

Running Head: VICTIM-OFFENDER MEDIATION

In press: *Contemporary Justice Review*

Apology in Victim-Offender Mediation

Mandeep K. Dhama, PhD

Middlesex University

Send correspondence to:

Mandeep K. Dhama, PhD
Professor of Decision Psychology
Department of Psychology
Middlesex University
The Burroughs
Hendon
London, UK
NW4 4BT

E-mail: m.dhama@mdx.ac.uk

Acknowledgements

The research presented in this paper was funded by a British Academy grant to the author. I would like to thank Karen Souza for her research assistance. I am also grateful for the co-operation of the co-ordinator and staff of Southwark Mediation Centre: Dave Walker, Lee Bosky, Gillian Walters, Elena Noel, Mel Bruce, Nicola Pocock and Amanda Stewart.

Abstract

Victim-offender mediation practices bring conflicting parties together so they can engage in a two-way dialogue and ultimately negotiate a mutually agreeable resolution. The fact that apology may be a motivator for participating in the mediation process and that it is often a common outcome of mediation suggests that research on mediation ought to more carefully explore the nature of the apologies that are offered. The present study provides a qualitative exploration of the *prevalence* and *nature* of the apologies offered by offenders to their victims during face-to-face mediations. Fifty-nine mediation agreements recorded by the longest running mediation scheme in the UK were analysed. It was found that 50.8% of agreements contained mention of the perpetrator saying 'I'm sorry' or offering a partial apology (i.e., acknowledging harm and/or promising forbearance). Full apologies were absent in the mediation agreements. Agreements did not make explicit mention of the offender admitting responsibility or expressing remorse or regret. Finally, although the mediation agreements did not make any explicit mention of offenders offering reparation, they did record efforts at providing solutions to the conflict.

Keywords: victim-offender mediation, restorative justice, apology, sorry

Victim-offender mediation practices¹ which are representative of restorative justice, bring conflicting parties together voluntarily so they can engage in a respectful, two-way dialogue. During this process, the parties can communicate their version of the harmful incident, including antecedents and consequences, as well as seek answers to their questions, and negotiate a mutually agreeable resolution. As such, mediation can start both parties on a path towards healing, rehabilitation, reconciliation and reintegration. Indeed, mediation provides offenders an opportunity to offer compensation or reparation and apologize to the victim (see e.g., Dhami, 2012; Poulson, 2003; Sherman et al., 2005).

Research has revealed that a common outcome of victim-offender mediation is an apology, and this may sometimes be the only outcome, in which case, it is considered symbolic reparation (e.g., Bolitho, 2012; Bonta, Wallace-Capretta & Rooney, 1998; Maxwell & Morris, 1993; Strang, Barnes, Braithwaite, & Sherman, 1999; Umbreit, 1995; Umbreit & Coates, 1992; Umbreit & Roberts, 1996). In England, Miers et al.'s (2001) review of seven schemes revealed that the most common outcome of a face-to-face meeting was a direct apology, and relayed oral or written apologies were characteristic of indirect mediations, where victims chose not to meet offenders. Shapland et al.'s (2006) evaluation of three schemes demonstrated that offenders were significantly more likely to apologise to victims if their case underwent mediation rather than the traditional court process. More recently, Dhami (2012) reported that the offender said "I'm sorry" in over a third of cases that were mediated by one scheme.

Not only is apology common in victim-offender mediation, but it is also expected by the parties, and may motivate individuals to engage in mediation. For example, Shapland et al. (2006) found that most offenders and victims in their study thought an apology might be forthcoming. Miers et al. (2001) found that offenders welcomed the opportunity to apologise

¹ For simplicity, 'family-group conferencing' is also included under this term. Family-group conferencing involves the victim's and offender's supporters also being present at the mediation meeting.

to their victims, and victims were pleased to receive apologies. In a series of early studies evaluating victim-offender mediation programs in Canada, the US and England, Umbreit and his colleagues consistently found that the vast majority of victims and offenders (i.e., over 70%) rated receiving and offering an apology, respectively, as important (Umbreit, 1995; Umbreit & Coates, 1992; Umbreit & Roberts, 1996). Furthermore, they often cited the opportunity to receive and offer an apology, respectively, as one of the main reasons that they chose to participate in the mediation process.

