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How has RJ been tested?

- Many studies of RJ
- Fewer studies of RJ conferencing
- But often weak designs
- Most rigorous evaluation via experiments
- These results today only from most rigorous experiments – randomised controlled trials (RCTs)
- These RCTs are on medical model of testing new drugs: eligible cases are randomly assigned either to get the treatment or NOT to get the treatment
What sort of RJ has been tested with RCTs?

- **Face to face RJ conferences (RJC)** between crime victim and offender
- In the presence of a trained facilitator
- And of their supporters (family and friends) and others affected
- Offender must have accepted responsibility for offence
- **Direct** discussion between victim and offender focused on feelings rather than facts
- May be either **instead of** formal justice processes or **in addition to** them
How has RJC been tested?

- Over eight years 11 RCTs conducted on RJ in Aust + UK + US
  - Different offences
  - Different offenders
  - Different locations
  - Different points in the justice system
- Objective to field test as broadly as possible
- Equal probability of assignment: court as usual compared with diversion to RJ (Australia) or court as usual compared with court plus RJ (United Kingdom)
- Outcomes measures: reoffending and victim satisfaction
RCTs Comparing RJC with Conventional Justice

- 1. Australia <30 years violence (diversion) 121
- 2. Australia juvenile personal property (diversion) 248
- 3. Australia juvenile shoplifting (diversion) 142
- 4. US Indianapolis juvenile property/violence (diversion) 782
- 5. UK juvenile property/violence (police Final Warning) 208
- 6. UK adult property (Magistrates Courts) 63
- 7. UK adult assault (Magistrates Courts) 44
- 8. UK robbery (Crown Courts) 88
- 9. UK burglary (Crown Courts) 167
- 10. UK violence – Probation 64
- 11. UK violence – Prison 94

Total offender N = 2021
What Does the Review of These Studies Conclude?

- **Offenders** –
  - Slows some down, others stop reoffending completely while others are unaffected
  - May be better for the most prolific offenders
    - On average 27% reduction in repeat convictions across British trials

- **Offences** –
  - Works better for violence than property offences
  - Wasted on minor offences

- **Victims** -
  - Unequivocal evidence on greater benefit for most of those willing to meet their offenders
1. What effect do face-to-face RJ conferences have on...

- Frequency of reconvictions
  - across different points of criminal justice process
  - with personal victims intended to be there?

- **ANSWER**: 9 out of 10 tests with personal victims show less crime for RJ than CJ (Australian juvenile property experiment failed for RJ)

- **NB especially results for prison and probation experiments**
Personal Victims Present: % Change* in Reconviction Frequency

*per person, RJ Group compared with Control Group
What about RJC and violent crime?

• Frequency of Reconviction
• In Violent Crime Experiments
• Youth and Adult Combined
• All levels of seriousness from simple assault to grievous bodily harm

**ANSWER**: 5 out of 5 violence tests show less crime for RJ
Percent Change* in the Frequency of Reconviction – Violence Experiments

*per person, RJ Group compared with Control Group
What about RJC and property crime?

What Effect Does RJ have on

- Frequency of Reconviction on
- Property Crime Offenders
- Youth and Adult Combined

**ANSWER:** 3 out 4 tests show less crime for RJ
- Effects not as big, or as prevalent, as for violence

- **RJ WORKS BETTER FOR MORE SERIOUS CRIME**
Percent Change* in the Frequency of Reconviction – Property Experiments

*per person, RJ Group compared with Control Group
What about RJC and Youth Crime?

What Effect Does Face-to-Face RJ Have on

- Youth Crime
- Property and Violent
- US, UK, Australia?

**ANSWER**: 3 out of 4 tests show less crime for RJ
Percent Change* in the Frequency of Reconviction – Youth Experiments

*per person, RJ Group compared with Control Group
What about RJC and adult crime?

What Effect Does Face-to-Face RJ Have on

- Adult Crime
- Property and Violent
- US, UK, Australia?
- Answer:
- 6 out of 6 tests on adults = less crime for RJ

- *Effects bigger for adults than for juveniles*
Percent Change* in the Frequency of Reconviction – Adult Experiments

*per person, RJ Group compared with Control Group

- LR5: -8%
- LR6: -16%
- NU8: -24%
- NU9: -41%
- TV10: -33%
- TV11: -55%
What about Prevalence and Frequency of Reoffending?

