

**The Good Lives Model and restorative justice: combined potential in cases of sexual
violence**

Marie Keenan, Tony Ward and Estelle Zinsstag

Dr Marie Keenan, School Social Policy Social Work and Social Justice, University College
Dublin, Ireland

Dr Tony Ward, School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600,
Wellington, New Zealand

Dr Estelle Zinsstag, School of Applied Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University, UK and Leuven
Institute of Criminology, KU Leuven, Belgium

Correspondence author: Marie Keenan marie.keenan@ucd.ie

The Good Lives Model and restorative justice: combined potential in cases of sexual violence

Abstract:

This article explores the combined potential of the Good Lives Model (GLM) and restorative justice as complementary approaches to justice, healing and social integration for sexual crime victims and offenders. When the synergies in both perspectives are combined, they have the potential to enhance the lives of victims, offenders and their respective communities. The two different practice approaches can be integrated within the practice framework model developed by Ward and Durrant (2021). We also suggest that aspects of the GLM could be explored as a potential framework to guide victim services too. The GLM and restorative justice are natural allies because of their shared commitment to the equal value and dignity of every individual involved in crime. The paper makes two important contributions. First it considers the potential to combine the GLM with restorative justice. Second it suggests there is potential to develop aspects of the GLM for survivor services.

Keywords: Good Lives Model; Restorative Justice; Sexual Violence; Victims; Perpetrators; Moral Repair

Clinical Impact Statement

This article provides guidance for practitioners on how the Good Lives Model (GLM) and restorative justice (RJ) offer complementary but *distinct* normative and practice frameworks that have overlapping domains of application in response to sexual crime, for victims and offenders.

Restorative justice addresses problems associated with justice and moral repair while the GLM offers a framework that aims to provide individuals with the skills and knowledge to live fulfilling lives, and in the case of individuals who have committed crime, crime free lives.

These complementary practice frameworks expand the range of approaches and interventions for practitioners to consider, as well as enhance the criminal justice repertoire of services in relation to a single case.

1. Introduction

Much has been written on the problem of sexual violence and abuse in empirical and popular literature, raising issues of power and control, privilege, consent, sexuality, misogyny and the need for men to take a stand. While the gendered nature of the crime is beyond doubt, males are also victims of this crime and females can be offenders (Cortoni & Gannon, 2016). The impact on victims¹ is well reported (Brown & Walklate, 2012; Herman 2005, 2015). High rates of attrition in sexual crime cases, resulting from under-reporting, low levels of prosecutions and low levels of convictions is a constant feature of many studies (see e.g., Brown & Walklate, 2012; Gillen, 2019; Keenan & Zinsstag, 2014; Lovett & Kelly, 2009; O'Malley, 2020; Temkin & Krahe, 2008), leading some to see sexual crime as effectively decriminalised (Baird, 2020: 16). Time and again the 'beyond reasonable doubt' standard, against which the evidence must be tested in the criminal courts, leaves justice gaps for victims, accountability gaps for offenders and healing gaps for all. This situation is almost universal in every jurisdiction in the world. In addition, the secondary victimisation that results from involvement with criminal justice systems (Gillen, 2019; O'Malley, 2020; Topping, 2021) and concerns about the inadequacy of the protections for acquitted persons (see Gillen, 2019) lead many to question the justice gaps that result and suitability of the criminal justice system at all for dealing with these complex crimes (see Cossins, 2020; Temkin & Krahe, 2008). Special courts are attempts to remedy these problems in some jurisdictions (Vetten, 2011), new specialist structures for

¹ We will generally use the term victim to characterise those who have been victimised by sexual violence, but we recognise that some prefer the term survivor, victim survivor or person harmed.

the investigation and prosecution of sexual offences involving more integrated approaches, are attempts in others (see Walby et al., 2015) while some jurisdictions make available restorative justice options as part of criminal justice responses to enhance the justice response to sexual crime more broadly (see Keenan & Zinsstag, in press). This is the context in which we set out to write this paper.

Sexual violence, although common and widespread, remains a complex problem that is difficult to understand and difficult to prevent. Because of the deeply personal and invasive nature of the crime, with its stigmatising and marginalising potential and effects, the impacts are often long lasting and life altering for all parties, albeit in different ways (Herman, 2005, 2015; Jülich et al., 2011; Newsom & Myers-Bowman, 2017). Community safety, particularly with regard to women and children remains a real concern. New directions in evidence informed ways to respond to these problems must therefore be continually explored.

In this article we explore the combined potential of the Good Lives Model (GLM) and restorative justice as complementary approaches to justice, healing and social integration for victims and offenders of sexual crime. When the synergies in both perspectives are combined, they have the potential to enhance the lives of sexual crime victims as well as offenders and their respective immediate communities. While the GLM has been in operation for almost twenty years as an approach to the treatment and rehabilitation of individuals who have committed sexual offences (Ward 2002a), restorative justice has been working under the radar but increasingly above the radar in the field of sexual violence for many years, as evidenced in recent studies (Keenan & Zinsstag, in press; Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017). The two different practice approaches can be integrated within the practice framework model developed by Ward and Durrant (2021). In our view, the GLM is a therapeutic approach (well-being values are central) while restorative justice is best conceptualised as a moral repair intervention (ethical justice values are at the centre).

In order to provide a concrete context for this integrative approach the paper is divided into five sections. We begin by outlining our stance on sexual violence, in particular, victims of sexual crimes. We then turn attention to providing a brief overview of practice frameworks. An analysis of the GLM for offender rehabilitation is then offered with a suggestion of its potential as a framework for working also with victims of sexual crime. An exploration of restorative justice in relation to sexual crime follows. We finish by discussing the synergies of the GLM and restorative justice and their combined potential for rehabilitation, justice and healing for victims and offenders. We stress their complementary but distinct roles within an overarching intervention plan. In other words, the GLM and restorative justice practices have distinct intervention targets, and in this sense, are not in direct competition with each other (see below). They are natural allies because of their shared commitment to the equal value and dignity of every individual involved in crime. The paper thus makes two important contributions. First it considers the potential to combine the GLM with restorative justice. Second it suggests there is potential to apply aspects of the GLM to a practice framework with survivors of sexual violence.