Therefore, the fact that apology may be a motivator for participating in the mediation process, and that it is often a common outcome of mediation suggests that research on mediation ought to more carefully explore the nature of the apologies that are offered. Given the central role that apology can play in mediation, there is a surprising dearth of research on this issue (see above for notable exceptions).

Past Research on Apology

Research, largely conducted outside the mediation or legal context, has explored the nature of apology and its effects. Beyond, the simple ‘‘I’m sorry’’, apologies may be full (also called sincere or genuine) or partial. Several researchers have attempted to identify or study the components of apology (e.g., Blecher, 2011; Dhimi, 2012; Goffman, 1971; Scher & Darley, 1997; Schmitt, Gollwitzer, Forster, & Montada, 2004; Schlenker & Darby, 1981; Slocum, Allan, & Allan, 2011). Generally, a full apology involves the following five components: (1) admitting responsibility for the behaviour and outcomes, (2) acknowledging the harm done and that it was wrong, (3) expressing regret or remorse for the harm done, (4) offering to repair the harm or make amends, and (5) promising not to repeat the behaviour in the future and to work toward good relations (i.e., forbearance).

Some of these components of apology may be interlinked, and so an expression of one may imply communication of another. For instance, Scher and Darley (1997) found that

remorse was assumed when offenders accepted responsibility, offered to make reparation or amends and promised forbearance. Gold and Weiner (2000) reported that the expression of remorse was related to perceptions of forbearance. Schmitt et al. (2004) found that when reparation is offered, it implies admitting responsibility, acknowledging harm, and expressing remorse. Robbennolt (2003) demonstrated that admitting responsibility also implied regret and forbearance. Finally, Dhami (2012) reported that saying “I’m sorry” was associated with admitting wrongdoing, expressing remorse, promising forbearance and offering reparation, but not acknowledging harm.

Apologies can influence perceptions of the offender and the offence (e.g., Gold & Weiner, 2000; Hodgkins & Liebskind, 2003; Ohbuchi, Kameda, & Agarie, 1989; Robbennolt, 2003; Scher & Darley, 1997). Apologies can also affect the desire to punish the offender (e.g., Gold & Weiner, 2000; Hodgkins & Liebeskind, 2003; Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Wooten, 2009) as well as offer reparation to the victim (see Brooks, 1999), and the prospect of both parties reconciling (e.g., Hodgkins & Liebeskind, 2003; Robbennolt, 2003; Scher & Darley, 1997; Tomlinson, Dineen, & Lewicki, 2004). In addition, apologies can affect an offender’s rehabilitation and a victim’s healing (e.g., Ohbuchi et al., 1989; see also Blecher, 2011). Finally, the offer of an apology during the mediation process can affect satisfaction with the mediation outcome (e.g., Dhami, 2012; see also Levi, 1997).

The Present Study

The main aim of the present study was to explore the *prevalence* and *nature* of the apologies that may be offered by offenders to their victims during the mediation process. The study provides a content analysis of mediation *agreements*. The agreement is a written document produced by both parties towards the end of the mediation meeting. It details the arrangement reached by both parties for resolving the conflict and repairing the harm done. The document also includes deadlines for fulfilment of the agreement, and any follow-up

plans. To-date, few studies have examined the content of these agreements (for an exception, see Hayes, McGee, Punter, & Cerruto, 2014), even though they may contain information on whether the offender apologised and the nature of the apology offered.

