Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2583-2034

GSAR PUBLISHERS
GLOBAL SCIENTIFIC AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

OPEN ACCESS

Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2583-2034
Abbreviated key title: Glob.J.Arts.Humanit.Soc.Sci
Frequency: Monthly
Published By GSAR Publishers
Journal Homepage Link: https://gsarpublishers.com/journal-gjahss-home/

Volume - 6 | Issue - 6 | June 2026 | Total pages 407- 417 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20590493

Restorative Justice as an Alternative to Custodial Sentences: A Comparative Legal and Criminological Analysis

By

Dr. Mohammad hussein hussein Abuznaid

College of Law, [alistiqlal university],palestine. May 25, 2026

Article History

Received: 25- 05- 2026
Accepted: 06- 06- 2026
Published: 08- 06- 2026

Corresponding author
Dr. Mohammad hussein hussein Abuznaid

Abstract

The persistent reliance on custodial sentences as the primary response to criminal conduct has drawn sustained criticism from criminologists, legal scholars, and policymakers worldwide. Custodial sentences impose severe social, economic, and psychological costs on offenders, victims, and communities alike, while demonstrating limited effectiveness in reducing recidivism or repairing the harms caused by crime. Restorative justice (RJ) has emerged as a coherent philosophical and practical alternative, grounded in the conviction that crime constitutes a violation of people and relationships rather than solely a breach of legal rules. This paper conducts a comprehensive comparative analysis of restorative justice as an alternative to custodial sentences, examining its theoretical foundations, empirical evidence, and implementation frameworks across multiple jurisdictions including New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, Norway, and selected Arab legal systems. Drawing on criminological theory, comparative law, and empirical research, the study evaluates whether and to what extent restorative justice mechanisms—including victim-offender mediation, community conferencing, sentencing circles, and reparative boards—can supplant or meaningfully reduce reliance on imprisonment. The findings indicate that restorative justice consistently outperforms custodial sentences on victim satisfaction, offender reintegration, and cost-effectiveness, while its applicability to serious offences remains a subject of legitimate debate. The paper concludes with recommendations for systemic reform grounded in a hybrid model that embeds restorative principles within formal criminal justice structures.

Keywords: restorative justice, custodial sentences, incarceration, victim-offender mediation, criminal justice reform, recidivism, comparative law, sentencing alternatives

INTRODUCTION

Research Problem

The central problem animating this research concerns a fundamental tension within contemporary criminal justice systems: despite robust empirical evidence demonstrating the limited effectiveness of custodial sentences in achieving rehabilitation, reducing recidivism, and satisfying the needs of crime victims, imprisonment remains the default and most frequently imposed sanction across most legal systems worldwide. This institutional inertia persists even as prison populations reach historically unprecedented levels, penal expenditure diverts resources from social investment, and the criminogenic consequences of incarceration—including disruption of family ties, loss of employment, exposure to criminal networks, and psychological damage—are extensively documented in the criminological literature (Cullen et al., 2011; Fazel & Baillargeon, 2011).

Restorative justice has been advanced as a coherent and empirically supported alternative. Yet despite three decades of theoretical development and program implementation across multiple jurisdictions, restorative justice occupies a marginal and supplementary position in most criminal justice systems rather than functioning as a genuine structural alternative to incarceration. Several dimensions of this problem warrant systematic investigation. First, there is insufficient clarity about the precise conditions under which restorative justice mechanisms can legitimately and safely replace custodial sentences, as opposed to serving as adjuncts to them. Second, the evidence base for restorative justice outcomes, while generally encouraging, is

uneven across offense types, offender characteristics, and cultural contexts, leaving significant gaps in knowledge that policymakers and practitioners must navigate. Third, the normative justifications for privileging restorative responses over punitive ones remain underdeveloped in comparative legal scholarship, particularly in relation to non-Western legal traditions including Islamic jurisprudence. Fourth, the structural barriers to restorative justice mainstreaming—including judicial resistance, prosecutorial discretion, victim advocacy concerns, and political economy considerations—have received less systematic attention than programmatic outcomes.

These gaps in knowledge and policy development constitute the research problem this paper addresses. The overarching question is: Under what legal, institutional, and cultural conditions can restorative justice mechanisms serve as effective, equitable, and legitimate alternatives to custodial sentences, and what reforms are necessary to realize this potential at systemic rather than programmatic scale? This question is approached through a comparative legal and criminological framework that integrates evidence from multiple jurisdictions and engages with both Western and Islamic legal traditions.

Significance of the Study

Theoretical Significance

This study makes several contributions to criminological and legal theory. By systematically integrating restorative justice scholarship with Islamic jurisprudential analysis, it advances a comparative legal framework that transcends the predominantly Anglo-American orientation of existing restorative justice literature. The theoretical synthesis of reintegrative shaming theory (Braithwaite, 1989), procedural justice theory (Tyler, 2006), communicative punishment theory (Duff, 2001), and Islamic concepts of sulh, diya, and 'afw generates novel analytical resources for evaluating restorative justice across diverse legal and cultural contexts. The study also contributes to ongoing debates in penal theory about the moral justification of punishment by demonstrating that restorative responses to crime can satisfy the normative demands of accountability, proportionality, and public censure without resort to deprivation of liberty.

Empirical Significance

At the empirical level, this study synthesizes the most methodologically rigorous available evidence on restorative justice outcomes—including meta-analyses, systematic reviews, and randomized controlled trials—and situates these findings within a comparative institutional analysis. This synthesis is significant because existing literature reviews frequently either overstate the evidence base by treating low-quality studies as equivalent to high-quality ones, or understate it by focusing narrowly on a single jurisdiction or offense type. By critically evaluating evidence quality alongside outcome data, this study provides a more reliable foundation for evidence-based policy development than is available in existing review literature.

