative justice initiatives can help prevent the offender from reoffending?
   Yes                     No                        Not Sure
   Why?

_____________________________________________________________________

10. How far do you think these initiatives go to stop offender committing crimes (one being not at all, four being very much)?
    1                   2                3                4
   Why?

11. As a victim if you were offered a restorative meeting would you attend?
    Yes                     No                        Not Sure
    Why?
12. Do you think that restorative justice helps the victim move on from the incident?

Never       Not Really      Sometimes       Mostly       Always

Why?

13. Do you consider restorative justice to be a lenient approach to punishment for a crime?

Yes                     No                        Not Sure

Why?

14. Do you think the offender benefits from restorative justice practice?

Never       Not Really       Sometimes       Mostly       Always

Why?

15. Do you think the victim benefits from restorative justice practices?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Really</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you think the use of restorative justice practices should depend on the crime?

Yes                      No                      Don’t Know

17. If Yes what crimes would you consider to be acceptable for the use of restorative justice?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18. Do you believe that Adults or Juveniles benefit most from restorative justice initiatives?

Adults                      Juveniles

19. Why do you think that some victim decline an offer to take part in restorative justice?

Fear                      Possible expense          Time          Not Interested        Victim’s feelings of Anger

20. Do you believe the restorative justice produces sincere apologies?

Never                      Not Really           Sometimes       Mostly          Always

Why?                        

________________________________________________________________________

21. Do you think that by providing an incentive (such as a reduced sentence) offenders would be more likely to participated in a restorative justice initiative?
22. Do you believe conferencing benefits both the victim and offender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Really</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why?

________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

23. Would you consider restorative justice to be an effective alternative to incarceration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

24. Do you think that there is a high value placed on the role of restorative justice initiatives in Ireland?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