2. Sexual violence

The World Health Organisation promotes a broad definition of violence, describing it as “the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation” (Krug et al., 2002, p. 5). Sexual violence, which can involve covert (as in many cases of child sexual abuse) as well as overt sexual violations, is often more complex to detect and to define. Questions which cast doubt on the motivations of complainants, victims, accused persons and offenders arise in this context. Questions regarding consent emerges in adult sexual crime, such as, what is consent

and at what point did consent change to non-consent? Queries are often raised in mitigation about the intentionality of the perpetrator (or the *mens rea* of the act) and to what extent the accused was reckless as to the consent of the injured party. In child sexual abuse the cultural and social context of the crime, including legal frameworks, also come into the analysis. Despite these conceptual difficulties, and ones that arise in marrying normative aspects of sexual violations with culturally specific conditions and interpretations, social, political and public forces in many jurisdictions have coalesced to define certain sexual and other acts as aberrant and have them codified in penal law. Terms such as sexual assault, sexual abuse and rape emerge from these codifications, which are also subject to penal sanction.

For the purposes of our work, we employ the terms sexual violence, sexual crime, and sexual abuse interchangeably to suggest that sexual violations involve a broad range of behaviours and patterns that encompass many types of coercive or non-consensual contact and non-contact sexual acts, in peace times and in times of war, some of which are prosecuted and some which are not. Sex trafficking and sexual violence perpetrated using communication technology also fall within our definition. The exponential growth in online child sexual exploitation and online sexual exploitation of adults pose particularly new justice, rehabilitative and healing challenges too (Mercado, Merdian & Egg, 2011; Webb, Craissati & Keen, 2007).

Despite decades of psychological, sociological, and feminist research on the problem of sexual violence (see for example Brown & Walklate, 2012; Busch, 2002; Herman, 2005; Stubbs, 2002; Walklate, 2004), it is still predominantly a crime that occurs in the private sphere and remains there. Internalised shame and trauma can result in emotional physical, social, and economic impacts for victims (Herman, 2005; 2015). Stigma and social ostracization are outcomes for individuals accused of or who have committed sexual crime, with fractured family and societal relations often resulting in challenging and marginalised futures (Farrall & Calverley, 2006). With most sexual violence cases occurring within a context of pre-existing

relationships, most are perpetrated by someone known to, or acquainted with the victim (see Temkin & Krahe, 2008). The breach of trust and relational betrayal that are core of such crimes add to the complexity of repairing harm following its occurrence.

3. Practice Frameworks

Practice frameworks, initially described by Ward and Durrant (2021), are a unique type of theory that unites treatment theories and approaches, explanatory theories and normative assumptions, and by doing so, provide clinicians with a way of structuring their intervention-related-actions in a theoretically informed way. The practice framework model was designed for those implementing interventions in criminal justice settings, as a tool that incorporates broader normative assumptions and values to guide interventions; they are not intended to replace specific etiological or treatment theories. Practice frameworks are defined by their *three-level, hierarchical structure* that link core values and principles, knowledge-related assumptions, and practice guidelines. The conceptually integrated structure of practice frameworks allows practitioners and researchers to make clearer connections between their overall practice aims, theoretical assumptions and the interventions used in forensic and correctional work (Ward & Durrant, 2021). In this way, practice frameworks operate as conceptual maps, which facilitate researchers and practitioners to richly define their practice niche and deliver meaningful intervention programmes. It is intended to avoid the problem of researchers and practitioners overextending the scope of particular therapeutic approaches, such as exporting risk prediction models to the context of therapeutic practices.

Different types of practice frameworks occupy distinct “niches”; essentially domains of application characterized by their own unique problems. For example, the niche of social reentry and integration requires a practice framework built on desistance ideas whereas problems such as social anxiety or impulsivity require a therapeutically oriented approach

(Ward & Durrant, 2021). Problems such as interpersonal accountability in private (as well as public) spheres requires an approach based on restorative justice principles and practices. In the context of a practice framework model, the core values that provide reasons for action can also directly determine the key task for that practice framework. For instance, core values centered around the safety of the community and the wellbeing of individuals suggest that the key tasks are ones of reducing offending behavior and providing rehabilitation. That is, if the clinician or stakeholders' value most the wellbeing of a client, and their living of a meaningful life, then the task of focus may be one of rehabilitation and reintegration into society. On the other hand, if stakeholders value the safety of the community more, then the primary task may be one of deterrence; the aim is to reduce the likelihood future offending and therefore protect the community. In this way values select the practice niche within which the Framework operates, although some problems may require more than one framework and therefore be conceptualized in slightly different ways. For example, a lack of empathy might be conceptualized as a treatment related problem and dealt with by therapy, or alternatively it could be seen as a moral problem best addressed by a practice framework such as restorative justice, or it could be conceptualized as both and addressed accordingly.

Multiple practice frameworks may be needed to be implemented at the same time for a particular individual in order to address the complexities of many real-world problems. Each framework would have its own set of core values and principles which make it especially useful for a particular problem or task. A *comprehensive intervention plan* would be comprised of several practice frameworks models, each addressing a distinct task within a particular domain: risk prediction, crime prevention, treatment, social reentry, moral repair and accountability, desistance, and so on. Different frameworks can offer distinct but complementary perspectives that allow for a more complete analysis of the issue at hand. Where an intervention plan would include a restorative justice practice framework, the request for a meeting with a victim should

not be offender initiated (see Keenan & Zinsstag, in press). However restorative principles of moral repair could drive the work for the offender in other ways, such as in repairing harm with families of origin, or other community members. In circumstances where victims initiate the request for a restorative justice meeting then the restorative justice practice framework could incorporate this request (see also Kirkwood, 2021).