Method

Sample

The present study involved analysis of agreements in cases that had undergone mediation at the Southwark Mediation Centre (SMC). SMC is a charity established in 1986, and based in south London. It is one of the oldest mediation centres in Europe, and the longest running in the UK. SMC deals primarily with hate crimes, neighbourhood disputes and anti-social behaviour. SMC takes referrals from the Housing Department, Southwark Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, Hate Crime Unit, and Police, as well as other agencies. Mediations may be conducted directly, face-to-face mediations or indirectly (and translators are provided where needed).

SMC granted access to 59 written agreements over a 3-year period. The agreements pertained to 57 mediated cases that were deemed representative of SMC's work and comprised approximately a quarter of agreements during the period.

In addition, data on the cases, victims (hereafter called complainants) and offenders (hereafter called perpetrators), as well as the mediation process was collected from the records kept by SMC. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics on the cases and mediation meetings.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The cases could be primarily described as incidents involving disputes (45.61%; e.g., housing, domestic, public nuisance) and harassment (21.05%). There was more than one perpetrator in 80.36% of the cases ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.50$) and the mean number of complainants directly affected was 1.77 ($SD = 1.12$). The complainant was a neighbour or

acquaintance of the primary perpetrator in 89.47% of cases. There was no previous victimization in 66.07% of cases. The perpetrator did not have a criminal history in 92.50% of cases.

The mediation was face-to-face (direct) in 96.43% of cases. The mean number of mediations for a case was .36 ($SD = .70$). The mediation took place pre-charge in 98.21% of cases. Only the complainant and perpetrator were present at 70.37% of the mediations, and their supporters were also present in 24.07% of mediations.

Analysis of Agreements

The mediation agreements were independently coded by two trained researchers who had agreed in advance on the thematic categories to be coded based on a preliminary reading of a random sample of 20 agreements. This resulted in 17 coding categories that were grouped into six general themes. Below, is a description of each theme and the categories contained therein.

The *conflict source* theme includes three categories as follows: one or both parties suggested that a third party/external source was a problem/cause of harm (*external source*); one or both parties wanted a further investigation to find the true source of the problem/harm (*investigate*); and someone involved in the incident had moved from the property permanently/temporarily (*moved*).

The *apology* theme includes the following four categories: The perpetrator offered a general apology (*sorry*); one or both parties acknowledged the harm done (*acknowledge harm*); the perpetrator promised forbearance (*own forbearance*); and the perpetrator said he/she would tell others not to cause the harm again (*other forbearance*).

The *solution* theme includes three categories as follows: The perpetrator offered a practical solution (*perpetrator solution*); the complainant offered a practical solution (*complainant solution*); and both parties agreed on a practical solution (*both solution*).

The *interaction* theme includes two categories, i.e., one or both parties raised a desire to maintain/develop positive relationship with the other (*relationship*), and one or both parties wished to walk past/away or not talk to/ignore each other (*walk past*).

The *future conflict* theme includes the following four categories: Both parties agreed on a method for future communication or complaints to each other (*complain each other*); both parties agreed to complain to/via others in the future (*complain to/via others*); the perpetrator forewarned the complainant of a potential harm causing incident that may occur in the future (*forewarn*); and both parties agreed to have the situation monitored/followed-up (*monitor situation*).

Finally, the *stakeholder* theme refers to one category i.e., both parties agreed to share the mediation outcome/agreement with others (*share agreement*).

The content of the agreements were coded by assigning a yes (1) or no (0) classification to each category. Inter-coder reliability was then measured using Cohen's Kappa which ranges from 0 to 1 (i.e., perfect agreement). Across the 17 categories, mean Kappa was .90 with a range from .44 (complainant solution) to 1 (sorry, complain each other, monitor situation, and walk past). Disagreements were discussed and resolved among the two raters.