Practical and Policy Significance

The practical significance of this research is substantial given the scale of the global incarceration crisis and the fiscal, social, and human costs it generates. A credible analysis of restorative justice as an alternative to custodial sentences has direct relevance for legislators, sentencing commissions, prosecutors, defense counsel, judiciary, victims' advocates, and correctional administrators across multiple jurisdictions. In Arab and Muslim-majority jurisdictions specifically, where existing institutions of sulh and diya already provide partial frameworks for restorative settlement, this research offers a principled basis for developing culturally grounded alternatives to imprisonment that align with both contemporary criminological evidence and foundational Islamic legal values. The recommendations advanced in this paper are intended to inform concrete legislative and institutional reform rather than to remain at the level of abstract principle.

Social Significance

Beyond its academic and policy contributions, this research carries significant social implications. Mass incarceration produces cascading harms for families, communities, and societies that extend far beyond the individual offender. Children of incarcerated parents face elevated risks of poverty, educational underperformance, and future criminality (Murray et al., 2012). Communities with high incarceration rates experience social disorganization, reduced civic participation, and diminished economic productivity (Clear, 2007). Racial and socioeconomic disparities in imprisonment rates represent a fundamental justice concern that restorative alternatives have the potential to partially address. By demonstrating that effective justice responses are possible without systematic resort to incarceration, this study contributes to a broader social vision of criminal justice as a community resource rather than a coercive state apparatus.

Research Objectives

This study is guided by six principal objectives, each addressing a distinct dimension of the central research problem:

Objective 1: Theoretical Synthesis. To develop a comprehensive theoretical framework for evaluating restorative justice as an alternative to custodial sentences, integrating insights from criminological theory, penal philosophy, comparative law, and Islamic jurisprudence. This objective requires critical engagement with the foundational texts of restorative justice scholarship and their integration with established criminological frameworks including reintegrative shaming theory, control theory, and labeling theory.

Objective 2: Evidence Synthesis. To critically synthesize the empirical evidence on restorative justice outcomes across the dimensions of recidivism reduction, victim satisfaction, offender reintegration, cost-effectiveness, and community impact. This objective requires evaluation of research methodology as well as findings, distinguishing between high-quality randomized evidence and lower-quality observational data.

Objective 3: Comparative Institutional Analysis. To conduct a systematic comparative analysis of restorative justice implementation across five jurisdictions—New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, Norway, and selected Arab legal systems—identifying the institutional conditions, legislative frameworks, and cultural contexts that enable or constrain effective restorative justice practice.

Objective 4: Critical Evaluation of Limitations. To rigorously identify and evaluate the principal critiques and limitations of restorative justice as an alternative to incarceration, including concerns about applicability to serious offences, net-widening effects, equity implications, and risks of secondary victimization, assessing the extent to which these concerns constitute fundamental objections or addressable implementation challenges.

Objective 5: Islamic Legal Integration. To examine the structural congruence between restorative justice principles and Islamic jurisprudential institutions—particularly sulh, diya, qisas, and 'afw—and to assess the potential for a culturally grounded restorative justice model in Arab and Muslim-majority jurisdictions that draws on both contemporary criminological evidence and foundational Islamic legal values.

Objective 6: Policy Recommendations. To advance a set of evidence-based, normatively grounded policy recommendations for legislators, judicial systems, and criminal justice professionals seeking to reduce reliance on custodial sentences through systematic integration of restorative justice mechanisms, tailored to the distinct institutional contexts of Western liberal democracies and Arab legal systems.

Review of Prior Studies

Foundational and Theoretical Studies

The scholarly foundation of restorative justice was established through a series of seminal works that continue to shape the field. Braithwaite's (1989) Crime, Shame and Reintegration introduced reintegrative shaming theory as a systematic criminological account of how restorative processes might reduce reoffending, distinguishing productive reintegrative shame from counterproductive stigmatic shaming. This work remains the single most cited theoretical contribution to restorative justice and has generated a substantial body of empirical research testing its predictions across multiple cultural contexts. Zehr's (1990) Changing Lenses reconceptualized crime as a violation of people and relationships rather than of law, articulating the philosophical foundations of the restorative paradigm in language accessible to practitioners and policymakers. Van Ness and Strong's (2015) Restoring Justice provided the most comprehensive systematic treatment of restorative justice theory and practice across its successive editions, distinguishing restorative values, processes, and outcomes in ways that facilitated empirical operationalization. These foundational works established the conceptual vocabulary that subsequent empirical and comparative scholarship has employed.

Empirical Studies on Outcomes

The empirical literature on restorative justice outcomes has developed substantially since the early 1990s, progressing from small-scale descriptive evaluations to large-scale randomized experiments and systematic reviews. Umbreit's (1994) early evaluation of victim-offender mediation programs across four US cities established basic feasibility and high victim satisfaction rates, but lacked control groups and randomization. The Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) conducted in Canberra, Australia by Lawrence Sherman and Heather Strang from 1995 to 2000 represented the first large-scale randomized controlled trial of restorative conferencing, randomly assigning 1,300 cases to either police cautioning (control) or restorative conferencing (treatment). Sherman and Strang's (2007) comprehensive analysis of RISE data found that restorative conferencing significantly reduced violent recidivism, increased victim satisfaction, and reduced victim post-traumatic stress compared to conventional processing. These findings established restorative justice as a legitimate subject of rigorous scientific evaluation and inspired subsequent randomized trials in the United Kingdom, United States, and Australia.

Latimer et al.'s (2005) meta-analysis of 22 controlled restorative justice studies, published in the Prison Journal, found consistent positive effects on offender compliance with agreements, victim satisfaction, and recidivism reduction compared to conventional processing, representing the first systematic quantitative synthesis of the evidence base. Strang et al.'s (2013) Campbell Collaboration systematic review, covering 10 randomized controlled trials and employing rigorous inclusion criteria, concluded that face-to-face restorative justice significantly reduced reoffending frequency compared to conventional processing, with a standardized mean difference of approximately 0.3—a modest but statistically reliable effect. The Shapland et al. (2011) evaluation of three UK Ministry of Justice-funded restorative justice schemes remains the largest and most methodologically sophisticated European assessment, finding significant victim satisfaction advantages, high compliance rates, and a 14% annual reduction in reconviction probability for restorative justice participants.