4. The Good Lives Model

4.1 The Good Lives Model and offender rehabilitation

The GLM was originally developed as a strength-based augmentation to enhance rather than replace the Risk-Need-Responsivity Model (Ward, 2002a; Ward & Gannon, 2006; Ward & Maruna, 2007). The GLM is *not* an etiological model of sexual offending; it is *not* a treatment programme and is it *not* an account of the sexual offence process. Rather, the GLM is a *practice framework* (see above Ward & Durrant, 2021). The underlying view of persons at the core of the GLM is as goal-directed agents with a range of priorities and capacities, who interact with their environments to pursue personally meaningful outcomes and lives.

According to the GLM, the aim (values) of correctional and rehabilitative intervention should be to reduce the likelihood of further offending via the promotion of a personally meaningful *Good Life*. These two normative priorities are not mutually exclusive, as offending is conceptualised as the result of problems in an individual's implicit *Good Life Plan*. The core values of the GLM orient researchers and practitioners to certain knowledge related assumptions: the importance of primary human goods in motivating human behaviour, internal and external obstacles to the attainment of these goods (risk factors) and an emphasis on individuals' capacity for agency (Prescott, Willis, & Ward, in press). A good life contains valued outcomes, termed *Primary Human Goods*, which are of varying importance to individuals, but should all be present to some degree. The GLM *Human Goods* are excellence

in work, excellence in play, creativity, knowledge, relatedness, community, pleasure, life, inner peace, spirituality, and excellence in agency (Purvis, Ward & Willis, 2011). The means by which these are attained are termed *Secondary Human Goods*, and these can be more or less healthy, adaptive, and pro or anti-social. For example, one person may achieve inner peace by practicing meditation, while another may use illegal substances to escape from, or avoid, dysphoric mood states. The utilisation of adaptive secondary goods depends on internal capacities as well as environmental resources and opportunities. Problems with internal and external resources are considered to be causes of or contributors to sexual offending (i.e., criminogenic needs), and equally when addressed they offer pathways to desistance; as such they should be the focus of therapeutic intervention (Laws & Ward, 2011). The GLM acknowledges the importance of targeting criminogenic needs but does so through the building of internal and external resources, rather than by simply focusing on risk reduction or risk management.

Taking into account the core values of the GLM practice framework, and its knowledge related assumptions, therapeutic interventions centre upon developing a personally meaningful good life plan, containing all primary goods to varying degrees (chosen by the individual), and the goals and strategies required to attain these without harming others. Such interventions can also be linked with risk reduction by identifying how the offending (either directly or indirectly) in the past was associated with attaining such primary goods (in ways that were harmful to others), and the barriers or problems (i.e., criminogenic needs) evident within the strategies employed by the offender to attain these goods. For example, in some situations sexual offending is used as a means to achieve relatedness or pleasure, because of problems differentiating between appropriate partners (i.e., children are preferred as sexual partners because individuals feel emotionally safer with them) or lack of understanding or reckless disregard as to what constitutes consent in sexual relations with adults. A new *good life plan*

could incorporate relatedness and pleasure via the goal of seeking an intimate relationship with an age-appropriate partner in which consent is negotiated through relational dialogue and respect. Individuals vary in their ability to engage in the normative practices involved in healthy relationships, such as having mutually respectful conversations, conflict resolution, mutually consenting physical intimacy etc and these strategies would be developed as part of a new life plan. The GLM thus represents a naturalistic (i.e., commitment to “natural desires”) and humanistic approach to understanding offending behaviour, with an emphasis on building strengths and capabilities in individuals rather than focusing on deficits or pathologies (Purvis, Ward & Willis, 2015).

When the GLM was first created by Tony Ward (2002a; 2002b), the intention was to produce an ethical rehabilitation (therapeutic) framework capable of incorporating existing best practice risk-management knowledge regarding offending behaviour and that would also allow for a more holistic and individual approach to rehabilitation, within a human rights ethic. With the aim of helping clients to develop the skills and infrastructure to live meaningful, healthy and socially responsible lives, the philosophical premise was that such an approach would reduce the risk that individuals would present to the community in a sustainable, long-term manner. Since its first inception empirical research has provided evidence for the validity of the core GLM assumptions and intervention approach (e.g., Harkins, Flak, Beech, & Woodhams, 2012; Lorito, Vollm, & Dening, 2018; Loney & Harkins, 2018; Martin, Hernandez, Hernandez-Fernaund, Arregui, & Hernandez, 2010; Taylor, 2017; Van Damme, Hoeve, Vermeiren, Vanderplasschen, & Colins, 2016; Ware & Bright, 2008).

4.2 The Good Lives Model and the potential for victim healing

Good Life Model (GLM) interventions for victims² of sexual crime would also centre upon achieving a personally meaningful good life plan, containing all primary goods to varying degrees (chosen by the individual), and the secondary goods (goals and strategies) required to attain these. While many therapeutic interventions with victims are generally holistic, the Good Life Model as a practice framework would also provide clinicians with a way of structuring their therapeutic work in a theoretically informed and comprehensive way, underpinned by a human-rights, strengths-based orientation; it is a question of how best to enhance someone's functioning alongside the reduction of suffering. It is often reported that individuals who have committed crimes receive more comprehensive therapeutic help and social support than victim survivors, especially in the aftermath of serious crime (Keenan, 2022). An intervention approach for victims of crime which was GLM informed could address this anomaly.