• What is the effect of Face-to-Face RJ on the *prevalence* and *frequency* of any reconviction over 2 years (percentage with 1 or more conviction or arrest)

• **16% Reduction in Prevalence** across all tests, on border of significance, across 3,140 offenders (i.e. 16% fewer RJ offenders re-offended than CJ)

• **27% Reduction in Frequency** across all tests, statistically significant (i.e. 27% less crime among offenders who had RJ in addition to CJ)
# Cost-Benefit Ratios: UK Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>RJ Cost</th>
<th>CJ Benefit Ratio</th>
<th>Total Benefit Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>598,848</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N’Umbria</td>
<td>275,411</td>
<td>1:0.26</td>
<td>1:1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>222,463</td>
<td>1:0.46</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,096,722</td>
<td>1:1.8</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CJ benefit is benefit from costs of crimes prevented, estimated at average 22% of total costs of crime (property loss, insurance, medical/hospital costs, victim wellbeing etc).*
Effects for Victims

BENEFITS:
• participation
• information
• fairness and respect
• apologies (and sometimes forgiveness)

EFFECTS:
• Fear, Anger, Sympathy for Offender
• Post-Traumatic Stress measures
• Desire for Retaliation
• Satisfaction With Process
Percentage of victims **angry** before/after meeting.

Preliminary UK & Australia

![Bar chart showing percentage of victims angry before and after meeting in Australia, London, Northumbria, and TV.

- **Australia**: Before 63%, After 29%
- **London**: Before 65%, After 23%
- **Northumbria**: Before 85%, After 34%
- **TV**: Before 52%, After 20%]
Percentage of victims sympathetic before/after meeting. Preliminary UK & Australia
Percentage of victims afraid before/after RJ meeting.
Preliminary UK & Australia
Findings on Victim Post-traumatic Stress

- London Crown Courts
- Burglary & Robbery
- Most meetings in prisons
- Telephone interviews
- Standard scale to measure psychological trauma
Average level of Victim Post Traumatic Stress
Both Robbery & Burglary

RJ (n=103)  CJ (n=113)

p ≤ 0.010
RJ Helps Women Victims PTSS More

Figure 2: Participants with PTSS Above Sub-Clinical Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>RJ</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Only</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men Only</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction in Victim Revenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or sub-category</th>
<th>CJ n/N</th>
<th>RJ n/N</th>
<th>OR (fixed) 95% CI</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>OR (fixed) 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISE-JPP-Females</td>
<td>2/29</td>
<td>2/34</td>
<td>21.66 1.19 [0.16, 8.99]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE-JPP-Males</td>
<td>5/51</td>
<td>2/37</td>
<td>26.42 1.90 [0.35, 10.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE-JVC-Females</td>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>8.75   6.11 [0.60, 62.23]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE-JVC-Males</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>3/33</td>
<td>15.17 10.00 [2.34, 42.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-Burg-Females</td>
<td>2/45</td>
<td>0/39</td>
<td>6.39   4.54 [0.21, 97.49]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-Burg-Males</td>
<td>2/29</td>
<td>0/29</td>
<td>5.79   5.36 [0.25, 116.76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-Rob-Females</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>5.09   10.24 [0.51, 206.88]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London-Rob-Males</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>10.72 1.21 [0.07, 21.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI) 223 218
Total events: 32 (CJ), 9 (RJ)
Test for heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.87, df = 7 (P = 0.68), I² = 0%
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.73 (P = 0.0002)
Victim Benefits

Compared with conventional justice, RJ provides

• significantly higher victim satisfaction than court justice
• significantly higher levels of apology
• significant greater reduction in desire for revenge
• significantly greater reduction (approx 40%) in post-traumatic stress symptoms (PTSS) for robbery and burglary victims.
Summary of RJ Effects, compared with conventional justice

• Violent Crime: Biggest, clearest effects of RJ
• Property Crime: positive, not so big

• RJ better for adult offenders than youth
• RJ appears more effective than court alone post-sentence than pre-sentence

• RJ better for women victims than men (but good for both)

• UK: RJ Cost effective for government costs

• Across all studies:
  – significantly fewer crimes
  – Significantly better for victims
Policy Implications for RJC in Crime

• Investment of RJC in more serious crimes (when victims want to do it)
• Particularly effective in reducing reoffending after conviction in court and prior to sentencing
• Need more tests of RJC re race and minorities groups
• Need more tests of RJC at point of release (weak statistical power in our research) - but promising here
• Cost effective in reduced reoffending in all studies where RJC used in addition to court.

• USE RJ IN THE WAYS IT HAS BEEN FOUND TO BE EFFECTIVE - AND DON’T LABEL AS RJ WHAT ISN’T RJ.