University of Kent

Kent Academic Repository

Suzuki, Masahiro and Maglione, Giuseppe (2026) *Rebuilding reparation: a multidimensional theory of repair in restorative justice*. The British Journal of Criminology . ISSN 0007-0955.

Downloaded from
https://kar.kent.ac.uk/117848/ The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from
https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azag092

This document version
Publisher pdf

DOI for this version

Licence for this version
CC BY (Attribution)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record
If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts
If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in ***Title of Journal*** , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries
If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies).

The British Journal of Criminology, 2026, **00**, 1–20
https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azag092
Original Manuscript

OXFORD

Rebuilding reparation: a multidimensional theory of repair in restorative justice

Masahiro Suzuki[1,*] and Giuseppe Maglione[2]

[1]Department of Criminology, Sociology, and Social Policy, Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom
[2]School of Social Sciences, University of Kent, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: Masahiro Suzuki, Department of Criminology, Sociology, and Social Policy, Loughborough University, Brockington Building, Margaret Keay Rd, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom; email: m.suzuki@lboro.ac.uk, masahirosuzuki9@gmail.com

This article develops a theoretical and critical reconstruction of reparation within restorative justice (RJ). Prevailing accounts have narrowly restricted reparation to material and symbolic acts undertaken primarily by the person responsible for the harm. This article advances a multidimensional theory of repair encompassing material, symbolic, relational and procedural forms and theorizes reparation as a distributed practice involving persons responsible, persons harmed, communities and justice institutions. It further situates reparation in RJ within a broader ethical and political conception of justice as the repair of relational coexistence rather than merely an outcome of dispute resolution. By clarifying conceptual boundaries while retaining normative depth, the framework contributes to theoretical debates on justice.

Keywords restorative justice, reparation, restitution, compensation, restoration

Introduction

Within conventional criminal justice systems, the dominant response to crime has been punitive, with an emphasis on punishment as a means of accountability. However, extensive scholarship has highlighted the limited effectiveness of retributive approaches in preventing further offending, alongside their tendency to marginalize or overlook the needs and experiences of the person harmed (Zehr 2015).[1] In contrast, restorative justice (RJ) adopts

[1] This article adopts person-first language when referring to individuals involved in wrongdoing and victimisation. Terms such as 'person responsible' and 'person harmed' are used instead of labels such as

© The Author(s) (2026). Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies (ISTD). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

a fundamentally different orientation by centring crime as a source of harm to individuals, relationships, and communities (Suzuki and Hayes 2016). It seeks to engage those who have caused harm in processes that provide opportunities to repair the harm experienced by those affected (Rossner and Bruce 2018). As such, reparation is one of the central goals in RJ (Anderson *et al.* 2025; Kirkwood 2022), not only as a practical response to harm but also as a pathway toward a broader restorative conception of justice grounded in a relational understanding of social life.

Despite its centrality within RJ, reparation remains conceptually underdeveloped and is often treated as either a self-evident idea or as an unspecified practice in the literature. This conceptual ambiguity is not merely terminological; rather, it reflects a deeper theoretical problem concerning how justice is understood within RJ. More than a decade ago, Daly and Proietti-Scifoni (2011) observed that scholars attach divergent meanings to the notion of reparation, resulting in conceptual ambiguity. Rosenblatt (2016) also noted that although reparation is frequently identified as a defining feature distinguishing RJ from retributive justice, there is little consensus on what kinds of actions can meaningfully be considered reparative. This problem persists today. The term reparation continues to be widely invoked without explicit definition (Spacey and Thompson 2022; Wilson *et al.* 2017). In other cases, it is narrowly understood as either tangible restitution, such as financial compensation (Haines 2000) or symbolic gestures such as apology or expressions of remorse (Maglione 2017; Retzinger and Scheff 1996). Sometimes, reparation is simply equated with the outcome agreement or action plan that the person responsible must complete (Hobbs *et al.* 2025; Scheuerman and Keith 2023). These inconsistencies and vagueness weaken the conceptual coherence of reparation and limit its usefulness as a guiding principle for RJ. Without a clear and theoretically grounded understanding of what reparation entails, it is difficult to evaluate RJ practices, compare outcomes across programmes or assess whether restorative processes genuinely address harm in a meaningful way.

This article responds to the need for greater clarity by proposing a reconstructed framework for understanding reparation in RJ. This research defines reparation in RJ as *a multidimensional process encompassing material, symbolic, relational, and procedural actions through which those harmed by crime, those responsible for harm, and their communities actively acknowledge and address the harm caused and, where appropriate and desired, work to rebuild trust and shared norms*. This definition distinguishes reparation from other terms often used interchangeably in RJ discourse. While restoration is commonly understood as the normative horizon of RJ, reparation refers more specifically to the acts and processes of making amends for the harm caused (Duff 2002; European Forum for Restorative Justice 2025). Related terms like restitution and compensation denote narrower mechanisms, typically involving monetary payment or the return of property to the owner, whereas reparation is broader, encompassing those concrete measures as well as symbolic and relational actions such as apology and expressions of remorse (Zedner 1994). In short, restitution or compensation can be part of (material) reparation, but reparation in RJ also includes addressing symbolic, relational, and procedural harm.[2]

'offender' or 'victim'. This choice reflects an RJ perspective that seeks to avoid reducing individuals to a single role defined by an event of harm and instead emphasises their broader personhood and capacity for change.

[2] The concept of harm itself may require clarification. In RJ scholarship, harm is often invoked in broad terms but rarely theorised systematically (Greenfield and Paoli 2022). Drawing on victimological and social harm literature (Canning *et al.* 2023; Pemberton et al. 2017), harm can be understood as multidimensional, encompassing material loss, moral or emotional injury, relational disruption and procedural injustice. Crime generates not only tangible damage but also disruptions to dignity, trust and participation

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

This reconceptualization builds on Sharpe's (2007) classic idea of reparation in RJ. As demonstrated by subsequent scholars (Heller 2023; Hobbs *et al.* 2022; Maglione 2018; Rosenblatt 2016), her contribution is pivotal to the conceptualization of reparation in RJ, as she not only provides a clear definition of reparation but also specifies the conditions under which reparation can occur within RJ processes, as well as its potential impacts on those involved. Renewed attention to reparation is particularly timely given the continued institutionalization and diversification of RJ across criminal justice (Maglione *et al.* 2024). Recent work has examined RJ as a form of political rationality shaping contemporary justice practices (Crawford 2015; Maglione 2019). This perspective highlights that RJ is embedded within broader political and institutional logics that shape how justice is understood. As RJ is increasingly implemented at scale and across varied justice contexts, the absence of a clear and shared understanding of reparation risks reducing it to merely a procedural outcome, a symbolic gesture or a managerial requirement, rather than a meaningful response to harm. It also risks disconnecting reparation from the broader restorative conception of justice that seeks to address the relational and political conditions in which harm occurs.