Previous texts have explained the theoretical components and principles of the GLM and its practical application in relation to correctional rehabilitation and management (see Laws & Ward, 2011; Purvis & Ward, 2021; Purvis, Ward & Shaw, 2013; Purvis, Ward & Willis, 2015; Ward & Gannon, 2007; Yates, Prescott, & Ward, 2010). However, what has not been articulated is the possibilities of applying a modified but equally comprehensive version of the GLM for therapeutic work with victims. Given the depth of research and theoretical refinement that has gone into the GLM we suggest it is time to articulate how some of the philosophical and ethical underpinnings and practice applications of the GLMs can be applied in victim,

² We have chosen to focus on victims of crime in this section of the paper as an exemplar of an integrated approach primarily because they are a group where the need to combine therapeutic *and* moral repair interventions, such as restorative justice, is of paramount importance. However, it is beyond the scope of the paper to review current therapeutic approaches to survivors of sexual crime, or any shortcomings of therapeutic approaches, or to elaborate exactly what a modified GLM for survivors would look like. We simply want to introduce the notion of *A Good Life* for survivors too and the promotion of a personally meaningful *Good Life* for them in the aftermath of sexual crime. We suggest that a framework for victims informed by the GLM, which has typically been applied to rehabilitation of individuals who have offended, could be made to enhance the work of promoting a personally meaningful Good Life plan for survivors in ways that are yet to be explored. In some senses this right is often neglected by the focus of narrower therapeutic models. We begin this process in this section of the paper.

healing services too. This approach also fits well with restorative justice philosophies and approaches.

To begin, the collaborative approach that the GLM offers (in correctional rehabilitation) is equally important in victim services. Second, the GLM's focus on individuals as continually evolving agents who are naturally designed to act in the pursuit of a range of biological, psychological, and social goals (Laws & Ward, 2011) also applies to the lives of victims. The natural desires for intimacy, life (health and wellbeing), knowledge, excellence in play, work and agency, inner peace, relatedness, community, spirituality, creativity and states of happiness and pleasure that the GLM considers in offender rehabilitation (Ward, 2002a, 2002b; Ward & Marshall, 2004) apply also to victims. Addressing these natural desires in a comprehensive GLM victim framework could enhance the overall responses to victim survivors.

While all people are multifaceted, acting in ways that reflect an interaction of biological, social, cultural, and psychological factors (Laws & Ward, 2011; Ward & Durrant, 2021) and correctional rehabilitation is seen as multifaceted and contextual (Ward & Maruna, 2007), victim healing and recovery can also be seen in the same light. Thus, any meaningful and effective healing interventions with victims must take account of their lifestyles and environments as well as the psychological and traumatic impact of the crime. Drawing on Ward (2010) in relation to correctional rehabilitation it is our contention that healing interventions with victims must also specify precisely what competencies are required to secure valued outcomes for their futures in personally meaningful ways.

While this is not the place to fully elaborate exactly how the GLM framework for victim healing could be operationalised, an example of its application might illuminate. For example, in situations where the experience of sexual abuse as a child disrupts an individual's acquisition of the psychological and social resources required to attain primary human goods, such as healthy trusting relational capacities, a victim version of the GLM framework can ensure that

all the necessary thinking and social and psychological resources are brought to bear in the victim's recovery journey as core to achieving a Good Life. In essence, the GLM for victims is focused on enabling them to live productive and meaningful lives within the context of their histories, presents and futures.

While the GLM is a therapeutic model that is strength based and sensitive to the complex needs of victim of crimes, on its own it is insufficient to address the moral issues of this group. In our view restorative justice is a practice framework specifically designed to address moral repair issues, which also resonates strongly with the core values of the GLM. Collectively they provide a more comprehensive (and complementary) approach than each in their own.

5 Restorative justice

5.1 Restorative justice: a maximalist consequentialist perspective

In the 1990s restorative justice began to be recognised as a way of thinking about justice and healing when dealing with the aftermath of crime, focusing particularly on repairing the harm done to people and in some situations the harm done to relationships (Braithwaite, 1989, 2000; Braithwaite & Parker, 1999; Christie, 1977; McCold & Wachtel, 1998; Zehr, 1990). A striking feature of restorative justice is its resonance with relationship oriented, constructive theories of punishment, such as Duff's (2001) communicative theory. Duff argues that because individuals who commit sexual offences are fellow members of the moral community, the aim of punishment should be to communicate the wrongness of their actions in order to give them an opportunity to redeem themselves and ultimately be reconciled to members of the community. When restorative justice emerged in the early 1990s it was offered mainly to youth rather than adult offenders, and serious interpersonal crime was largely excluded. Much of the early research focused on its efficacy to reduce youth offending and the practices were largely

diversionary, and offender focused. Not enough research examined the victim experience or the potential in serious crime involving adult offenders. That has now changed. While restorative justice has been accepted internationally as a useful response to youth offending at nearly every stage of the criminal justice process, and for minor crime in the case of adults, in recent years restorative justice is becoming increasingly recognised for its justice and healing potential in more serious high tariff crime, including crimes of violence (see Daly, 2006a; Jülich, Buttle, Cummins & Freeborn, 2010; Keenan, Zinsstag & O’Nolan, 2016; Marinari, 2021; Miller, 2011; Pali & Madsen, 2011; Umbreit et al., 2003a, 2003b; Zinsstag & Vanfraechem, 2012).

Restorative justice as a discipline is an evolving one in relation to theory and concepts too, with “process” definitions being seen as minimalist when compared to more maximalist consequentialist understandings (Walgrave, 2021). While recognising the importance of a participatory process among the main stakeholders in restorative justice, this “process only” definition fails to take account of the broader aims and philosophy of restorative justice (Walgrave, 2020: 434). A maximalist consequential perspective includes the process definition but also extends beyond that to a philosophy which permeates criminal justice thinking with restorative ideas (Walgrave, 2008, 2020). A maximalist, consequentialist conceptualisation of restorative justice helps to bring into view a more pluralist view of justice; one that extends beyond law and order, to relationships and harm and the need for moral repair, in the private as well as the public sphere. Essentially the aim of a maximalist consequentialist restorative justice is to influence the development of a “restorative criminal justice system” at every level (Keenan & Zinsstag, in press). A range of restorative interventions, with additional guidelines in the case of sexual crime, could form part of a reformed restorative criminal justice system, including, but not limited to the following: restorative plea bargains, restorative specialist courts, restorative rehabilitation, and restorative incarceration (Keenan & Zinsstag, in press).