Findings and Discussion

Table 2 presents the percentage of mediation agreements in which the 17 thematic categories were observed. In over three-quarters of the agreements both parties agreed to share the mediation outcome/agreement with others such as the police, housing office, the Council and family.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Components of Apology

An apology (simply in terms of saying “sorry”) was offered in around a fifth of agreements. The components of a full apology include admitting responsibility, acknowledging harm, expressing remorse, promising forbearance, and offering reparation. The mediation agreements, however, only contained explicit evidence of two of these components i.e., acknowledgement of harm and promise of forbearance. Nevertheless, as discussed below, communication of the other three components may be implicit. Overall, 50.80% of mediation agreements contained either a “sorry”, acknowledgment of harm or promise of forbearance.

Admitting responsibility. Victims may attend mediation in order to teach the offender a lesson in accountability (Umbreit, 1995; Umbreit & Coates, 1992). Indeed, offenders are typically required to accept responsibility for the incident before participating in mediation, although this does not necessarily imply they will reassert a sense of responsibility during the mediation meeting itself. In the present study, there was little evidence of explicit admissions of responsibility and wrongdoing in agreements. However, this might be implicit in the perpetrators’ saying “sorry”.

On the other hand, the absence of admitting wrongdoing might be due to the fact that in many agreements there was discussion of an external source to the conflict or to the need to investigate the source further. Indeed, in nearly half of the agreements (see Table 2), both parties suggested that the source of the problem may be external.

“Drilling can be heard by both; this is coming from another property.” (Z1406)

“...the banging and dragging of furniture has now been identified as coming from elsewhere.” (Z1080)

“Both [parties] stated that the people delivering junk mail often left the gate open.” (Z1254)

“[Both parties] agreed that the sound insulation at the property is not good. [Complainant] wanted [Perpetrator] to know that the noise he experiences was not all [Perpetrator’s] fault.” (ZY549)

In over a third of agreements (see Table 2), the parties wanted to investigate the source of the problem further, believing that it might lie externally to the perpetrator.

“[Complainant] will contact a council surveyor so that a structural survey and a water trace can be carried out regarding crack in her property.” (Z1406)

“To ID sounds both parties to keep a diary to record sounds that they believe is coming from each other prop. Mediator to send diaries (to include what room the parties are in).” (A99872)

“All agreed that, with Mr. XXX participation, Southwark Mediation Centre (SMC) would arrange for a ‘Sound Level Agreement’ (SLA) at the properties with all involved.” (Z1130)

“It was agreed that over the next few weeks [both parties] would give some attention and focus to the noise they hear in order to identify the source and cause of some of the sounds heard.” (Z1143).

Finally, in a minority of agreements, it was revealed that the source of the problem had moved away.

Acknowledging harm. In the present study, perpetrators acknowledged that their behaviour resulted in harm to the complainant in only just over a quarter of agreements (see Table 2).

“[Perpetrator] explained she is very sorry that [Complainant] is suffering and she is not doing any noise deliberately.” (Z1404)

“[Victim] apologised to [Perpetrator] for any upset caused and for any misunderstandings.” (A99808)

“[Perpetrator] realised her responses can be very intimidating.” (A99982)

“[Perpetrator] was aware of manipulative behaviour that has impacted on himself and [Complainant].” (A99974)

Expressing remorse. Tavuchis (1991, p. 36) states that “apology must express sorrow.” In the present study, explicit expressions of remorse were absent from the agreements. However, saying “sorry” (which occurred in around a fifth of agreements), may be taken as a proxy for expressing remorse.

Promising forbearance. Victims often want reassurance that the offence will not reoccur. In the present study, the forbearance that perpetrators offered was both on behalf of themselves and on behalf of others (e.g., their family members). This represents the fact that some of the harmful incidents involved multiple perpetrators. These two types of promises of forbearance each occurred in over a third of agreements (see Table 2).