Clarifying the concept of reparation in RJ is therefore important not only for theoretical coherence but also for examining how RJ principles are translated, transformed or potentially compromised when RJ operates within conventional criminal justice institutions. This distinction is particularly important because RJ should not be assumed to remain inherently separate from retributive or managerial forms of justice. As critical scholarship has demonstrated, RJ practices can be incorporated into existing criminal justice systems in ways that reproduce institutional priorities, responsibilize individuals, prioritise measurable outcomes, or supplement rather than challenge punitive practices (Butler *et al.* 2024; Crawford and Rojas 2024; Woolford *et al.* 2025). Institutionalization may therefore produce hybrid forms of justice in which restorative, retributive, rehabilitative and managerial rationalities coexist and sometimes conflict.

Accordingly, the framework developed here should not be read as assuming that RJ necessarily achieves repair, nor that practices labelled 'restorative' are inherently reparative. RJ processes can fail to address participants' needs, reproduce unequal power relations generate pressure to participate or reconcile, or reduce reparation to administratively convenient outcomes such as apology, restitution or agreement completion (Maglione 2021; Suzuki 2026). These possibilities are particularly important where RJ is embedded within criminal justice institutions whose organizational priorities may differ from the needs and expectations of those affected by harm. Reparation is therefore treated in this article as a normative and analytical criterion against which RJ practices can themselves be critically assessed, rather than as an outcome that follows automatically from the use of RJ.

From this perspective, the multidimensional framework has a critical as well as constructive function. It allows researchers and practitioners to ask not simply whether an intervention is formally designated as restorative, but what forms of harm it recognizes, whose understandings of repair shape the process, which actors are assigned responsibility and whether material, symbolic, relational and procedural dimensions are meaningfully addressed. The possibility that RJ may be co-opted by punitive or managerial systems therefore strengthens, rather than diminishes, the need for conceptual clarity about reparation. Without such clarity, restorative language may legitimize practices that leave underlying harms, inequalities, or institutional conditions largely unchanged.

in social life. The framework developed in this article adopts this multidimensional understanding of harm (Suzuki, under review). Each dimension of reparation proposed in this article—material, symbolic, relational and procedural—corresponds to a distinct dimension of harm generated by wrongdoing.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Beyond RJ scholarship, this article also contributes to ongoing debates in theoretical criminology. First, it challenges offender-centric models of responsibility that dominate criminal law by theorizing reparation as a *distributed practice* involving persons responsible, persons harmed, communities and justice institutions. Second, the article contributes to debates about the political rationalities of justice by showing how reparation in RJ can either reproduce or resist institutional and economic logics that reduce harm and responsibility to commensurable and exchangeable units (Maglione 2024). In doing so, this article positions RJ not merely as a dispute-resolution technique but as a site through which broader questions of justice, coexistence, and social repair are negotiated. In this respect, the framework proposed resonates with zemiological approaches that emphasize the broader social harms produced by institutional arrangements and social inequalities (Canning *et al.* 2023), suggesting that RJ may provide a normative framework for addressing harm beyond the narrow confines of criminal law. Third, although developed through the context of RJ, the framework is not limited to processes formally designated as restorative. By conceptualizing reparation in terms of the dimensions of harm addressed rather than the formal designation of a justice process, it provides an analytical basis for examining reparative elements within conventional criminal justice and other responses to interpersonal, institutional, and collective harm.

The principle of repair in restorative justice

Repairing the harm caused by crime has long been regarded as a defining objective of RJ in both scholarly and policy formulations (Zehr 2015). Rather than treating crime primarily as a violation of law against the state, RJ reframes it as a violation of people and relationships, thereby positioning repair as a central concern of justice itself. For example, Bazemore and Green (2007) argue that RJ requires the person responsible to engage in actions directed toward making amends to those affected by their wrongdoing. Their framework emphasizes responsibility through repair rather than punishment, proposing that RJ processes should create opportunities for the person responsible to acknowledge harm and undertake reparative actions defined in dialogue with those affected. This focus on making amends represents a shift from the retributive question of 'what punishment is deserved?' to the restorative question of 'how can we address the harm?'

The emphasis on repair is also reflected in influential policy frameworks. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime defined RJ as being 'based on the belief that the parties involved in or affected by crime ought to participate actively in repairing the harm, alleviating the suffering that it caused and, whenever possible, taking steps to prevent the reoccurrence of the harm' (UNODC 2020, p. 3). In this view, reparation is framed as a participatory and forward-looking process involving not only the person harmed and the person responsible but also the wider community and aimed at future prevention. Similarly, in a practice-oriented formulation, Kirkwood (2022) identifies repairing the harm caused by crime as one of the core values underpinning RJ, underscoring its normative and operational significance in RJ practices. Empirical studies of RJ have further confirmed the centrality of 'repair' within the field. In a recent content analysis of RJ literature, Anderson *et al.* (2025) found that repairing the harm caused by crime is among the most frequently cited foundational principles in RJ.

Across theoretical writings, policy documents and practical guides, RJ is consistently defined by its commitment to repairing harm through inclusive processes that actively involve those affected by crime. This normative orientation towards reparation is commonly presented as one of the features distinguishing RJ from predominantly legalistic

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

or retributive approaches, although how far this distinction is maintained in institutional practice remains contested.

Sharpe's framework of reparation in restorative justice

Given that repair is a core aim of RJ, one might expect the concept of reparation to be well defined. However, as noted, there is considerable ambiguity around what 'repairing' entails in practice and how it should be evaluated. In many RJ studies, reparation is treated as a self-evident term or is used in a generic sense without a detailed definition (Spacey and Thompson 2022; Wilson *et al.* 2017). Other scholars focus on specific aspects. Some equate reparation with material restitution (Haines 2000), while others emphasize symbolic acts like apologies or other expressions of remorse (Retzinger and Scheff 1996). Still others use reparation interchangeably with the agreement reached at the end of an RJ process (e.g. obligations in a restitution contract) (Hobbs *et al.* 2025; Scheuerman and Keith 2023). This conceptual patchwork has long been recognized as problematic (Daly and Proietti-Scifoni 2011; Rosenblatt 2016). It obscures whether RJ is actually achieving its reparative goals, since 'repair' is operationalized as anything from paying a sum of money to saying sorry.

Attempting to address this conundrum, Sharpe (2007) offers one of the most systematic conceptualizations of reparation in RJ, shaping scholarship in the field (Heller 2023; Hobbs *et al.* 2022; Maglione 2018; Rosenblatt 2016). Sharpe's contribution can be summarized in three key points. First, she drew a clear distinction between material and symbolic forms of reparation, while acknowledging they often overlap in practice. Material reparation addresses the quantifiable, financial or physical loss or destruction to property or contents resulting from wrongdoing by providing goods, financial payments or practical services that compensate for losses or repair damage. Symbolic reparation, by contrast, addresses the moral and emotional dimensions of the offence. It centres on acknowledgement of wrongdoing, acceptance of responsibility and expressions of remorse. An apology is the most cited form of symbolic reparation, but Sharpe noted that symbolism can also be conveyed through respectful participation or other gestures showing commitment to making amends. Crucially, Sharpe emphasized that these two forms are interrelated because material reparation can carry symbolic meaning (e.g. paying back stolen money can symbolize accountability), and symbolic reparation can have material effects (e.g. a sincere apology might alleviate emotional suffering of the person harmed). The distinction lies in their primary function (concrete vs. moral amends) rather than their effects. This analytical framework of 'material vs. symbolic reparation' has had an enduring influence on some RJ scholarship and is frequently cited in discussions of RJ outcomes (Heller 2023; Hobbs *et al.* 2022; Maglione 2018; Rosenblatt 2016).