5.2 Restorative justice and sexual violence

Since the late 1990s many scholars (see e.g., Bolitho, 2015; Bolívar et al., 2013; Daly & Wade, 2017; Goodmark, 2018; Keenan, 2014; Keenan & Zinsstag, in press; Koss, 2000; Laxminarayan, Lens & Pemberton, 2013; McGlynn et al., 2017; Zinsstag & Busck-Nielsen, 2017) have advanced the case for the use of restorative justice in sexual violence cases. The argument rests on a number of explicit limitations of conventional criminal justice including the limited role that victims play in criminal justice and their dissatisfaction at being mere witnesses in the state's case; lack of offender accountability when no criminal proceedings are advanced; the fact that some victims want accountability without a criminal trial; poor reintegration of offenders in the community following periods of incarceration; and, the limited role for communities in criminal justice, despite the impact that sexual crime has on communities and the importance of communities in repairing the social bonds.

Previous texts have explained the theoretical components and principles of restorative justice and its practical application in sexual violence cases (see Bolitho & Freeman, 2016; Daly 2011, 2016, 2017; Hudson, 2002; Jülich & Buttle, 2010; Jülich et al., 2010; Mercer, 2020). The empirical literature outlining the support for restorative justice in sexual violence cases has also been evidenced (see Daly 2006b; Daly & Bouhours, 2011; Keenan, 2020; Keenan & Zinsstag, in press). There is also evidence that survivors themselves want this service to be made available to them (see Keenan, 2014; Marsh & Wagner, 2015; Moore, Keenan, Moss & Scotland, 2021). Some scholars (see Godden-Rasul, 2017; Jülich & Landon, 2017; Pali, 2017) caution that the power imbalance involved in sexual crime could provide opportunity for offenders to re-victimise the victim in the most subtle of ways in restorative processes if the facilitators are not trained to re-balance these dynamics. Feminists are concerned about the reprivatisation of sexual crime if restorative justice is used as an alternative

to criminal justice. The case is also made for additional specialist training for restorative justice facilitators in cases of sexual crime (Keenan, 2017, 2018).

While there is a growing body of literature on the benefits of restorative justice for victims of sexual crime (see Keenan & Griffith, 2019, 2021; Koss, 2013, 2014; Mariani, 2021; McGlynn, Westmarland & Godden, 2012; Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017) there is limited research on the outcomes of restorative justice for sex offenders who have participated in such processes. Further outcome research is needed. There is also growing interest in understanding how restorative justice can contribute to offender rehabilitation in cases of sexual violence through supporting desistance from further offending and in enhancing offender accountability (see Woessner, 2017).

One of the factors that can inhibit restorative justice work in the field of sexual violence is the perception that it is inherently a more-risky practice in sexual violence cases than other types of crime. The nature and intimacy of the harm, the power imbalance associated with sexual violence, the relational connections between victims and offenders, the perceived menacing characteristics of offenders, the particular vulnerabilities of victims, the inadequacy of support services, and the anxieties and responses of communities are some of the reasons why this is believed to be the case. These challenges are easily addressed in practice and in developing social support for participants (see Keenan & Zinsstag, in press; Zinsstag & Keenan, 2017).

6. The Good Lives Model and restorative justice: a combined approach to justice, rehabilitation and healing

The GLM and restorative justice are complementary but *distinct* normative and practice frameworks that have overlapping domains of application (see Ward & Durrant, 2021). The GLM is a rehabilitation theory that aims to promote the reintegration of individuals by

equipping them with the internal and external resources to achieve more fulfilling and less harmful lives. We have suggested above that a modified version of the framework could be useful for people harmed by sexual violence as for those who perpetrate it. Restorative justice practices seek to respond to crimes in a reparative and inclusive manner; it is inextricably linked to *ethical* values, while the GLM has a stronger association with *prudential* (welfare enhancing) values. In essence, they occupy distinct, although complementary, practice “niches”. The value of the GLM in relation to correctional practice, resides in its ability to integrate the established facts about effective treatment with sound clinical knowledge about how best to motivate and to engage individuals in the difficult task of lifestyle change. It is essentially a forward-looking perspective that sets out to constructively change the way people live their lives based on the clarification of core personal commitments, skill acquisition, and social re-entry. The process of lifestyle change is mediated by helping individuals to articulate and pursue their personal goals and the reduction of their specific dynamic risk factors. The normative component of the GLM revolves around the understanding that individuals who have committed crimes have core entitlements to basic goods as well as duties to others to respect their core interests. The normative components of the amended GLM for victims, hinge on the premise that victims of sexual crime have core entitlements to pursue their personal goals while recovering from the impact of sexual violation. The primary emphasis of restorative justice is on repairing the harm caused by crime and working for a restorative criminal justice system; it is concerned with moral repair (Walker, 2006).

While restorative justice is not punishment oriented, at least in the narrow sense of this term, careful attention is paid to offender reparation, victim healing, the reaffirmation of community norms and the repair of relationships between the offender, victims, and community (moral repair). Re-establishing relationships between victims and offenders is not necessarily part of this imperative, unless otherwise desired by the parties, such as in some

cases of historical intrafamilial child sexual abuse. The major intention is to facilitate the healing of the victim and community and to deal with norm violation in a holistic and just way, rather than to increase individuals' specific capabilities, although that can occur through the process. Restorative justice can provide a normative framework within which correctional restorative rehabilitation can be implemented. Its emphasis on the values of acknowledgment of harm committed, collaboration, and moral, social, and psychological repair, aligns naturally with the GLM's ecological and strength-based perspective. Each framework on its own lacks the theoretical resources to provide a comprehensive approach to interventions for victims and those who have committed sexual offences. On the one hand, while the GLM can provide guidance for the therapeutic aspect of intervention it lacks the capacity to address moral and justice related concerns and needs. On the other hand, restorative justice practices clarify the duties and entitlements of victims and key stakeholders towards each other but have little substantial to say about the structure and content of treatment plans, despite the recognised benefits when restorative justice and treatment approaches are coordinated (Daly, 2006).