“In hindsight [Perpetrator] acknowledged she was angry and it will not happen again.” (A99981)

“[Perpetrator] explained that the noise is not deliberate and she will try her best to minimise the noise.” (Z1408)

“[Perpetrator] gives her word that she will not throw any liquid/water out of her window.” (Z1125)

“[Perpetrator] also said that she would talk to all her family about the noise that disturbs [complainant]” (Z1305)

“[Perpetrator] will talk to his staff about minimising the noise from the lids, especially on Saturdays.” (Z1220)

“Both [parties] have agreed to speak to their children about not causing an argument.” (Z1369)

Offering reparation. One reason that victims attend mediation is to receive reparation (Wyrick & Costanzo, 1999). Although offers to repair the harm were not explicit in agreements, efforts at making reparation may be evident in perpetrators’ offering ‘solutions’ to the conflict. In the present study, the agreements showed that practical solutions were offered to resolve the situation and/or repair the harm done. Solutions were offered by the perpetrator in nearly two-thirds of agreements (see Table 2).

“[Perpetrator] explained that usually the washing machine time restriction is 9pm, but now [Perpetrator] will bring that time back earlier.” (Z1403)

“[Perpetrator] stated that he would look into getting some door stops/cushioning devices to stop the door banging.” (Z1336)

“[Perpetrator] made [Complainant] aware that he has his T.V. on low and also has earphones to listen to the T.V.” (Z1088)

“[Perpetrator] advised that he is looking at fitting a ‘soft closure’ on the door so that it won’t slam (within two weeks).” (Z1220)

There were a minority of agreements in which complainants both appeared to implement solutions themselves as well as recommend solutions that the perpetrator could implement (see Table 2).

“[Complainant] bought the equipment to repair the leak.” (A99982)

“[Complainant], very kindly, will trim the climbing plants so that it is only half way between the top of the garden door and [Perpetrator’s] window.” (Z1125)

“[Complainant] has asked if it is possible for more rugs to be placed in the flat.” (Z1421)

"[Complainant] has suggested using margarine/oil to stop the creaking."

(Z1245)

Finally, in a minority of agreements, both parties agreed on the solutions (see Table 2).

"...both agree that if the rosebush cannot be uprooted, if it is kept cut back that would be ok." (Z1153-B)

"[Both parties] agree that if they receive letter for each other they will put them in the others letter box." (Z1254)

Future Interaction and Conflict

Mediation can start both conflicting parties on a path towards reconciliation. Indeed, the nature of the future interaction and relationship between the two parties also appeared in the agreements. In over a third of agreements (see Table 2), both parties wished to maintain the peace or develop a positive relationship with each other for the future.

"Both parties agreed they had been friends in the past and would like to have a neighbourly relationship in the future." (Z1314)

"Should a crisis or emergency occur they all stated they would like to look out for each other and to check they were alright." (A99808)

"[Both parties] would like to be able to approach each other in a respectful manner and to say 'hello' to each other." (Z1076)

"[Complainant] has said she would like to be able to speak to XXX out on the street. [Perpetrator] would like to do this as well." (Z1245)

However, there were also a minority of agreements in which the parties agreed to having no relationship, by agreeing in future to walk away or past each other and to ignore or not talk to each other (see Table 2).

"Wanted XXX to know that if she sees XXX she will walk past him." (ZY556)

“[Complainant] wanted [Perpetrators] to know that he wants to be able to walk past [Perpetrators] and his friends freely.” (ZY622)

The agreements also involved discussion of how best future conflicts and complaints ought to be reported. Half of the agreements ended with both parties agreeing to monitor the situation and/or having a follow-up (see Table 2), and five of the 57 cases had already been followed-up.

“SMC to contact in 4 weeks (if no news beforehand).” (Z1310)

“It was agreed that L and G would make regular contact with both [Complainant] and [Perpetrator] to see how things have been.” (Z1305)

“It was agreed that L and D would monitor the situation over the next few weeks.” (Z1156)

“It was agreed to meet again on Wednesday 8th April 2009.” (Z1385-A)

In half of the agreements (see Table 2), the parties agreed to complain directly to one another.