Second, Sharpe articulated conditions under which reparation is most effective, effectively specifying when and how reparation should occur in RJ. She argued that reparation is most meaningful when it is tailored to the specific harms caused, determined by those most directly affected, and offered voluntarily rather than imposed. Tailoring means that the content of the reparation should respond to the particular needs arising from the offence to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach. Stakeholder determination implies that the person harmed and the person responsible should shape what reparation looks like, which aligns with RJ's emphasis on participant empowerment and mutual agreement. The importance of the offer being voluntary stems from the understanding that symbolic aspects like apology or remorse lose authenticity if coerced, and even material compensation may carry more meaning if freely given. By highlighting these conditions, Sharpe showed that RJ processes themselves (e.g. facilitating dialogue, ensuring voluntary participation) may create

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

the relational and procedural context necessary for reparation to truly work. This insight hinted that the process through which reparation is reached is as important as the outcome, a point that foreshadows the need to consider procedural dimensions.

Third, Sharpe analysed the potential impacts of reparation on those harmed by crime. She identified four interrelated outcomes that meaningful reparation can achieve for the person harmed: repairing damage (e.g. restoring losses or well-being), vindicating the innocent (e.g. affirming that they were wronged and did not deserve the harm), locating responsibility (e.g. clearly placing accountability on the person responsible), and restoring equilibrium (e.g. helping to rebalance the sense of justice and safety in the person harmed). These outcomes extend beyond the immediate transaction of compensation or apology, as they speak to broader psychological and relational reparative effects. By addressing tangible losses, reparation can help the person harmed recover a sense of stability. By publicly acknowledging the wrong and who is responsible, it can offer moral vindication. By making amends, it can help restore a sense of fairness or order that was disrupted by the crime. Sharpe's multidimensional account here positions reparation not merely as an 'add-on' to RJ but as central to the moral and relational healing that RJ promises.

Sharpe's (2007) work stands out as a rare and sustained effort to offer a coherent conceptualization of reparation, articulating the conditions under which it can operate effectively, and clarifying its potential impacts for those harmed by crime. Nonetheless, it also reflects the era and context in which it was developed in the academic literature (i.e. mid-2000s) and, as such, has certain limitations in today's context. For example, the distinction between material and symbolic reparation emerged earlier in RJ practices during the early to mid-1990s (Moore 2004) because, within the RJ sphere, practice has often preceded scholarly conceptualization (Moore and Vernon 2024). Additionally, RJ theory has expanded in the past two decades to involve a wider range of offences (including serious crimes), more institutional actors (courts, police, community organizations) and higher expectations for evidence-based outcomes (Gavrielides 2021; Maglione *et al.* 2024), which suggests the need to extend the conceptual map of reparation.

Conceptual limits in prevailing accounts of reparation in restorative justice

As discussed above, Sharpe (2007) conceptualizes reparation primarily through the distinction between material and symbolic forms and emphasizes reparative actions undertaken by the person responsible, such as compensation or apology. This conceptualization introduces two limitations that leave room for further conceptual development within RJ. First, reparation can and should be understood as operating across additional dimensions, including relational and procedural dimensions, because the harms caused by crime extend beyond material loss and symbolic injury to include damaged relationships and compromised experiences of justice (Suzuki, under review). Relational reparation addresses the breakdown of trust, respect, and social bonds between those harmed, those responsible, and, in some cases, the wider community (Walgrave *et al.* 2021). While symbolic reparation focuses on moral acknowledgement and expressions of remorse (Sharpe 2007), relational reparation concerns the reconstruction of social relations through processes that enable dialogue, mutual recognition, and the re-establishment of legitimate interpersonal norms and relationships. An apology, for example, may serve a symbolic function by acknowledging wrongdoing (Brook and Warshwski-Brook 2010; Fernández-Manzano 2014), but relational reparation requires sustained interaction and responsiveness that allow relationships to be renegotiated rather than merely recognized as damaged (Suzuki and Yuan 2021; Walters 2014).

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Procedural reparation, by contrast, concerns how justice is enacted rather than what is exchanged or expressed. Crime often produces procedural harms by silencing the person harmed, marginalizing their perspectives, or subjecting them to opaque and disempowering decision-making processes (Pemberton *et al.* 2017). Procedural reparation seeks to address these harms by ensuring fairness, voice, respect, and meaningful participation within RJ processes (Kirkwood 2022; Van Camp 2017; Walklate 2025). Unlike symbolic reparation, which centres on moral communication (Sharpe 2007), procedural reparation focuses on re-establishing legitimacy through just processes that acknowledge agency and dignity (Hoyle and Batchelor 2018; Scheuerman *et al.* 2021). In this sense, procedural reparation is not reducible to apology or other symbolic acts, but operates through the design and conduct of RJ processes themselves, thereby shaping how reparation is experienced and evaluated by those affected.

Second, Sharpe's framework largely presumes that reparation is undertaken by the person responsible, thereby limiting the range of actors recognized as capable of engaging in reparative action. While reparation by the person responsible remains central to RJ, this offender-centric framing may overlook how other actors, particularly communities and justice institutions (e.g. courts), can meaningfully contribute to repairing harm (Bolívar 2010). Crime often produces collective and structural harms that extend beyond the victim-offender dyad, including community mistrust, social fragmentation and institutional failure (Maglione 2019). In such contexts, reparation may require collective or shared responses, such as community-led support, institutional acknowledgement of harm or reforms aimed at preventing recurrence (Bonett *et al.* 2025). Recognizing communities and justice institutions as potential agents of reparation expands the conceptual scope of RJ and aligns with its broader commitments to social repair, inclusion, and the re-establishment of legitimate norms (Bazemore and Green 2007; Dzur and Olson 2004). By moving beyond an exclusive focus on the person responsible, reparation can be understood as a distributed responsibility that more accurately reflects the relational and social dimensions of harm.

Taken together, these limitations suggest the need to reconsider reparation along two axes: what dimensions of harm are being repaired and who can contribute to that repair. These conceptual constraints point to the need for a renewed typology of reparation in RJ that is multidimensional in scope and inclusive in its attribution of responsibility. The following section develops such a typology by rebuilding reparation as a set of material, symbolic, relational and procedural actions undertaken by multiple actors, thereby providing a more comprehensive framework for analysing, practising, and evaluating RJ.