The different emphases of the GLM and restorative justice can be further explained as follows. First, while the GLM (prudential) and restorative justice (moral) are based on different kinds of values, they are both concerned with repairing the damage created by crime, acknowledge the interests of victims, individuals who offend and community stakeholders, and are forward looking. For restorative justice the damage is moral in nature while the GLM is primarily concerned with the harm done to peoples' psychological and social functioning. A core aim is to provide individuals with the social and psychological resources to live meaningful and "better" lives. In our view, restorative justice and the GLM address quite different repair tasks and therefore are not in competition with each other. They constitute contrasting practice frameworks that can coexist as parts of an overall intervention plan (Ward & Durrant, 2021) or criminal justice repertoire of services. For example, a victim of a crime

may benefit from anxiety treatment for the intense fear, flashback experiences, and avoidance behaviour caused by a sexual assault (GLM guided) as well as structured meetings with the person who assaulted them (restorative justice guided). Each practice framework has its preferred “niche” of application and is best suited to a particular task. It is a mistake in our view, to search for a universal, a one size fits all perspective. Thus, a comprehensive intervention plan is likely to utilise a number of practice frameworks, each addressing the problems in a different niche or problem space. A therapeutic framework like the GLM (and a victim version of the GLM) is ideally suited to dealing with social and psychological problems while a restorative justice practice framework is better positioned as a response to moral concerns and justice needs. There may be overlap between niches, but at some level, they each possess unique content, and as such offer, a distinctive but complementary contribution to intervention. The two frameworks operate within different niches, with restorative justice addressing problems associated with moral repair (a moral/normative niche) while the GLM is concerned with equipping individuals with the skills and knowledge to live fulfilling and in the case of individuals who have committed crime, crime free lives (a therapeutic niche).

Because the GLM is oriented more towards individuals’ well-being it is better equipped to guide comprehensive intervention planning. For victims of sexual violence this might mean working therapeutically on trauma related problems or dealing with ongoing problems with emotional modulation and expression. For those individuals who committed sexual offences, the focus could be on managing problematic sexual fantasies or improving intimacy skills. On the other hand, restorative justice sets out to repair the damage caused by the violation of core community values (e.g., crimes). It assumes that such behaviour is wrong and that individuals are obligated to face the consequences arising from the harm they caused, and ideally, seek redemption in some way. While restorative justice practices, such as, victim-offender dialogues or meetings between all the key stakeholders may bring psychological benefits to

victims and those who offend, that is not its **primary** aim; rather they intend it to address the moral harm created by the crime. The overlapping values based on the equal value or dignity of all human beings means that they are “natural allies” in any correctional intervention plans and in response-based work with victims. In addition, both victims and offenders need to heal psychologically as well as repair the moral damage created by sexual offending.

A second important feature of combining GLM and restorative justice approaches in intervention planning is that both can deal with the conflicting moral obligations of practitioners. On the one hand there is a duty to do your best for your client (victim or offender) and help them to overcome their psychological problems; problems that might be seriously eroding their ability to live fulfilling and meaningful lives. On the other hand, practitioners have an obligation to ensure that the interests of other key stakeholders associated with an offence are taken into account when working with either victims or offenders. This is a complex problem with no easy solution (see Ward, 2013). However, restorative justice with its strong grounding in relationship repair automatically considers the perspectives and needs of victims, offenders and community representatives when deciding on what kind of interventions to recommend; its “line of sight” is multifaceted. The GLM seeks to enable the development of strengths and by doing so it is directly risk reducing and well-being enhancing. For example, helping someone to acquire vocational skills (e.g., training as a mechanic) is likely to improve their chances of working, and by doing so can reinforce and even instil self-regulatory and social skills (e.g., learning to problem solve, listen carefully, plan ahead etc). Risk oriented intervention models such as the risk-need-responsivity model (Bonta & Andrews, 2017) are unlikely to resonate so strongly with restorative justice. Furthermore, the acknowledgement of the importance of *human goods* in the lives of victims and offenders in both models means they are also trying to work out how best to heal individuals and communities rather than simply attempt to reduce harm.

7. Conclusion

Sexual crime is an inherently different type of crime from others, and clinical experience indicates that it shows features which differentiate it from other types of violent crime: victims of sexual crime often experience potent and debilitating self-blame and take responsibility for the offence; the perpetrator in the majority of cases is someone known to the victim, loved by them and in a trusting position of power in their lives; offenders in the majority of cases have used subtle techniques and strategies to groom and disempower the victim and overcome their resistance; the process of reporting the crime and pursuing justice through the criminal justice system is experienced as traumatic by victims and their families.

It is a mistake to look for the “one true model” that can deal with every moral, social, and psychological problem experienced by both victims of abuse and those who committed sexual crimes. Such a strategy is likely to result in overblown claims, neglect, and unnecessary acrimony between practitioners with different theoretical allegiances. The pluralistic nature of the practice framework model makes this less likely and also encourages researchers and clinicians to think carefully about the different problems and their respective niches individuals present with. However, different practice frameworks within a comprehensive plan, should at least be consistent with each other and hopefully share some core values. Otherwise, the result might be intractable ethical dilemmas such as the dual relationship problem and chaotic clinical practice (Ward, 2013). In our view, correctional rehabilitation should be implemented within a normative framework of accountability and a commitment on behalf of victims, offenders, and the community to work towards restoration, trust, and healing. The GLM and restorative justice are natural allies in this process because of their recognition of the inherent value of all individuals and appreciation that if you want people to lead less harmful lives, you need to offer them hope of achieving more fulfilling ones.