“If there are any issues to raise regarding any noise etc she would like [Complainants] to send her a text saying the following: Dear XXX, please can you keep the noise down if you can.” (A99982)

“It was agreed that in the future, communication would be, respectfully, face to face, by knocking on each other’s doors” (Z1113)

“If [complainant] can hear any noise from her home after 10pm she would be happy for him to press her buzzer to get her attention, and she would address any noise.” (ZY549)

“[Perpetrator] advised [Complainant] to come to him if there are problems in the future rather than going to other agencies such as the Council.” (Z1220)

In over two-fifths of agreements (see Table 2), both parties indicated a desire to communicate or complain to or via other parties, thus avoiding direct contact with one another.

“[Complainant’s daughter] has stated that [Complainant] is willing to speak with L or G as go between about any issues around the properties.” (Z1314)

“Both [parties] have agreed that if the noise is becoming a disturbance that [Complainant] will inform either Nicola or Lee so they can discuss it with [Perpetrator].” (Z1319)

“It was agreed that if [Complainant] does hear a late night door slamming she will contact G who in turn will call [Perpetrator] to see if the source of the noise can be identified.” (Z1336)

In around a fifth of agreements (see Table 2), the perpetrator forewarned the complainant about the potential for future harm.

“[Perpetrator] said that she would let [Complainant] know if she was planning a party.” (Z1314)

“[Perpetrator] said she will continue to let [Complainant] know on the odd occasion that she might have a birthday celebration up stairs.” (Z1306)

“If [Perpetrator] is going to have a large gathering in the future she will give [Complainant] at least a week prior notice in writing.” (Z1374)

Conclusions

The opportunity to offer and receive an apology may be the main reason why offenders and victims, respectively, choose to participate in the mediation process. In addition, apology may sometimes be the only, and main, outcome of mediation. The present study examined the prevalence and nature of apologies offered in direct, face-to-face mediation for cases primarily involving disputes and harassment, and that were recorded in

the mediation agreement. It was found that 50.8% of agreements contained mention of the perpetrator saying 'I'm sorry' or offering a partial apology (i.e., acknowledging harm and/or promising forbearance). Full apologies were absent in the mediation agreements.

Specifically, the mediation agreements did not make explicit mention of the offender admitting responsibility. The mediation agreements also did not make any explicit mention that the offender expressed remorse or regret. However, according to the mediation agreements, some offenders did acknowledge the harm that was done. Some offenders also promised forbearance. Here, offenders did so not only on their own behalf, but also on the behalf of others. Future research could explore how a promise of forbearance on the behalf of others is perceived by victims. Finally, although the mediation agreements did not make any explicit mention of offenders offering reparation, they did record offenders' efforts at providing solutions to the conflict. Victims also offered solutions. Future research could also explore how offenders perceive victim's offers of solutions to the conflict.

An apology may be unwarranted in cases where the source of the conflict is unclear or external, as was true for many of the cases in the present study. A (full) apology may be superfluous when there is potential for the harm and conflict to continue, as was also true in some cases, especially those where the offender suggested how he/she would forewarn the victim. A partial apology may be sufficient when the evidence of the offender's responsibility for the incident is unclear and when the infraction is less severe (e.g., Dhimi, 2012; Robbennolt, 2003; Schlenker & Darby, 1981), as was true for many of the cases in the present study. Where a (full) apology is warranted, offenders may find it difficult to make the necessary utterances in a face-to-face meeting with the victim, especially when others are present (Tavuchis, 1991).

There have been several concerns expressed about the role of apology in victim-offender mediation, including the idea that offenders may feel pressured to apologise

(Blecher, 2011), and that they may apologise for self-serving reasons (Blackman & Stubbs, 2001). In the present study, the low frequency of partial and full apologies in the agreements, suggests that offenders did not feel pressured to apologise either by victims or facilitators. It also demonstrates that offenders were not simply viewing apology as an easy, self-serving approach to deal with the situation.