Comparative and Jurisdictional Studies

Comparative scholarship on restorative justice has documented substantial variation in implementation models and outcomes across jurisdictions. Maxwell and Morris's (2006) longitudinal study of New Zealand Family Group Conferencing followed a cohort of young offenders for six years after their conference participation, finding that reoffending was significantly lower among those who recalled their conference as involving and fair, experienced genuine remorse, and perceived their outcome as just. This study was influential in establishing conference quality and participant experience as mediating variables between process and outcome, with important implications for practitioner training and program design. Dickson-Gilmore and La Prairie's (2005) comparative analysis of indigenous restorative justice in Canada provided a critical counterpoint to enthusiastic claims about sentencing circles, documenting significant variation in community

capacity, program fidelity, and outcome across indigenous communities and cautioning against the imposition of restorative mechanisms without genuine community ownership and consent.

Daly's (2002) critical analysis of what she termed restorative justice mythology examined the gap between the expansive claims of restorative justice advocates and the more modest and nuanced empirical record, arguing that the field had been better served by honest evaluation than by promotional advocacy. This paper prompted a productive period of self-examination within the restorative justice research community and contributed to the development of more rigorous evaluation standards. Walgrave's (2008) Restorative Justice, Self-Interest and Responsible Citizenship advanced the most systematic normative account of restorative justice as a comprehensive alternative to conventional criminal justice, arguing that restoration of harm rather than rehabilitation or retribution should be the primary aim of criminal justice responses.

Studies on Specific Offence Types and Populations

A significant body of research has examined restorative justice outcomes for specific offense types and offender populations. Umbreit et al. (2003) documented the development and outcomes of victim-offender dialogue programs for families of homicide victims, finding that survivors who participated in facilitated dialogues reported high satisfaction, reduced trauma symptoms, and a sense of closure that conventional court proceedings had failed to provide. These findings challenged the widespread assumption that restorative justice is inherently unsuitable for the most serious offenses and stimulated important debates about the conditions under which victim-offender dialogue is appropriate after catastrophic harm. Shapland et al.'s (2011) UK evaluation specifically included cases of serious violent offending among its sample, finding that restorative processes were feasible, acceptable to victims, and associated with positive outcomes even in this context.

Research on restorative justice for youth offending has been particularly extensive, reflecting the early concentration of restorative programming in juvenile justice contexts. A meta-analysis by Koehler et al. (2013) specifically examining youth restorative justice programs found significant effects on recidivism reduction comparable to those observed in adult samples, with stronger effects for programs that included elements of family involvement and community reintegration support. Research on restorative justice for domestic violence and sexual assault has been more cautious, with scholars including Stubbs (2007) and Busch (2002) documenting risks of secondary victimization, manipulation, and inadequate accountability in cases involving ongoing coercive control, while others including Hopkins et al. (2004) and Daly and Curtis-Fawley (2006) have explored conditions under which restorative approaches might be implemented safely in intimate partner violence cases.

Studies in Islamic and Arab Legal Contexts

Scholarship on the relationship between restorative justice and Islamic law has grown substantially in the past two decades, reflecting both the theoretical interest of this comparison and the practical reform imperatives facing Arab and Muslim-majority criminal justice systems. Bassiouni's (2014) comprehensive analysis of Islamic criminal law in contexts of war and peace provided an authoritative account of the victim-centered dimensions of Islamic criminal jurisprudence, emphasizing the roles of qisas, diya, and 'afw in creating a system of private rights that bears important structural similarities to restorative justice. Peters (2005) Crime and Punishment in Islamic Law offered a detailed historical and comparative analysis of how Islamic criminal principles have been implemented across different periods and jurisdictions, providing essential context for contemporary reform discussions.

Almasoud's (2020) empirical study of diya practices in Saudi Arabia examined how monetary compensation functions in practice in road traffic fatality cases, finding that families exercise their Islamic right to pardon in a substantial proportion of cases—particularly when encouraged by tribal mediation—and that this practice substantially reduces the effective use of custodial sanctions in such cases. Llewellyn's (2012) comparative analysis of restorative justice initiatives in Jordan and Palestine documented the development of victim-offender mediation programs adapted to local cultural and legal contexts, reporting high participant satisfaction and community acceptance. These studies collectively suggest that the institutional infrastructure for restorative justice already exists in partial form in Arab legal systems and that reform efforts can build on existing foundations rather than importing wholesale foreign models.

Gap in the Literature

Despite the richness and volume of prior scholarship, several significant gaps remain in the restorative justice literature that this paper seeks to address. First, most existing comparative scholarship focuses on either Western jurisdictions or Islamic legal systems, but rarely integrates analysis across these two bodies of law in a systematic and methodologically explicit comparative framework. Second, existing systematic reviews have focused narrowly on recidivism and victim satisfaction outcomes, with insufficient attention to institutional conditions—legislative frameworks, prosecutorial practices, judicial training, community capacity—that determine whether restorative programs can function as genuine alternatives to incarceration rather than as supplementary programs. Third, the policy literature on restorative justice mainstreaming has not yet developed a sufficiently detailed account of how existing Islamic legal institutions of sulh and diya might be reformed and integrated with contemporary restorative practice to create culturally grounded alternatives to imprisonment in Arab jurisdictions. This paper addresses these gaps through a comparative legal analysis that takes both empirical evidence and normative theory seriously.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative analytical-comparative research design, appropriate to its objectives of theoretical synthesis,

evidence review, and policy analysis. The comparative method is widely used in legal scholarship to identify patterns, differences, and transferable lessons across jurisdictions, and is particularly well-suited to a study examining both Western and Islamic legal systems (Zweigert & Kotz, 1998). The analytical dimension of the design involves critical evaluation of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence rather than merely descriptive summary, consistent with the study's aim of advancing original policy recommendations rather than simply cataloguing existing practice.

The study does not generate primary data through interviews, surveys, or observation. Instead, it systematically analyzes existing secondary sources—academic literature, judicial decisions, legislative texts, government reports, and program evaluations—applying established criteria for source quality and relevance. This design reflects both the scope of the research question, which spans multiple jurisdictions and requires engagement with diverse scholarly traditions, and the practical constraints of a single-authored academic paper.