A multidimensional typology of reparation in restorative justice

Building on the preceding critique, this section develops a theoretical typology of reparation grounded in a multidimensional understanding of harm and proposes a conceptual framework for analysing how justice responds to wrongdoing. If crime generates different forms of harm—material, moral, relational and procedural (cf., Canning *et al.* 2023; Pemberton *et al.* 2017)—reparative responses must also operate across corresponding dimensions. These dimensions correspond not only to different forms of harm but also to different normative expectations about justice, ranging from compensation to recognition and relational repair. Table 1 provides an overview of the typology, summarizing each dimension's core meaning, typical forms of reparative action, the key actor(s) involved and indicators that could be used to evaluate outcomes in that domain. Following the table, each dimension is described in detail.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Table 1 A multidimensional typology of reparation in restorative justice

Dimension	Core meaning	Typical actions or processes	Key actor(s)	Indicators
Material	• Tangible efforts to address concrete harm and its consequences	• Financial compensation • Replacement or repair of damaged property • Provision of services or practical assistance	• Person(s) responsible (providing material amends) • Justice institutions (facilitating or enforcing restitution)	• Completion of agreed material outcomes • Satisfaction of the person(s) harmed with material reparation • Reduction of practical burdens resulting from harm
Symbolic	• Expressive acts to acknowledge harm and reaffirm moral norms	• Symbolic gestures of amends (e.g. apologies) • Expression of remorse • Acknowledgement of responsibility	• Person(s) responsible (as primary giver of apology/remorse) • Community representatives or justice institutions (involved in collective acknowledgement or ceremonies)	• Perceived sincerity of apology and acknowledgement • Recognition of wrongdoing • Restoration of moral legitimacy
Relational	• Efforts to address damaged relationships, trust, communication, and social bonds, where appropriate and desired	• Facilitated dialogue • Agreements on future interactions • Community support	• Person(s) harmed and person(s) responsible (engaging in direct or indirect dialogue) • Facilitator(s) (mediating and guiding communication) • Community involvement (supporting reintegration and relationship repair)	• Quality of dialogue • Change in trust and mutual recognition • Willingness to re-engage or coexist
Procedural	• Fair, transparent processes to enable participation, accountability and norm rebuilding	• Inclusive decision-making • Information sharing • Follow-up on agreements	• Facilitator(s) (ensuring fair process) • Justice institutions (providing a supporting framework and oversight) • Person(s) harmed and person(s) responsible (participating in shaping outcomes) • Community representatives (where applicable, to ensure community standards are met)	• Active participation in decision-making • Perceptions of fairness and voice • Procedural legitimacy

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Material reparation retains Sharpe's (2007) emphasis on tangible responses to the concrete consequences of wrongdoing, including restitution, compensation, the repair or return of property, and practical assistance. These actions directly attempt to make the person harmed *whole* in a material sense. In many RJ programmes, especially for property offences, material reparation is a primary component of outcome agreements (Strang 2002). The key actors in material reparation are typically the person responsible, who is expected to offer or perform the compensatory act, and sometimes justice institutions (e.g. courts or victim compensation funds), which may facilitate or enforce the material repair, especially if the person responsible lacks the capacity to fully repair the harm on their own (Miers 2014). For example, a court might convert an RJ agreement into a formal restitution order, or a state fund might cover losses of the person harmed when the person responsible cannot pay. Indicators of material reparation focus on both objective completion and subjective satisfaction. Objectively, one can assess whether agreed material outcomes were completed (e.g. Was the money paid? Was the graffiti cleaned up?). Subjectively, it is important to assess the satisfaction of the person harmed (e.g. Did the material reparation actually alleviate their burden or sense of loss?). A successful material reparation would also likely reduce the practical hardships resulting from the crime (e.g. financial strain, loss of property) and leave the person harmed feeling that the concrete harm has been substantively addressed.

Symbolic reparation similarly builds on Sharpe's (2007) account of acknowledgement, responsibility, remorse and apology. Symbolic acts are crucial because crime often causes moral and emotional injuries that material compensation alone cannot fix (Retzinger and Scheff 1996; Walker 2006). A person who has been humiliated or whose sense of justice was violated may need acknowledgement and vindication more than money (Daly 2017). A person responsible is the central actor in delivering symbolic reparation, since an apology or acknowledgement of responsibility typically must come from them to carry weight (Suzuki 2024). However, others can play a role. Community representatives and/or justice institutions can participate in collective acknowledgements or rituals of restoration (Walgrave *et al.* 2021). For instance, community leaders might join in condemning the act and affirming the blamelessness of the person harmed, amplifying the symbolic effect (Rossner and Bruce 2016). Indicators in the symbolic domain are inherently about perceptions and feelings: the sincerity of the apology as perceived by the person harmed (and community), whether the person harmed feels that the person responsible truly acknowledged the wrongdoing, and whether the interaction has helped restore a sense of moral balance or dignity. One might evaluate, for example, if the person harmed now feels the person responsible has taken responsibility and if the broader community narrative about the crime has shifted (e.g. from silence or denial to acknowledgement and condemnation of the harm). Symbolic reparation is considered meaningful only if it is experienced as authentic by the person harmed because a perfunctory or coerced apology would not meet this criterion and could even be counter productive (Hayes 2006).

Relational reparation[3] addresses the damage crime does to relationships, social ties and trust. Many crimes, especially those involving people who know each other or small communities, result in a breakdown of trust, estrangement or the fracturing of social bonds (Wikström and Dolmén 2001). Relational reparation is about actively rebuilding those relationships or at least re-establishing mutual respect between parties (Hansen

[3] It is important to note that symbolic and relational reparation, while distinct analytically, may be intertwined. An apology (symbolic) might be one step in a longer relational process of rebuilding trust, which typically requires sustained engagement over time rather than a one-time gesture.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

and Umbreit 2018). Typical processes facilitating relational repair include family group conferences or shuttle mediation, where parties engage in open communication (Suzuki 2025). Dialogue may create opportunities for new understandings or agreements about how participants wish to interact going forward, although such outcomes cannot be assumed and may not be desired in all cases. For example, they might agree on how to behave if they encounter each other in the community, or the person responsible might agree to certain conditions that reassure the person harmed (e.g. staying away from their residence). Community involvement can also be part of relational repair, such as neighbours coming together to support both the person harmed and the person responsible in reintegration, or community-led activities to address underlying conflict (Olson and Dzur 2004).[4] The key actors here are both the person harmed and the person responsible because their mutual engagement is the core of relational repair, with the help of a facilitator who ensures communication is constructive and safe, as well as potentially community members who can support or witness the process (Birkbeck and Smith 2024; Bolitho and Bruce 2017). Successful relational reparation might be indicated by improvements in the quality of interaction between the parties. For instance, dialogue characterized by active listening and empathy would suggest progress (Jonas *et al.* 2022). Other indicators include changes in trust or mutual regard, and the willingness of the person harmed and the person responsible to continue communicating or co-existing without hostility. Even if a full friendship is not achievable, relational reparation can be evident if parties can at least treat one another as moral equals and live in the same community with less fear or anger than before.

Procedural reparation is perhaps the newest and most abstract dimension in this framework. It concerns the fairness and inclusiveness of the process itself, recognizing that crime often inflicts 'procedural harm' on the person harmed in the sense of feeling voiceless, disempowered, or treated unfairly by the justice system (Pemberton *et al.* 2017). Conventional criminal justice procedures can sideline the person harmed, obscure the truth, and leave those harmed feeling that justice was not done in a procedural sense. Procedural reparation seeks to remedy those kinds of harms by designing the RJ process in a way that is just and empowering. This involves ensuring all parties have an opportunity to voice their perspectives and influence decisions, that decision-making is transparent, and that outcomes are arrived at collaboratively rather than imposed without input (Hartmann 2018; Walklate 2025). In practical terms, it might involve letting the person harmed and the person responsible mutually agree on what reparation is appropriate, sharing all relevant information about the case with both, and possibly involving community members in decision-making to reflect community norms. It might also include monitoring follow-through on agreements, which shows respect for what was decided and holds everyone accountable (Suzuki and Wood 2017). The key actors enabling procedural reparation are the facilitators, who design and run the process, and the justice institutions that authorise or oversee the process (Bruce 2013). However, the person harmed and the person responsible (and sometimes community participants) are also actors in procedural reparation, in that their active and meaningful participation is both a means and an end. Through participating, they regain a sense of agency and fairness (Hoyle and Batchelor 2018). Indicators of procedural reparation include participants' subjective perceptions of fairness, respect and voice during the RJ process. Another indicator may be the rate of

[4] At the same time, the notion of 'community' should not be treated as homogeneous or unproblematic, since communities are internally diverse and questions often arise regarding who is able to represent or speak on behalf of them within RJ processes (Rossner & Bruce, 2016).