The present study provides an exploration of apology as it was recorded in mediation agreements for cases involving primarily disputes and harassment. Future research could extend such an analysis to cases involving other types of offences. Indications of apology may be more prevalent in such cases, and the apologies that are recorded in these mediations agreements may be more likely to be full than partial in terms of the components they refer to (e.g., acknowledge harm).

The limitation of studying agreements is that it is unclear if an apology was really partial, absent or if it was simply not recorded. The main function of an agreement is to remind both parties of the resolution that was reached during the mediation, and the efforts that may need to be taken after mediation (e.g., offender tasks and deadlines). Given that apology may be symbolic reparation (Retzinger & Scheff, 1996), it is recommended that these are recorded in detail. Agreements are given to both parties and reading the apology may provide some extra benefit to both parties, beyond the (often behavioural) resolution they have agreed to.

Future research could consider the nonverbal communication of apology (e.g., gesture, smile, tone of voice) in mediation meetings. For instance, expressions of remorse may be nonverbal rather than verbal, and some components of apology may be easier to express nonverbally than other components. Such research would need to take into account the cultural differences in nonverbal communication (e.g., Park & Guan, 2009).

Studying the prevalence and nature of apology in victim-offender mediation may help us to better understand the mechanisms through which mediation processes work to benefit a victim's healing, reconciliation of victims and offenders, and offenders' reform and reintegration (e.g., see Bolitho, 2012; Dhimi, 2012). For instance, an offender may be set on the path towards reform if he/she admits responsibility for his/her behaviour and outcomes, acknowledges the harm done and that it was wrong, and expresses regret and remorse for the harm done. In addition, an offender's offer to repair the harm or make amends could help a victim start the healing process. Finally, an offender's promise of forbearance could reduce a victim's fear of re-victimization, as well as encourage the offender to reform.

References

- Blackman, M. C., & Stubbs, E. C. (2001). Apologies: Genuine admissions of blameworthiness or scripted, sympathetic responses? *Psychological Reports*, 88, 45-50.
- Blecher, N. J. (2011). Sorry justice: Apology in Australian family group conferencing. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 18, 95–116.
- Bolitho, J. J. (2012). Restorative justice: The ideals and realities of conferencing for young people. *Critical Criminology*, 20, 61-78.
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (1998) *Restorative justice: An evaluation of the restorative resolutions project*. (User report 1998-05). Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.
- Brooks, R. L. (1999). (Ed.), *When sorry isn't enough*. London: New York University Press.
- Dhami, M. K. (2012). Offer and acceptance of apology in victim-offender mediation. *Critical Criminology: An International Journal*, 20, 45-60.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Gold, G. J., & Weiner, B. (2000). Remorse, confession, group identity, and expectancies about repeating a transgression. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 291-300.
- Hayes, H., McGee, T. R., Punter, H., & Cerruto, M. J. (2014). Agreements in restorative justice conferences. Exploring the implications of agreements for post-conference offending behaviour. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54, 109-127.
- Hodgkins, H. S., & Liebeskind, E. (2003). Apology versus defence: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 297-316.
- Maxwell, G. M., & Morris, A. (1993). *Family, victims and culture: Youth justice in New Zealand*. Wellington: Social Policy Agency.

- Miers, D., Maguire, M., Goldie, S., Sharpe, K., Hale, C., et al. (2001). *An exploratory evaluation of restorative justice schemes*. (Crime reduction research series paper 9). London: Home Office.
- Ohbuchi, K., Kameda, M., & Agarie, N. (1989). Apology as aggression control: Its role in mediating appraisal of and response to harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*, 219–227.
- Park, H. S., & Guan, X. (2009) Cross-cultural comparison of verbal and nonverbal strategies of apologizing. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *2*, 66-87.
- Poulson, B. (2003). A third voice: A review of empirical research on the psychological outcomes of restorative justice. *Utah Law Review*, 167–203.
- Retzinger, S., & Scheff, T. (1996). Strategy for community conferences: Emotions and social bonds. In B. Galaway, & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative justice: International perspectives* (pp. 315-336). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Robbennolt, J. K. (2003). Apologies and legal settlement: An empirical examination. *Michigan Law Review*, *102*, 460–516.
- Scher, S. J., & Darley, J. M. (1997). How effective are the things people say to apologize? Effects of the realization of the Apology Speech Act. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *26*, 127–140.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Darby, B. W. (1981). The use of apologies in social predicaments. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*, 271-278
- Schmitt, M., Gollwitzer, M., Forster, N., & Montada, L. (2004). Effects of objective and subject account components on forgiving. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *144*, 465–485.
- Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Chapman, B., Colledge, E., Dignan, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G. and Sorsby, A. (2006) *Restorative justice in practice: The*