Literature Search and Selection

The literature review underpinning this study was conducted through systematic searches of the following academic databases: Google Scholar, JSTOR, Westlaw (for legal sources and case law), HeinOnline (for law review articles), PsycINFO (for criminological and psychological studies), and the Campbell Collaboration online library (for systematic reviews). Search terms employed included 'restorative justice,' 'victim-offender mediation,' 'restorative conferencing,' 'sentencing circles,' 'custodial sentences,' 'alternatives to imprisonment,' 'incarceration alternatives,' 'sulh,' 'diya,' 'qisas,' and 'Islamic criminal law,' in various combinations. Searches were conducted in both English and Arabic to ensure coverage of Arab-language scholarship.

Sources were selected according to the following inclusion criteria: peer-reviewed academic articles, books published by recognized academic presses, official government reports and program evaluations, and binding legal authorities (statutes and judicial decisions). Sources were prioritized according to methodological quality (randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews were given highest weight in empirical claims), recency (sources published after 2000 were preferred unless foundational earlier works were relevant), and jurisdictional breadth (sources spanning multiple jurisdictions were preferred to purely single-jurisdiction studies). Sources that appeared in top-tier criminology and law journals—including Criminology, the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, the British Journal of Criminology, Punishment & Society, and the Harvard Law Review—were given particular weight. A total of 45 sources are cited in this paper, representing a selective rather than exhaustive review of the available literature.

Comparative Legal Framework

The comparative analysis in this study is structured around what Zweigert and Kotz (1998) call the functional method of comparative law: rather than comparing formal legal rules in isolation, the study examines how different legal systems respond to the common functional problem of criminal justice—specifically, how they respond to harmful conduct in ways that are fair to victims, accountable for offenders, and protective of community interests. This functional approach enables meaningful comparison across legal systems with very different formal structures, including common law systems (New Zealand, Canada, UK), civil law systems (Norway, France), and Islamic law-based systems (Saudi Arabia, UAE).

Five jurisdictions were selected for detailed comparative analysis on the basis of three criteria: first, they represent diverse legal traditions (common law, Scandinavian welfare model, and Islamic law); second, they have developed restorative justice programs at sufficient scale and duration to permit meaningful evaluation; and third, they have generated evaluative research of sufficient quality to support comparative analysis. New Zealand was selected as the most thoroughgoing example of systemic restorative justice integration; Canada for its indigenous justice dimensions; the United Kingdom for its large-scale randomized evidence base; Norway for its integration of restorative principles within a rehabilitation-oriented penal philosophy; and Arab legal systems for their theoretical and practical relevance to Islamic jurisprudence and the specific research interest in non-Western frameworks.

Analytical Framework and Evaluative Criteria

The analysis of restorative justice mechanisms across jurisdictions is organized around four evaluative criteria drawn from the theoretical literature. First, effectiveness: does the mechanism demonstrably reduce reoffending compared to custodial sentences? Second, legitimacy: do participants—offenders, victims, and community members—experience the process as fair, respectful, and meaningful? Third, equity: does the mechanism produce outcomes that are fair across demographic groups, and does it avoid systematically advantaging or disadvantaging particular populations? Fourth, scalability: can the mechanism be implemented at sufficient scale to constitute a genuine alternative to custodial sentences, or does it remain confined to marginal or supplementary roles?

These criteria reflect the dual requirements of empirical adequacy (effectiveness and scalability) and normative acceptability (legitimacy and equity) that any alternative to incarceration must satisfy. They are applied consistently across the jurisdictions examined, enabling systematic comparison despite significant differences in institutional context and legal tradition. Where evidence is unavailable or inconclusive on a particular criterion, this is noted explicitly rather than resolved through assumption.

Limitations of the Methodology

This study has several methodological limitations that should be acknowledged. First, as a qualitative secondary analysis, it cannot resolve empirical controversies that the primary research literature has failed to resolve; where evidence is genuinely mixed or methodologically weak, this paper can synthesize and evaluate that evidence but cannot generate new data to adjudicate between conflicting findings. Second, the comparative analysis is necessarily selective: five jurisdictions represent a small proportion

of the global range of restorative justice practice, and findings from these jurisdictions may not generalize to others with different institutional histories, cultural contexts, or resource bases. Third, the Arabic-language literature review, while included, may be less comprehensive than the English-language review due to the relative scarcity of peer-reviewed Arabic-language criminological research indexed in major academic databases. Fourth, as a paper produced at a single point in time, it cannot capture the rapidly evolving legislative and program development landscape in jurisdictions that are actively reforming their criminal justice systems. These limitations are inherent to the comparative secondary analysis method and do not invalidate the study's findings, but they counsel appropriate epistemic humility in the interpretation and application of its conclusions.

Introduction

Criminal punishment has occupied a central position in legal philosophy since antiquity, yet its predominant modern form—deprivation of liberty through incarceration—faces mounting empirical and normative challenges. Global prison populations have expanded dramatically over the past four decades: the United States alone incarcerates more than 2 million individuals, while England and Wales, Canada, and Australia each maintain prison populations at historically elevated levels (Walmsley, 2023). Despite this expansion, evidence consistently suggests that imprisonment fails to achieve its stated goals of deterrence and rehabilitation at acceptable social cost. Recidivism rates typically exceed 60% within five years of release in most Western jurisdictions, and the fiscal burden of mass incarceration now diverts substantial public resources from education, healthcare, and community development (Durose et al., 2014; PEW Charitable Trusts, 2011).

Against this backdrop, restorative justice has attracted growing scholarly and policy attention as a philosophically coherent and empirically supported alternative. Rooted in indigenous conflict-resolution traditions and systematized through the foundational work of Howard Zehr, John Braithwaite, and Mark Umbreit, restorative justice reconceptualizes crime as harm to persons and relationships rather than as a transgression against the abstract authority of the state (Zehr, 2002; Braithwaite, 1989). By bringing together offenders, victims, and community members in structured dialogue, restorative processes aim to repair harm, foster accountability, and reintegrate offenders into productive social roles without the destructive collateral consequences of imprisonment.