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

active participation (e.g. did the person who was harmed speak and help shape the outcome, or were they passive?). Finally, one can look at broader signs of legitimacy (e.g. Do participants view the handling of the case as fair and just?). If procedural reparation is successful, one would expect higher satisfaction with justice procedures and perhaps greater compliance with the agreed outcomes. For example, when the person responsible feels they were treated fairly and had a hand in crafting the solution, they may be more likely to follow through on agreements (Tyler *et al.* 2007). In essence, procedural reparation is about repairing the harm of exclusion and powerlessness by making the (justice) process itself reparative.

In developing this typology, it is important to note that these four dimensions may be analytically distinct yet interrelated and overlapping. In practice, a single RJ case will often engage multiple dimensions (Moore and Vernon, forthcoming). For instance, in a victim-offender mediation about an assault, an apology (symbolic) might come alongside paying the medical bills (material). Both can occur within facilitated dialogue that gives the person harmed a voice (procedural) and perhaps leads to a mutual understanding or renewed respect (relational). Therefore, the typology's purpose is not to rigidly classify RJ cases or outcomes into only one category, but rather to ensure the recognition of the full spectrum of what reparation can entail. By doing so, RJ interventions can guard against the tendency to treat reparation too narrowly (e.g. only counting monetary restitution) or superficially. Instead, this framework urges practitioners and researchers to attend to all four dimensions. A well-rounded RJ process ideally should incorporate elements of each, or at least consider them (e.g. Was the material harm addressed? Was there meaningful symbolic acknowledgement? Were relationships tended to? Was the process fair and participatory?).

By explicitly theorizing relational and procedural reparation in addition to the material and symbolic, the typology fills conceptual gaps left by Sharpe's account. It aligns the concept of reparation more closely with contemporary RJ theory, which emphasizes participation, legitimacy, and community engagement as crucial to justice (Dzur and Olson 2004; Van Camp 2017). Furthermore, by highlighting that reparation is a shared action among the person responsible, the person harmed, communities, and institutions, this framework reflects the reality that repairing harm often requires collective effort. Offender-focused reparation alone may be insufficient in cases where systemic or community factors contributed to the harm (cf., Canning *et al.* 2023). The involvement of community representatives or institutions can address those broader issues.

A distinctive contribution of this renewed typology is the incorporation of dimension-specific criteria for assessing reparation. Whereas earlier literature typically spoke about reparation in qualitative terms, this framework suggests indicators that researchers and practitioners can use to assess whether and to what extent reparation has been achieved in each domain. Specifying dimension-specific indicators provides a basis for examining reparation more systematically while recognizing that not all dimensions are readily reducible to quantitative measures. For instance, using this typology, an evaluation of an RJ programme could track not just whether the person responsible has paid restitution (material) but also whether the person who was harmed felt the apology was sincere (symbolic), whether participants' relationship improved or deteriorated (relational), and whether they felt the process was fair (procedural). By translating the abstract idea of repairing harm into specific components, the typology provides a more rigorous basis for assessing RJ outcomes.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Reparation, justice and the politics of coexistence

The typology's contribution to improving evaluation should not overshadow the more fundamental theoretical and normative dimensions of the approach proposed here. In fact, the four dimensions of reparation outlined above should be understood as contributing to a deeper process of restoration, conceived not simply as a practical outcome but as the normative core of (restorative) justice. RJ is not just an external mechanism that corrects wrongdoing; rather, it is an immanent ethical and political task grounded in the relational condition of human existence (Nancy 2000; cf., Llewellyn 2021; Maglione *et al.* 2024). 'Doing justice' here consists in reconstructing the shared world in which human beings coexist, recognize one another, and make sense of their lives together. Harm, in this sense, is not limited to material loss or moral injury. It also disrupts relationality itself, isolating persons, eroding trust and suspending the space in which people can appear to one another as responsible and responsive beings.

Within this framework, the four dimensions of reparation correspond to different aspects of restoring the conditions of just coexistence. Material reparation addresses the concrete disruptions to people's lives, helping to rebuild the practical conditions of living together. Symbolic reparation responds to the moral and expressive dimensions of harm, reaffirming shared values and acknowledging responsibility. Relational reparation directly engages the breakdown of social bonds, creating spaces of encounter in which mutual recognition, dialogue and new forms of coexistence can emerge. Procedural reparation, in turn, reaffirms the conditions of justice itself by ensuring that those affected are heard, respected, and able to participate meaningfully in decisions that concern them. Each dimension addresses a different facet of the rupture caused by crime, but all contribute to the broader task of restoring the shared relational space that harm has disrupted.

There are crucial political stakes in this restorative task. Harm is not only interpersonal; it is always fundamentally embedded in wider social and economic arrangements that reduce singular beings to interchangeable units, subject to logics of equivalence, productivity or exchange (Canning *et al.* 2023). Contemporary criminal justice systems frequently translate harm into commensurable units such as financial compensation, punishment severity or risk scores. These mechanisms render harm legible to bureaucratic and economic systems but often obscure the relational and social dimensions of wrongdoing. In this sense, capitalist and sovereign forms of justice tend to erase difference by imposing uniform measures of value, responsibility and punishment (Nancy 2007). Reparation truly enables the restoration of justice only when it carries a counter-political task: resisting the reduction of persons to abstract categories such as 'offender', 'victim' or 'case', and instead affirms their singularity and mutual exposure. The relational and procedural dimensions are particularly significant here, as they reopen spaces in which difference can be expressed, heard, and negotiated, rather than suppressed by institutional or economic imperatives. RJ encounters may provide sites of democratic practice, where justice is enacted through the affirmation of plurality (of experiences, identities, and desires) rather than the imposition of equivalence. From this perspective, RJ can be understood as a counter-practice that seeks to reestablish spaces in which harm is articulated, interpreted and addressed through dialogue rather than reduced to standardized measures of liability or punishment.

As Nancy (2000) would argue, this is a process of affirming a *singular plural* being interrupted by harm. This is why reparation is not merely a set of technical outcomes or negotiated obligations. It is an ethical and political practice through which justice is enacted as the restoration of just coexistence. Rather than returning parties to a prior state of harmony, multidimensional reparation seeks to reopen, at different levels, the relational space in

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

which plural beings can confront their shared vulnerability, difference, and responsibility for the world they inhabit together. Reparation in RJ thus becomes the concrete expression of a form of justice that affirms the plural, democratic, and unfinished character of human coexistence while resisting political and economic logics that seek to erase difference.