Disclosure statement

There is no potential conflict of interest in the publication of this article on the part of any of the authors

Funding

No particular funding supported this work

Ethical approval

There was no need for any IRB or Ethical Review Board approval for this article.

Data availability statement

As this is a conceptual / theoretical paper there are no empirical data to be made available in the public domain.

References

Baird, V. (2020). Annual Report Victims' Commissioner for England and Wales. London:

The House of Commons. Retrieved from

<https://victimscommissioner.org.uk/document/annual-report-of-the-victims-commissioner-2019-to-2020/> (last accessed 10.01. 2022)

Bolitho, J. (2015) Putting justice needs first: a case study of best practice in restorative justice, *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 3 (2), 256-281

Bolitho, J. & Freeman, K. (2016). *The use and effectiveness of restorative justice in criminal justice systems following child sexual abuse or comparable harms*. Report for the Royal Commission into institutional responses to child sexual abuse. Available at <https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Research%20Report%20-%20Restorative%20justice%20following%20child%20sexual%20abuse%20or%20comparable%20harms%20-%20Government%20responses.pdf>

- Bolívar, D. (2012). Community of care from a victim perspective: a qualitative study. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 15(1), 17–37
- Bolívar, D., Aertsen, I. & Vanfraechem, I. (2013). *Victims and restorative justice: an empirical study on the needs, experiences and position of the victim within restorative justice practices*. Unpublished report. Leuven: European Forum for Restorative Justice.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2000). Decomposing a holistic vision of restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 3 (4), 433-440.
- Braithwaite, J. & Parker, C. (1999) Restorative justice is republican justice. In G. Bazemore & L. Walgrave (eds.) *Restorative juvenile justice: repairing the harm of youth crime* (pp. 103-126). Monsey: Willow Tree Press.
- Brown, J.M. & Walklate, S.L. (eds.) (2012). *Handbook on sexual violence*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 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*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 223-248.
- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology*, 17(1), 1-15.
- Christie, N. (2013). Words on words. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 1(1), 15-19.
- Cortoni, F. & Gannon, T. A. (2016). Understanding female sexual offending. In A. R. Beech & T. Ward (Eds.) *Theories of sex offending* (p.453-471). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cossins, A. (2020). *Closing the justice gap for adult and child sexual assault: rethinking the adversarial trial*. London: Palgrave/Macmillan.

- Daly, K. (2006a). Restorative justice and sexual assault: an archival study of court and conference cases. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 46(2), 334-356.
- Daly, K. (2006b). The limits of restorative justice. In D. Sullivan & L. Tifft (eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice: a global perspective* (pp. 134-145). New York: Routledge
- Daly, K. (2011). Conventional and innovative justice responses to sexual violence. *Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault*, 12, 1-35.
- Daly, K. (2016). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(1), 9-29.
- Daly, K. (2017). Sexual violence and victims' justice interests. In E. Zinsstag & M. Keenan (eds.) *Restorative responses to sexual violence: legal, social and therapeutic dimensions* (pp. 108-139). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Daly, K. & Bouhours, B. (2011). Conventional and innovative justice responses to sexual violence, Appendix: Inventory of responses to sexual violence, *ACSSA Issues 12*. (Commonwealth of Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies).
- Daly, K. & Wade, D. (2012). *South Australian Juvenile Justice and Criminal Justice (SAJJ-CJ) Technical Report No. 5: In-depth study of sexual assault and family violence cases, Part II, sibling assault, other sexual assault and youth parent assault*. Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University.
- Day, A., & Casey, S. (2009). Values in forensic and correctional psychology. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 232–238. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.03.008.
- Duff, R. A. (2001). *Punishment, communication, and community*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Farrall, S. & Calverley, A. (2006) *Understanding Desistance from Crime: Theoretical Directions in Resettlement and Rehabilitation*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

- Gillen, J. (2019). *Gillen Review. Report into the law and procedures in serious sexual offences in Northern Ireland*. Retrieved from www.justice-ni.gov.uk/publications/gillen-review-report-law-and-procedures-serious-sexual-offences-ni (last accessed 9 September 2021).
- Godden, N. (2013). *Seeking justice for victim-survivors: unconventional legal responses to rape* (PhD dissertation). Durham University, United Kingdom. Retrieved from <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6379/>. (last accessed 8 September 2019)
- Goodmark, L. (2018). Restorative justice as feminist practice. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(3), 372-384.
- Harkins, L., Flak, V. E., Beech, A., & Woodhams, J. (2012). Evaluation of a community-based sex offender treatment program using a Good Lives Model approach. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 24, 519-543. DOI: 10.1177/1079063211429469
- Herman, J. (2005). Justice from the victim's perspective. *Violence Against Women*, 11(5), 571-602.
- Herman, J. (2015). *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence: From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.
- Hudson, B. (2002). Restorative justice and gendered violence: diversion or effective justice? *The British Journal of Criminology*, 42(3), 616-634.
- Jülich, S.J. & Buttle, J. (2010). Beyond conflict resolution: towards a restorative process for sexual violence. *Te Awatea Review*, 8, 21-25.
- Jülich, S.J., Buttle, J., Cummins, C. & Freeborn, E. (2010). *Project Restore: an exploratory study of restorative justice and sexual violence*. Auckland: AUT University.
- Jülich, S. & Landon, F. (2017). Achieving justice outcomes: participants of Project Restore's restorative processes. In E. Zinsstag & M. Keenan, (eds.) *Restorative responses to sexual violence: legal, social and therapeutic dimensions* (pp. 192-211). Abingdon: Routledge.