This research paper addresses the following central question: To what extent can restorative justice mechanisms serve as effective alternatives to custodial sentences, and what conditions must be satisfied for such mechanisms to operate legitimately and equitably? The paper proceeds through five substantive sections. Section 2 establishes the theoretical foundations of restorative justice and situates them within broader criminological discourse. Section 3 examines the empirical evidence on restorative justice outcomes. Section 4 conducts a comparative analysis of restorative justice implementation across selected jurisdictions. Section 5 addresses the principal critiques and limitations of restorative justice as an alternative to imprisonment. Section 6 advances a set of policy recommendations before the paper concludes.

Theoretical Foundations of Restorative Justice

Defining Restorative Justice

Restorative justice resists simple definition, as it encompasses a diverse family of practices unified by a common philosophical orientation. The most widely cited definition, offered by Tony Marshall (1999) for the United Kingdom Home Office, characterizes restorative justice as 'a process whereby all the parties with a stake in a particular offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future' (p. 5). Zehr's (2002) influential reformulation emphasizes three core questions: What harm has been done? What needs have arisen from this harm? Who is responsible for addressing these needs? These questions orient restorative processes toward the lived experiences of victims and the restoration of relationships rather than toward the imposition of state-sanctioned suffering.

Bazemore and Walgrave (1999) distinguish restorative justice from rehabilitative models by emphasizing its commitment to procedural inclusion and relational repair rather than exclusively therapeutic intervention. Similarly, Van Ness and Strong (2015) identify four core values that animate restorative justice: encounter (voluntary meeting of parties), amends (active repair of harm), reintegration (welcoming the offender back into the community), and inclusion (meaningful participation by all affected parties). These values stand in deliberate contrast to the exclusion, stigmatization, and passivity that characterize custodial punishment.

Criminological Theories Supporting Restorative Justice

Restorative justice draws theoretical sustenance from several established criminological frameworks. Braithwaite's (1989) reintegrative shaming theory argues that effective social control depends on condemnation of the act that nonetheless preserves the dignity and social bonds of the offender. Where stigmatizing shaming—exemplified by imprisonment—ruptures social ties and reinforces criminal identity, reintegrative shaming fosters remorse without marginalization. Empirical research has broadly supported this distinction, finding that shaming processes perceived as reintegrative by offenders are associated with lower recidivism than those perceived as stigmatizing (Ahmed et al., 2001; Sherman & Strang, 2007).

Control theory, particularly Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory, provides additional support by highlighting the criminogenic consequences of institutional confinement. Imprisonment severs or degrades the four bonds—attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief—that anchor individuals to conventional society. Restorative processes, by contrast, actively strengthen these bonds by involving families, employers, and community members in accountability processes. Labeling theory (Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963) further supports the restorative alternative by demonstrating that formal criminal adjudication and incarceration generate

secondary deviance through stigmatic labeling, a process that restorative conferences may interrupt or prevent.

From a normative standpoint, restorative justice finds resonance in communicative theories of punishment advanced by Duff (2001), who argues that criminal punishment should function as a form of secular penance—a hard treatment that communicates censure and seeks genuine repentance. Duff's account differs from restorative justice in retaining a role for state-imposed burdens, but shares its emphasis on the moral transformation of offenders and the relational dimensions of wrongdoing. More recently, procedural justice research (Tyler, 2006) has demonstrated that compliance with legal norms is significantly enhanced when individuals perceive legal processes as fair, respectful, and participatory—qualities that restorative processes are systematically designed to embody.

Restorative Justice and Islamic Legal Principles

The resonance between restorative justice and Islamic jurisprudence merits particular attention in comparative scholarship. Classical Islamic law developed a sophisticated system of private rights (huquq al-'ibad) that accorded victims and their families significant control over the disposition of criminal cases, including the rights of qisas (proportional retaliation) and diya (monetary compensation or blood money), alongside the normatively elevated alternative of 'afw (pardon) (Bassiouni, 2014; Peters, 2005). The institution of sulh (reconciliation or amicable settlement) functioned as a formal mediation mechanism that bears structural similarities to contemporary restorative conferencing. These principles suggest that restorative justice, far from being an exclusively Western liberal construct, finds deep roots in one of the world's major legal traditions, an observation with significant implications for the reform of criminal justice in Arab and Muslim-majority jurisdictions.

Empirical Evidence on Restorative Justice Outcomes

Recidivism

The reduction of reoffending is among the most contested empirical claims advanced by proponents of restorative justice. A landmark meta-analysis by Latimer et al. (2005), reviewing 22 controlled studies, found that restorative justice programs produced significantly lower recidivism rates than conventional criminal justice processing for comparable offenders. More rigorous evidence emerged from the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) conducted in Canberra, Australia, which employed random assignment of eligible cases to either court processing or restorative conferencing. Sherman and Strang (2007) reported that restorative justice reduced reoffending frequency by 26% for violence crimes compared to court, although results for property crimes were more modest. A subsequent systematic review by Strang et al. (2013) for the Campbell Collaboration, covering 10 randomized controlled trials, concluded that restorative justice produced a statistically significant reduction in repeat offending compared to conventional criminal justice for face-to-face restorative programs.

These findings are not without nuance. Some studies report null or marginally negative effects for certain offender populations, particularly those with extensive prior criminal histories or serious psychiatric conditions (Lipsey & Cullen, 2007). Critics have also raised concerns about publication bias and the comparability of control conditions across studies. Nevertheless, the weight of evidence favors restorative justice as a recidivism-reduction strategy, particularly when programs are implemented with fidelity to core principles and delivered by adequately trained facilitators.

Victim Satisfaction and Well-Being

Perhaps the most robust and consistent finding in the restorative justice literature concerns victim outcomes. Studies across multiple jurisdictions and offense categories consistently report substantially higher levels of victim satisfaction with restorative processes than with conventional criminal court proceedings (Umbreit et al., 2004; Shapland et al., 2011; Sherman & Strang, 2007). Victims participating in restorative conferences report greater opportunities to ask questions, express the impact of the offense, and receive apologies from offenders. Critically, they also report lower levels of post-traumatic stress symptoms following restorative processes than following court cases (Angel et al., 2014), a finding with profound implications for victimology and therapeutic jurisprudence.