Beyond restorative justice: reparation across justice processes

Although the framework developed here emerges from RJ, its relevance may not be confined to practices formally designated as restorative. If reparation responds to material, symbolic, relational and procedural dimensions of harm, elements of reparation may also be found within conventional criminal justice and other responses to harm. The distinction is not simply between RJ processes that repair and conventional processes that do not. Rather, the framework may provide a means of examining which dimensions of harm different justice processes address, how they do so, and where their reparative possibilities remain limited.

For example, conventional criminal justice processes may also contribute to particular dimensions of reparation. Compensation or restitution orders may address material consequences of crime, while state-funded compensation may provide redress where the person responsible cannot do so. Their reparative significance, however, cannot be inferred from the transfer of money or property alone. Compulsory compensation may alleviate material loss while carrying limited symbolic meaning, particularly where it does not communicate acknowledgement or responsibility. Conversely, compensation provided by the state or an institution may acquire symbolic significance when accompanied by acknowledgement of institutional responsibility (Haynes *et al.* 2015; Miers 2014). The framework therefore draws attention both to the dimension of harm addressed and to the meaning attributed to the response by those affected.

The framework may also illuminate initiatives beyond the conventional criminal justice–RJ distinction. Responses to institutional abuse, colonization, war and other forms of collective or state harm may combine material redress with public acknowledgement, truth-telling, institutional apology, participation and efforts to reconstruct damaged social relationships (e.g. McAlinden *et al.* 2025). Truth and reconciliation processes are particularly relevant, as they may engage several dimensions of reparation simultaneously (Doxtader and Villa-Vicencio 2004). The framework allows such processes to be examined in terms of which harms are addressed, which remain unaddressed, who bears responsibility for repair and whose understandings of reparation shape the response.

This broader application also highlights distributed reparative responsibility. Where harm is produced or compounded by institutional practices, structural inequalities or state action, responsibility for repair cannot necessarily be located solely in an individual person responsible for wrongdoing. Governments, public institutions, communities and other actors may have distinct capacities and responsibilities to contribute to repair. Yet, institutional responses should not be assumed to be reparative simply because they involve compensation, apology, participation or truth-telling. Whether such measures meaningfully contribute to repair remains an empirical and normative question requiring attention to the experiences of those affected.

Multidimensional reparation can thus provide a framework for analysing justice processes beyond RJ. It enables comparison across different mechanisms by asking what harms are recognized, what forms of repair are pursued, who participates in and bears responsibility for repair and how those responses are experienced. While RJ explicitly places repair at the centre of its normative orientation, it does not possess a monopoly on reparative practices; equally, describing a process as restorative does not guarantee

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

meaningful reparation. The framework thus provides a basis for examining the reparative possibilities and limitations of a wider range of responses to interpersonal, institutional, and collective harm.

Implications for restorative justice research, practice, and policy

The renewed typology offers important implications. For research, it provides a systematic framework for operationalizing reparation in empirical studies. By specifying dimensions and corresponding indicators, it enables scholars to move beyond binary or overly narrow measures of RJ success and to examine how different forms of reparation interact and unfold over time. Importantly, the multidimensional nature of reparation outlined in this framework suggests the value of combining different forms of evidence when evaluating RJ practices. Quantitative indicators, such as completion rates or participation levels, may capture whether agreed outcomes are achieved, while qualitative approaches are often better suited to examining relational change, perceived sincerity and experiences of procedural legitimacy. In this sense, mixed-methods approaches may be useful because they allow researchers to examine how different dimensions of reparation unfold and interact. At the same time, the ontological perspective outlined above suggests that reparation should not be treated solely as a set of measurable outcomes. It also involves rebuilding relational conditions through which plural beings coexist. This recognition invites research that is attentive to conflict, difference, and the political contexts in which harm and reparation occur, including how institutional and economic structures shape the possibilities of repair.

For practice, the renewed typology highlights the importance of designing interventions that attend to multiple dimensions of reparation rather than prioritizing a single outcome, such as apology or restitution. Practitioners are encouraged to consider how material, symbolic, relational, and procedural elements can be integrated within RJ processes to address the full range of harms experienced by the person harmed and wider communities. The ontological and political framing of reparation further emphasizes that RJ processes are not merely techniques for dispute resolution, but spaces in which difference, vulnerability and conflict can be expressed and negotiated. This acknowledgement places particular importance on the relational and procedural dimensions, which create the conditions for encounters that resist the reduction of participants to fixed roles or institutional categories. The identification of key actors across dimensions also underscores the need for practitioner reflexivity regarding roles and responsibilities, particularly in facilitating relational repair and ensuring procedurally just processes. Moreover, the typology cautions against reducing reparation to checklist-style outcomes and instead frames it as an ongoing, context-sensitive process.

At the policy level, the renewed typology has implications for how RJ is institutionalized, regulated and evaluated. Policies that equate reparation with restitution or apology alone risk narrowing the scope of RJ and undermining its transformative potential. From the ontological perspective, such reductions also reflect wider political and economic logics that seek to render harm and responsibility commensurable and exchangeable, often erasing difference in favour of standardized outcomes. By contrast, the renewed typology supports policy frameworks that recognize reparation as a multidimensional process involving multiple actors and requiring procedural safeguards. It also provides a basis for developing evaluation standards and accountability mechanisms that reflect the complexity of RJ, moving beyond compliance-based metrics toward assessments of legitimacy, participation and social repair. In this sense, policy approaches to RJ should aim not only to implement reparative measures but also to preserve the relational and democratic spaces in which

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

plural forms of life, conflict and responsibility can be articulated rather than absorbed into managerial or market-oriented logics.

Conclusion

Reparation in RJ is a rich and complex concept. This article has argued that reparation should be understood not as a single act or outcome, but as a multidimensional process that engages material, symbolic, relational and procedural dimensions of harm and repair. By extending Sharpe's (2007) pioneering framework to include relational and procedural aspects and by positioning reparation as a shared responsibility, it offers a more complete picture of how RJ can address the aftermath of crime. This renewed typology provides both a conceptual clarification and a practical approach by specifying what repairing the harm means. It also offers indicators to evaluate whether amends have been made in each relevant way.

More broadly, the argument advanced here contributes to theoretical criminology debates about justice. By conceptualizing reparation as multidimensional, the framework challenges individualized and offender-centric models of accountability that underpin modern criminal law. It also situates RJ within wider political debates about how harm is recognized, measured and addressed in contemporary societies. In doing so, the article positions RJ not simply as an alternative justice mechanism but as a lens through which to reconsider the relational and political foundations of justice itself. The framework's relevance therefore extends beyond RJ, providing a conceptual vocabulary for examining the reparative possibilities and limitations of conventional criminal justice processes and other responses to institutional and collective harm.

The framework also advances RJ theory, bringing it in line with contemporary understandings that justice must address not only outcomes but also relationships and procedures. It has direct relevance for practice and policy, as it encourages a holistic approach to designing RJ interventions and measuring their success. A key contribution of this work is to bridge the gap between abstract principles and observable outcomes, linking the moral and relational aspirations of RJ with tangible practices and evaluative tools. At the same time, the framework situates reparation within a broader restorative conception of justice, understood as an ethical and political task of reconstructing the relational conditions through which people share a world in common, and thereby responds to concerns about the institutionalization and narrowing of RJ within contemporary criminal justice systems (Maglione *et al.* 2024).