second report from the evaluation of three schemes. The University of Sheffield Centre for Criminological Research Occasional Paper 2.

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Angel, C., Woods, D., Barnes, G. C., Bennett, S., et al. (2005).

Effects of face-to-face restorative justice on victims of crime in four randomized, controlled trials. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 367–395.

Slocum, D., Allan, A., & Allan, M. M. (2011). An emerging theory of apology. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 63, 83-92.

Strang, H., Barnes, G., Braithwaite, J., & Sherman, L. W. (1999). Experiments in restorative policing: A progress report on the Canberra reintegrative shaming experiments (RISE). Australian Federal Police and Australian National University.

Tavuchis, N. (1991). *Mea culpa: A Sociology of apology and reconciliation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tomlinson, E. C., Dineen, B. R., & Lewicki, R. J. (2004). The road to reconciliation: Antecedents of victim willingness to reconcile following a broken promise. *Journal of Management*, 30, 165-187.

Umbreit, M. S. (1995). *Mediation of criminal conflict: An assessment of programs in four Canadian provinces*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.

Umbreit, M. S., & Coates, R. B. (1992). *Victim offender mediation. An analysis of programs in four states of the U.S.*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.

Umbreit, M. S., & Roberts, A. W. (1996). *Mediation of criminal conflict in England: An assessment of services in Coventry and Leeds*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.

Wooten, D. B. (2009). Say the right thing: Apologies, reputability, and punishment. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19, 225-235.

Wyrick, P. A., & Costanzo, M. A. (1999). Predictors of client participation in victim-offender mediation. *Mediation Quarterly*, 16, 253-267.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics on Case and Mediation

Variables	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Offence			
Dispute/nuisance	45.61		
Harassment	21.05		
Combination of above and other crimes	33.33		
Perpetrators			
Multiple	80.36		
Number of complainants		1.77	1.12
Complainant-perpetrator relationship			
None	7.02		
Neighbour/acquaintance	89.47		
Friend/partner/related	3.51		
Complainant no previous victimization	66.07		
Perpetrator no criminal history	92.50		
Face-to-face mediation	96.43		
Number of mediations		.36	.70
Timing of mediation			
Pre-charge	98.21		
Post-charge/pre-conviction	1.79		
Participants			
Complainant & perpetrator	70.37		
Complainant, perpetrator & supporters	24.07		
Complainant, perpetrator & professionals			

(i.e., housing officer, law enforcement, teacher,
interpreter)

5.56

Table 2. Thematic Categories Observed in Mediation Agreements

Theme and Category	Percentage
<i>Conflict Source</i>	
External source	45.76
Investigate	37.29
Moved	10.17
<i>Explicit Apology</i>	
Other forbearance	38.98
Own forbearance	35.59
Acknowledge harm	28.81
Sorry	22.03
<i>Solutions Offered</i>	
Perpetrator solution	64.41
Complainant solution	13.56
Both solution	11.86
<i>Future Interaction</i>	
Relationship	37.29
Walk past	8.47
<i>Future Conflict</i>	
Monitor situation	50.85
Complain each other	50.85
Complain to/via others	42.37
Forewarn	18.64
<i>Stakeholder</i>	
Share agreement	77.97