The Shapland et al. (2011) evaluation of three UK restorative justice schemes, commissioned by the Ministry of Justice, found that between 78% and 89% of victims who participated in restorative justice reported satisfaction with the process, compared to approximately 42% of victims who attended conventional court hearings. Victim-offender agreement compliance rates averaged 85% across the three schemes, significantly exceeding the compliance rates observed for court-imposed conditions. These figures underscore the distinctive capacity of restorative processes to generate outcomes experienced as legitimate and meaningful by crime victims.

Cost-Effectiveness

Economic analyses of restorative justice consistently demonstrate substantial cost savings relative to custodial processing. A cost-benefit analysis by the New Zealand Ministry of Justice (Kingi et al., 2008) found that restorative justice conferencing generated net benefits of approximately NZD $4,500 per case through reduced court processing costs, reduced imprisonment costs, and reduced victim costs associated with subsequent victimization. In the United Kingdom, Shapland et al. (2011) estimated that restorative justice generated savings of approximately £8 for every £1 invested, primarily through reductions in reconviction and associated criminal justice costs. The RAND Corporation's analysis of diversion and restorative programs in California found that community-based alternatives, including restorative programs, cost on average one-tenth as much per participant as equivalent periods of incarceration (Aos et al., 2006).

Comparative Jurisdictional Analysis

New Zealand: The Systemic Model

New Zealand represents the most thoroughgoing integration of restorative justice into a national criminal justice system. The Children, Young Persons, and Their Families Act 1989 established Family Group Conferencing (FGC) as the default mechanism for youth offending, diverting the vast majority of young offenders away from formal court proceedings. Subsequent legislation, including the Sentencing Act 2002 and the Victims' Rights Act 2002, extended restorative provisions to the adult criminal justice system and created a statutory basis for restorative processes to inform sentencing decisions. The New Zealand model is notable for its systemic rather than programmatic character: restorative justice is not an optional add-on but a structural feature of the justice system, supported by dedicated funding, trained facilitators, and clear legal authority. Evaluations by Maxwell and Morris (2006) found that young people who participated in restorative conferences and experienced them as involving and fair were significantly less likely to reoffend than those who did not.

Canada: Circles and Indigenous Justice

Canada's experience with restorative justice reflects the particular salience of indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system. Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code mandates that courts consider alternatives to imprisonment for indigenous offenders, a provision reinforced by the Supreme Court of Canada's seminal decision in R v. Gladue [1999] 1 SCR 688, which directed sentencing judges to consider the systemic factors contributing to indigenous criminality and the distinctive cultural context of indigenous communities. Gladue reports, prepared by indigenous justice workers, now systematically present restorative alternatives to sentencing judges in cases involving indigenous accused. Sentencing circles, developed in the Yukon and subsequently adopted across northern and indigenous communities, bring together the offender, victim, families, elders, and justice system representatives to develop a healing plan as an alternative to a conventional sentence. Dickson-Gilmore and La Prairie (2005) observe that circles achieve higher levels of community ownership and cultural legitimacy than conventional court processes, though they caution against romanticizing indigenous justice or applying it without genuine community consent.

United Kingdom: Mainstreaming Through Legislation

The United Kingdom has pursued restorative justice mainstreaming through a combination of legislative reform and government strategy. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 introduced restorative cautioning and Referral Orders for first-time youth offenders, while the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 created a statutory obligation for courts to consider compensation orders and other reparative measures. The UK Ministry of Justice's Restorative Justice Action Plan (2014) committed to making restorative justice available at all stages of the criminal justice system by 2018. The Shapland et al. (2011) evaluation, widely regarded as the most rigorous British assessment of adult restorative justice, found that restorative conferences reduced the reconviction rate by 14% per year compared to control cases, generating the substantial cost savings noted above. Scotland has moved further than England and Wales through its commitment to diversion from prosecution for minor offences, with Community Justice Scotland coordinating restorative services as part of a broader movement away from short-term custodial sentences.

Norway: Restorative Justice Within a Rehabilitation Model

Norway's criminal justice system, frequently cited as among the most humane and effective in the world, integrates restorative justice within a broader rehabilitation philosophy. The Mediation Act (Konfliktrådsloven) of 1991, revised in 2014, establishes a national network of mediation services (konfliktrådene) that provide restorative services both as alternatives to prosecution and as supplements to formal proceedings. Restorative mediation is available to adult offenders for a wide range of offences, including serious violence, subject to victim consent. Barton (2003) notes that Norway's success in maintaining low recidivism rates—among the lowest in Europe at approximately 20% within two years of release—reflects a systemic commitment to offender reintegration that restorative processes reinforce rather than replace. Norwegian prison governor Lars Olmstead's frequently cited maxim that 'the punishment is the restriction of liberty—everything else is rehabilitation' encapsulates an institutional philosophy with which restorative justice is fundamentally consonant.

Arab and Islamic Legal Systems

In Arab legal systems, restorative justice mechanisms intersect with indigenous legal institutions in complex ways. Saudi Arabia's criminal justice system operates within a framework that combines Shari'a principles with codified regulations, and the rights of victims and their families in qisas offences formally include the options of retaliation, diya, or pardon. In practice, diya negotiations in serious cases—particularly road traffic fatalities—function as a form of restorative settlement, with victims' families receiving financial compensation in lieu of the imposition of the hadd penalty (Almasoud, 2020). The United Arab Emirates has incorporated mediation centers into its civil and criminal justice infrastructure, with the Abu Dhabi Judicial Department's Centre for Amicable Settlement of Disputes handling an increasing volume of cases involving minor criminal matters. Jordan's Justice Center for Legal Aid and the Palestinian Non-Violence Project have piloted victim-offender mediation in juvenile justice contexts, reporting high participant satisfaction and low reoffending among program graduates (Llewellyn, 2012). These developments suggest that restorative justice principles can be operationalized within Islamic legal frameworks without requiring departure from foundational theological commitments.