Ultimately, the multidimensional framework developed here should not be understood as a claim that RJ necessarily repairs harm or provides an inherently superior form of justice. Rather, it offers a conceptual basis for examining what repair might entail, whose understandings of harm and reparation are privileged, which actors are expected to contribute to repair, and the conditions under which RJ practices may (or may not) be experienced as reparative. Attending to material, symbolic, relational and procedural dimensions makes it possible to examine both the possibilities and limitations of RJ without assuming that participation, dialogue, apology or agreement are reparative in themselves. Reparation, understood in this way, therefore operates not only as an aspiration of RJ but also as a critical standard against which RJ practices and their institutionalization can be assessed.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr David Moore and Professor Mark Monahan for their insightful comments on the early draft of this manuscript.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

References

Anderson, J., Islam, M. S., Li, B. and Anderson, J. (2025), 'A Study of the Values and Principles-Based Approach to Restorative Justice', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 28: 13–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2025.2472310

Bazemore, G. and , Green, D. L.(2007), 'Yardsticks" for Victim Sensitive Process: Principle-Based Standards for Gauging the Integrity of Restorative Justice Process', *Victims Offenders*, 2: 289–301.https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880701404031

Birkbeck, C. and Smith, G. (2024), 'Moral Work in Victim-Offender Mediation', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 24: 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221095976

Bolitho, J. and Bruce, J. (2017), 'Science, Art and Alchemy: Best Practice in Facilitating Restorative Justice', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 20: 336–62.https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2017.1348896

Bolívar, D. (2010), 'Conceptualizing Victims' 'Restoration' in Restorative Justice', *International Review of Victimology*, 17: 237–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/026975801001700301

Bonett, R., Lloyd, C. D., Stone, A. G. and Ogloff, J. R. P. (2025), 'Group Conferencing is Associated with Lower Rates of Repeated Recidivism Among Higher-Risk Youth and There are Enhanced Effects Based on Who Attended the Conference', *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 23: 72–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/15412040241258952

Brook, E. and Warshwski-Brook, S. (2010), 'The Healing Nature of Apology and Its Contribution toward Emotional Reparation and Closure in Restorative Justice Encounters', In S. G. Shoham, P. Knepper, & M. Kett (Eds.), *International Handbook of Victimology* (pp. 511–535). CRC Press.

Bruce, J. (2013), 'Understanding 'Back Stage' and 'Front Stage' Work in Restorative Justice Conferences: The Benefits of Using Ethnographic Techniques', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 25: 517–26.

Butler, S., Maglione, G. and Buchan, J. (2024), 'Institutionalising Restorative Justice for Adults in Scotland: An Empirical Study of Criminal Justice Practitioners' Perspectives',*Criminology&CriminalJustice*,24:269–90.https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221104229

Canning, V., Hillyard, P. and Tombs, S. (2023), 'Social Harm and Zemiology', In A. Liebling, S. Maruna, & M. Lesley (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (7th ed., pp. 501–520). Oxford University Press.

Crawford,A.(2015),'TemporalityinRestorativeJustice:OnTime,TimingandTime-Consciousness', *Theoretical Criminology*, 19: 470–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480615575804

Crawford, A. and Rojas, P. P. (2024), 'Restorative Justice, Voluntariness and the Ongoing Challenges of Institutionalisation', *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 7: 401–9. https://doi.org/10.5553/TIJRJ.000232

Daly, K. (2017), 'Sexual Violence and Victims' Justice Interests', In E. Zinsstag & M. Keenan (Eds.), *Restorative Responses to Sexual Violence: Legal, Social and Therapeutic Dimensions* (pp. 108–139). Routledge.

Daly, K. and Proietti-Scifoni, G. (2011), 'Reparation and Restoration', In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Crime and Criminal Justice* (pp. 207–253). Oxford University Press.

Doxtader, E. and Villa-Vicencio, C. (2004), *To Repair the Irreparable: Reparation and Reconstruction in South Africa*. David Philip Publishers.

Duff, R. A. (2002), 'Restorative Punishment and Punitive Restoration', In L. Walgrave (Ed.), *Restorative Justice and the Law* (pp. 82–100). Willan Publishing.

Dzur, A. W. and Olson, S. M. (2004), 'The Value of Community Participation in Restorative Justice', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 35: 91–107. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9833.2004.00218.x

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

European Forum for Restorative Justice (2025), *Guideline on the Principle of Restoration in Restorative Justice*. https://www.verywellhealth.com/fetal-doppler-5119457#

Fernández-Manzano, M. (2014), 'Restorative Justice, Forgiveness and Reparation for the Victims', *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 4: 390–403.

Gavrielides, T. (2021), *Comparative Restorative Justice*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74874-6

Greenfield, V. A. and Paoli, L. (2022), *Assessing the Harms of Crime: A New Framework of Criminal Policy*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198758174.001.0001

Haines, K. (2000), 'Referral Orders and Youth Offender Panels: Restorative Approaches and the New Youth Justice', In B. Goldson (Ed.), *The New Youth Justice* (pp. 58–80). Russell House Publishing.

Hansen, T. and Umbreit, M. (2018), 'Regenerative Justice, Beyond Restoring', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 21: 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2018.1455508

Hartmann, A. (2018), 'Victims and Restorative Justice: Bringing Theory and Evidence Together', In T. Gavrielides (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of Restorative Justice* (pp. 127–144). Routledge.

Hayes, H. (2006), 'Apologies and Accounts in Youth Justice Conferencing: Reinterpreting Research Outcomes', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9: 369–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580601014292

Haynes, S. H., Cares, A. C. and Ruback, R. B. (2015), 'Reducing the Harm of Criminal Victimization: The Role of Restitution', *Violence and Victims*, 30: 450–69. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00049

Heller, D. (2023), 'Reparations and Restorative Justice: A Path to Racial Healing', *Hastings Journal of Gender & Law*, 37: 37–52.

Hobbs, A., Cienfuegos-Silvera, A. and Wylie, L. E. (2022), 'Variations in Victim Presence in Restorative Youth Conferencing Programs: The Use of Surrogate Victims Increases Reparation Completion', *Victims & Offenders*, 17: 994–1008. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2021.1982097

Hobbs, A., Garman, J. and Brewer, S. (2025), 'Restorative Diversion: Victim Youth Conferencing Effects on Recidivism', *Criminal Justice Studies*, 38: 147–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2025.2508061

Hoyle, C. and Batchelor, D. (2018), 'Making Room for Procedural Justice in Restorative Justice Theory', *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1: 175–86.https://doi.org/10.5553/IJRJ/258908912018001002001

Jonas, J., Zebel, S., Claessen, J. and Nelen, H. (2022), 'The Psychological Impact of Participation in Victim-Offender Mediation on Offenders: Evidence for Increased Compunction and Victim Empathy', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12: 812629–13.https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.812629

Kirkwood, S. (2022), 'A Practical Framework for Restorative Justice', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 63: 101688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101688

Llewellyn, J. J. (2021), 'Transforming Restorative Justice', *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 4: 374–95. https://doi.org/10.5553/TIJRJ.000096

Maglione, G. (2017), 'Embodied Victims: An Archaeology of the 'Ideal Victim of Restorative Justice', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 17: 401–17.https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895816677172