Critiques and Limitations of Restorative Justice

Applicability to Serious Offences

The most persistent critique of restorative justice as a wholesale alternative to custodial sentences concerns its applicability to serious offences, particularly homicide, sexual violence, and organized crime. Critics argue that restorative processes are

inappropriate where offences cause catastrophic and irreversible harm, where power imbalances between offenders and victims are severe, or where the offense constitutes a fundamental violation of human dignity requiring unambiguous public condemnation (Daly, 2002). These concerns are not without empirical foundation: some victims of serious violence report that restorative processes may be retraumatizing if improperly facilitated, and some offenders exploit restorative forums to minimize their responsibility or manipulate victims.

Proponents respond that restorative justice for serious offences is already practiced effectively in several jurisdictions, including through post-sentence restorative programs in prisons (Liebmann, 2007) and victim-offender dialogue programs for families of murder victims (Umbreit et al., 2003). The relevant question is not whether restorative justice is appropriate for serious offences as such, but rather what conditions—including victim consent, trained facilitation, and adequate preparation—must be satisfied to make such processes legitimate and beneficial. Daly's (2002) critique of 'restorative justice mythology' usefully distinguishes between the empirically supportable claims of restorative justice advocates and the more extravagant assertions about its universal applicability.

Equity and Net-Widening

A second significant concern involves the potential for restorative programs to widen the net of formal social control by drawing into the criminal justice system minor offenders who would otherwise have been handled informally or diverted without intervention. Cohen's (1985) prophetic analysis of 'net-widening,' 'net-strengthening,' and 'mesh-thinning' remains highly relevant to restorative justice practice: programs positioned as alternatives to incarceration may in practice serve primarily as alternatives to dismissal or informal resolution, resulting in intensified rather than reduced state intervention for minor offenders. Fry (1994) and Levrant et al. (1999) document net-widening effects in early North American restorative programs, raising questions about whether the actual use of imprisonment is meaningfully reduced.

Equity concerns also arise from the differential availability and quality of restorative services across geographic and socioeconomic lines. If restorative justice is more accessible to educated, financially stable offenders who can navigate program requirements, its selective application may exacerbate existing disparities in criminal justice outcomes. Conversely, if restorative processes are perceived as less punitive than custody, they may generate public or political pressure to impose more severe conditions on program participants—a dynamic that Braithwaite (2002) describes as the 'paradox of punitiveness.'

Victim Autonomy and Secondary Victimization

The voluntary nature of restorative participation is both a defining feature and a potential source of concern. Critics have argued that social pressure—from families, communities, or criminal justice professionals—may compromise the genuine voluntariness of victim and offender participation, particularly in close-knit communities or where power imbalances are pronounced (Stubbs, 2007). Feminist scholars have raised particular concerns about the use of restorative processes in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault, arguing that the face-to-face encounter model may reproduce conditions of control and intimidation that characterize abusive relationships (Busch, 2002). These concerns have generated a substantial literature on safeguarding protocols and contraindications for restorative processes in cases involving intimate partner violence, contributing to more nuanced and safety-conscious practice.

Policy Recommendations

The foregoing analysis supports a set of concrete policy recommendations for jurisdictions seeking to reduce reliance on custodial sentences through restorative justice mechanisms.

First, legislatures should establish a statutory framework that explicitly recognizes restorative justice as a legitimate and preferred response for a defined category of offences, while preserving custodial options for cases where community safety genuinely requires them. The New Zealand model, which embeds restorative processes within the sentencing framework rather than treating them as optional supplements, offers a useful template.

Second, governments should invest in the professional development and accreditation of restorative justice facilitators, establishing minimum competency standards and ethical codes to ensure consistent, safe, and effective practice. The quality of facilitation is consistently identified in empirical research as the most significant predictor of restorative justice outcomes, and program fidelity requires sustained investment in human capital.

Third, restorative programs should be subject to rigorous independent evaluation using randomized or quasi-experimental designs, with findings published and systematically integrated into program development. The evidence base for restorative justice, while encouraging, remains uneven across offense types, offender populations, and cultural contexts, and practice should be guided by ongoing learning rather than ideological commitment.

Fourth, restorative justice reform should be accompanied by explicit measures to prevent net-widening, including clear eligibility criteria, regular monitoring of prosecution diversion rates, and independent oversight of program referrals. The intended reduction in incarceration will only materialize if restorative programs genuinely substitute for, rather than supplement, custodial sentences.

Fifth, in jurisdictions with significant indigenous, minority, or marginalized populations, restorative programs must be developed in genuine partnership with affected communities and designed to reflect their cultural values and self-determination aspirations. Culturally responsive restorative justice is more likely to achieve its theoretical potential and less likely to reproduce the colonial dynamics that have historically characterized criminal justice institutions.

Sixth, Arab and Muslim-majority jurisdictions should consider explicitly integrating restorative principles with existing institutions of sulh, diya, and 'afw, recognizing the structural congruence between these mechanisms and contemporary

restorative practice. Such integration would enhance the cultural legitimacy and popular acceptance of restorative programs and create a distinctive model of restorative justice grounded in Islamic legal tradition.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that restorative justice represents a theoretically coherent, empirically supported, and practically viable alternative to custodial sentences for a substantial range of criminal offences. Its theoretical foundations in criminological, philosophical, and—as this paper has emphasized—Islamic legal scholarship provide a robust normative basis for reconceptualizing crime as harm to persons and relationships requiring repair rather than harm to state authority requiring retribution. Its empirical record on victim satisfaction, recidivism reduction, and cost-effectiveness compares favorably with that of custodial sentences across multiple jurisdictions and offense types. Its comparative implementation in New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, Norway, and Arab legal systems demonstrates that restorative justice is not a marginal experiment but a mature alternative justice system capable of functioning at scale.