____ (2018), 'Immature Offenders. A Critical History of the Representations of the Offender in Restorative Justice', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 21: 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2017.1413360

____ (2019), 'The Political Rationality of Restorative Justice', *Theoretical Criminology*, 23: 545–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480618756364

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

____ (2021), 'Restorative Justice and the State. Untimely Objections against the Institutionalisation of Restorative Justice', *British Journal of Community Justice*, 17: 5–22.
____ (2024), *Restorative Justice and Contemporary Political Theory: Critical Encounters*. Routledge.
Maglione, G., Marder, I. D. and Pali, B. (2024), *Restorative Justice at a Crossroads: Dilemmas of Institutionalisation*. Routledge.
McAlinden, A.-M., Keenan, M. and Gallen, J. (2025), *Transforming Justice Responses to Non-Recent Institutional Abuses*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780191967399.001.0001
Miers, D. (2014), 'Offender and State Compensation for Victims of Crime: Two Decades of Development and Change', *International Review of Victimology*, 20: 145–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758013508683
Moore, D. B. (2004), 'Managing Social Conflict - The Evolution of a Practical Theory', *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 31: 71–91. https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.2961
Moore, D. B. and Vernon, A. (forthcoming), Communities of Practice: Building Momentum for Restorative Reform.
____ (2024), *Setting Relations Right in Restorative Practice: Broadening Mindsets and Skill Sets*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003224099
Nancy, J.-L. (2000), *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford University Press.
____ (2007), *The Creation of the World or Globalization*. SUNY Press.
Olson, S. M. and Dzur, A. W. (2004), 'Revisiting Informal Justice: Restorative Justice and Democratic Professionalism', *Law & Society Review*, 38: 139–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-9216.2004.03801005.x
Pemberton, A., Aarten, P. G. M. and Mulder, E. (2017), 'Beyond Retribution, Restoration and Procedural Justice: The Big Two of Communion and Agency in Victims' Perspectives on Justice', *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 23: 682–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2017.1298760
Retzinger, S. M. and Scheff, T. J. (1996), 'Strategy for Community Conferences: Emotions and Social Bonds', In B. Galaway & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives* (pp. 315–336). Criminal Justice Press.
Rosenblatt, F. F. (2016), 'Restorative Justice and the Blurring between Reparation and Rehabilitation', In T. Gavrielides (Ed.), *Offenders No More: An Interdisciplinary Restorative Justice Dialogue* (pp. 39–60). Nova Science Publishers.
Rossner, M. and Bruce, J. (2016), 'Community Participation in Restorative Justice: Rituals, Reintegration, and Quasi-Professionalization', *Victims & Offenders*, 11: 107–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1125980
____ (2018), 'Trajectories and Typologies of Pre-Sentence Restorative Justice Rituals', *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 51: 502–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865817749263
Scheuerman, H. L., Gilbert, T. N., Keith, S. and Hegtvedt, K. A. (2021), 'Discerning Justice: Clarifying the Role of Procedural and Interactional Justice in Restorative Conferencing', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 24: 4–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2020.1755843
Scheuerman, H. L. and Keith, S. (2023), 'Importance of Victims: How Does Offense Type Affect Restoration and Reparation in Restorative Justice Conferencing? ', *Temida*, 26: 325–43. https://doi.org/10.2298/tem2303325s
Sharpe, S. (2007), 'The Idea of Reparation', In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of Restorative Justice* (pp. 24–40). Willan Publishing.
Spacey, M. and Thompson, N. (2022), 'Beyond Individual Trauma: Towards a Multi-Faceted Trauma-Informed Restorative Approach to Youth Justice that Connects Individual

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Trauma with Family Reparation and Recognition of Bias and Discrimination', *British Journal of Community Justice*, 18: 18–35. https://doi.org/10.48411/vcqn-0794

Strang, H. (2002), *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*. Clarendon Press.

Suzuki, M. (2024), 'Possibility of Sincere Apology in Restorative Justice: When and How?', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 68: 1342–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221132238

____ (2025), 'Beyond Face-to-Face: Exploring the Restorative Potential of Shuttle Mediation', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958251400121

____ (2026), 'Restorative Journeys: Youth Offending Trajectories and Victim Recovery Following Restorative Justice Conferencing', *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.70038

Suzuki (under review). Reintroducing harm in restorative justice: A typology of first- and second-order harms.

Suzuki, M. and Hayes, H. (2016), 'Current Debates over Restorative Justice: Concept, Definition and Practice', *Prison Service Journal*, 228: 4–8. https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/prison-service-journal-228

Suzuki, M. and Wood, W. R. (2017), 'Restorative Justice Conferencing as a 'Holistic' Process: Convenor Perspectives', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 28: 277–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2017.12036075

Suzuki, M. and Yuan, X. (2021), 'How Does Restorative Justice Work? A Qualitative Metasynthesis', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 48: 1347–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854821994622

Tyler, T. R., Sherman, L., Strang, H., Barnes, G. C. and Woods, D. (2007), 'Reintegrative Shaming, Procedural Justice, and Recidivism: The Engagement of Offenders' Psychological Mechanisms in the Canberra RISE Drinking-and-Driving Experiment', *Law & Society Review*, 41: 553–86.

UNODC (2020), *Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes: Second Edition*. https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/20-01146_Handbook_on_Restorative_Justice_Programmes.pdf

Van Camp, T. (2017), 'Understanding Victim Participation in Restorative Practices: Looking for Justice for Oneself as well as for Others', *European Journal of Criminology*, 14: 679–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370816682981

Walgrave, L., Ward, T. and Zinsstag, E. (2021), 'When Restorative Justice Meets the Good Lives Model: Contributing to a Criminology of Trust', *European Journal of Criminology*, 18: 444–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819854174

Walker, M. U. (2006), *Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618024

Walklate, S. (2025), 'Victim-Survivor Stories of Restorative Justice: Why Should They Matter?', *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 8: 395–414. https://doi.org/10.1163/25890905-00803002

Walters, M. A. (2014), *Hate Crime and Restorative Justice: Exploring Causes, Repairing Harms*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof

Wikström, P.-O. H. and Dolmén, L. (2001), 'Urbanisation, Neighbourhood Social Integration, Informal Social Control, Minor Social Disorder, Victimisation and Fear of Crime', *International Review of Victimology*, 8: 121–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/026975800100800202

Wilson, D. B., Olaghere, A. and Kimbrell, C. S. (2017), *Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Principles in Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis*. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/250872.pdf

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

Woolford, A., McVicar, A. and Kaur, A. (2025), 'Against the Churn: Institutionalization, Transformation, and Restorative Justice', *Contemporary Justice Review*, 28: 198–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2025.2518107

Zedner, L. (1994), 'Reparation and Retribution: Are They Reconcilable?', *The Modern Law Review*, 57: 228–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.1994.tb01934.x

Zehr, H. (2015), *Changing Lenses: Restorative Justice for Our Times*. Herald Press.

Downloaded from academic.oup.com/bjc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bjc/azag092/9055796 by guest on 16 November 2026

© The Author(s) (2026). Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies (ISTD). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The British Journal of Criminology 2026 00(00) 1–20
https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azag092
Original Manuscript