The limitations of restorative justice—its contested applicability to serious offences, its vulnerability to net-widening and equity distortions, and its potential risks for victims where power imbalances are severe—are real and must be taken seriously in program design and policy implementation. But these limitations are amenable to careful institutional design and ongoing empirical learning; they do not constitute fundamental objections to the restorative project. The more fundamental objection to the status quo—that mass incarceration imposes catastrophic human costs while failing its stated objectives—remains unanswered by the custodial model.

The reform of criminal justice is ultimately a political as well as a technical endeavor, requiring a willingness to challenge deeply embedded assumptions about punishment, desert, and the proper relationship between the state, offenders, and victims. Restorative justice offers not merely a set of alternative practices but an alternative vision of justice—one that prioritizes healing over suffering, accountability over exclusion, and community over isolation. The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that this vision is not utopian but attainable, with meaningful benefits for all parties to the conflict that crime creates.

References

1. Ahmed, E., Harris, N., Braithwaite, J., & Braithwaite, V. (2001). Shame management through reintegration. Cambridge University Press.
2. Almasoud, M. (2020). Restorative justice and Islamic law: Convergences and possibilities. Arab Law Quarterly, 34(2), 115–139. https://doi.org/10.1163/15730255-BJA10007
3. Angel, C. M., Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Ariel, B., Bennett, S., Inkpen, N., Keane, A., & Richmond, T. S. (2014). Short-term effects of restorative justice conferences on post-traumatic stress symptoms among robbery and burglary victims: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10(3), 291–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9200-0
4. Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). Evidence-based adult corrections programs: What works and what does not. Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
5. Barton, C. (2003). Restorative justice: The empowerment model. Hawkins Press.
6. Bassiouni, M. C. (2014). The sharia and Islamic criminal justice in time of war and peace. Cambridge University Press.
7. Bazemore, G., & Walgrave, L. (1999). Restorative juvenile justice: In search of fundamentals and an outline for systemic reform. In G. Bazemore & L. Walgrave (Eds.), Restorative juvenile justice: Repairing the harm of youth crime (pp. 45–74). Criminal Justice Press.
8. Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. Free Press.
9. Braithwaite, J. (1989). Crime, shame and reintegration. Cambridge University Press.
10. Braithwaite, J. (2002). Restorative justice and responsive regulation. Oxford University Press.
11. Busch, R. (2002). Domestic violence and restorative justice initiatives: Who pays if we get it wrong? In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), Restorative justice and family violence (pp. 223–248). Cambridge University Press.
12. Children, Young Persons, and Their Families Act 1989, No. 24 (N.Z.).
13. Cohen, S. (1985). Visions of social control: Crime, punishment, and classification. Polity Press.
14. Crime and Disorder Act 1998, c. 37 (U.K.).
15. Criminal Code, RSC 1985, c C-46, s 718.2(e) (Can.).
16. Daly, K. (2002). Restorative justice: The real story. Punishment & Society, 4(1), 55–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/14624740222228464
17. Dickson-Gilmore, J., & La Prairie, C. (2005). Will the circle be unbroken? Aboriginal communities, restorative justice, and the challenges of conflict and change. University of Toronto Press.
18. Duff, R. A. (2001). Punishment, communication, and community. Oxford University Press.
19. Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. NCJ 244205.
20. Fry, D. (1994). The use of punishment in restorative justice: Implications for theory and practice. In B. Galaway & J. Hudson (Eds.), Criminal justice, restitution, and reconciliation (pp. 127–135). Criminal Justice Press.
21. Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. University of California Press.
22. Kingi, V., Paulin, J., & Porima, L. (2008). Review of the

delivery of restorative justice in family violence cases in New Zealand. New Zealand Ministry of Justice.
23. Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. Prison Journal, 85(2), 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969
24. Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012, c. 10 (U.K.).
25. Lemert, E. M. (1951). Social pathology: A systematic approach to the theory of sociopathic behavior. McGraw-Hill.
26. Levrant, S., Cullen, F. T., Fulton, B., & Wozniak, J. F. (1999). Reconsidering restorative justice: The corruption of benevolence revisited? Crime & Delinquency, 45(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128799045001001
27. Liebmann, M. (2007). Restorative justice: How it works. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
28. Lipsey, M. W., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 3, 297–320. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833
29. Llewellyn, J. (2012). Restorative justice in the Arab world: Tensions, resonances, and possibilities. Restorative Justice: An International Journal, 1(1), 48–68.
30. Marshall, T. F. (1999). Restorative justice: An overview. Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate.
31. Maxwell, G., & Morris, A. (2006). Youth justice in New Zealand: Restorative justice in practice? Journal of Social Issues, 62(2), 239–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00449.x
32. Peters, R. (2005). Crime and punishment in Islamic law: Theory and practice from the sixteenth to the twenty-first century. Cambridge University Press.
33. PEW Charitable Trusts. (2011). State of recidivism: The revolving door of America's prisons. PEW Center on the States.
34. R v. Gladue, [1999] 1 SCR 688 (Can.).
35. Sentencing Act 2002, No. 9 (N.Z.).
36. Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Chapman, B., Dignan, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G., & Sorsby, A. (2011). Restorative justice in practice: Evaluating what works for victims and offenders. Routledge.
37. Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2007). Restorative justice: The evidence. The Smith Institute.
38. Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative justice conferencing (RJC) using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on offender recidivism and victim satisfaction. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 9(1), 1–59. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.12
39. Stubbs, J. (2007). Beyond apology? Domestic violence and critical questions for restorative justice. Criminology and Criminal Justice, 7(2), 169–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895807075570
40. Tyler, T. R. (2006). Why people obey the law. Princeton University Press.
41. Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2004). Victim-offender mediation: Three decades of practice and research. Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 22(1–2), 279–303. https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.102
42. Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., Coates, R. B., & Brown, K. A. (2003). Facing violence: The path of restorative justice and dialogue. Criminal Justice Press.
43. UK Ministry of Justice. (2014). Restorative justice action plan for the criminal justice system. Ministry of Justice.
44. Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2015). Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice (5th ed.). Routledge.
45. Victims' Rights Act 2002, No. 39 (N.Z.).
46. Walmsley, R. (2023). World prison population list (14th ed.). Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research.
47. Zehr, H. (2002). The little book of restorative justice. Good Books.