Jülich, S.J., McGregor, K., Annan, J., Landon, F., McCarrison, D. & McPhillips, K. (2011).

Yes, there is another way! *Canterbury Law Review*, 17, 222-228.

Keenan, M. (2014). *Sexual trauma and abuse: restorative and transformative possibilities? A collaborative study on the potential of restorative justice in sexual crimes in Ireland*.

Dublin: University College Dublin. Accessed 19/06/2018

<http://hdl.handle.net/10197/8355>

Keenan, M. (2017). Criminal justice, restorative justice, sexual violence and the rule of law.

In E. Zinsstag & M.Keenan (eds). *Restorative responses to sexual violence: legal, social and therapeutic dimensions*. London: Routledge (pp. 44-68).

Keenan, M. (2018). Training for restorative justice work in cases of sexual violence.

International Journal of Restorative Justice, 1(2).

Keenan, M. (2020). Kas taastavale õigusele on kohta, kui seksuaalne kuritarvitamine toimub

perekonnas? [Is there a place for restorative justice when the abuse is in the family?].

Sotsiaaltöö [Social Work] Estonia, 2020 (4). Accessed 20/08/2021

<https://researchrepository.ucd.ie/handle/10197/11902>

Keenan, M. & Griffith, A. (2019). Two women's journeys: restorative justice after sexual

violence. In B. Pali, K. Lauwaert & S. Pleysier (ed.), *The praxis of justice* (pp. 305-318).

Den Haag: Eleven International Publishers.

Keenan, M. & Griffith, A. (2021). Restorative justice after sexual violence: an international

perspective. In R. Killean, E. Dowds & A.-M. McAlinden (eds), *Sexual violence on trial:*

local and comparative perspectives (pp. 188-198). London: Routledge.

Keenan, M. & Zinsstag, E. (2014). Restorative justice and sexual offences: can 'changing

lenses' be appropriate in this case too? *Monatsschrift für Kriminologie und*

Strafrechtsreform, 97(1), 93-106.

- Keenan, M. & Zinsstag, E. (in press – due 2022) *Sexual violence and restorative justice: addressing the justice gap*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keenan, M., Zinsstag, E. & O’Nolan, C. (2016). Sexual violence and restorative practices in Belgium, Ireland and Norway: a thematic analysis of country variations. In *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 4(1), 86-114.
- Kirkwood, S. (2021). A practice framework for restorative justice. *Aggression and Violence Behavior*, 63, 1-10.
- Koss, M. (2013). The RESTORE program of restorative justice for sex crimes: vision, process and outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(9), 1623-1660.
- Koss, M.P. (2014). The RESTORE program of restorative justice for sex crimes: vision, process and outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(9), 1623-1660.
- Koss, M. (2000). Blame, shame, and community: justice responses to violence against women. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1332-1343.
- Krug, E.G. et al (2002) (eds). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Law, D. R. & Ward, T. (2011). *Desistance from sexual offending: Alternatives to throwing away the keys*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Laxminarayan, M., Lens, K. & Pemberton, A. (2013). Victim-offender encounters in the Netherlands. In D. Bolivar, I. Aertsen & I. Vanfraechem (eds.), *Victims and restorative justice: an empirical study on the needs, experiences and position of the victim within restorative justice practices* (pp. 100-145). Unpublished report. Leuven: European Forum for Restorative Justice.
- Loney, D. M., & Harkins, L. (2018). Examining the good lives model and antisocial behavior. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 24, 38-51. DOI: 10.1080/1068316X.2017.1371304

- Lorito, C., Vollm, B., & Dening, T. (2018). The individual experience of ageing prisoners: systematic review and meta-synthesis through a Good Lives Model framework. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 33*, 252-262. DOI: 10.1002/gps.4762
- Lovett, J. & Kelly, L. (2009). *Different systems, similar outcomes? Tracking attrition in reported rape cases across Europe*. London: Child and Women Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University.
- Marinari, A. (2021). *Restorative justice for survivors of sexual abuse*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Marsh, F. & Wager N. (2015). Restorative justice in cases of sexual violence: Exploring the views of the public and survivors. *Probation Journal, 62*(4) 336–356.
- Marshall, W.L., Serran, G.A., Fernandez, Y.M., Mulloy, R., Mann, R.E., & Thornton, D. (2003). Therapist characteristics in the treatment of sexual offenders: Tentative data on their relationship with indices of behaviour change. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 9*, 25-30. doi:10.1080/355260031000137940
- Marshall, W.L., Serran, G.A., Moulden, H., Mulloy, R., Fernandez, Y.M., Mann, R.E. & Thornton, D. (2002). Therapist features in sexual offender treatment: their reliable identification and influence on behaviour change. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 9*, 395-405.
- Martin, A. M., Hernandez, B., Hernandez-Fernaund, E., Arregui, J. L., & Hernandez, J. A. (2010). The enhancement effect of social and employment integration on the delay of recidivism of released offenders trained with the R & R programme. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 16*, 401-413. DOI: 10.1080/10683160902776835
- Mercado, C.C., Merdian, H.L. & Egg, R. (2011). The internet and sexual offending. An international perspective. In D.P. Boer, R. Eher, L.A. Craig, M.H. Minder & F. Pfäfflin (eds.), *International perspectives on the assessment and treatment of sexual offenders: theory, practice, and research* (pp. 507-524). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

- Mercer, V. (2020) *Restorative practice and harmful sexual behaviour assessment framework and practice guidance*. Manchester: AIM Project. Retrieved from www.aimproject.org.uk.
- Mercer, V., Sten Madsen, K., Keenan, M. & Zinsstag, E. (2015). *Doing restorative justice in cases of sexual violence: a practice guide*. Leuven: Leuven Institute of Criminology. Accessed 19/06/2021 <http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7160>
- McCold, P. & Wachtel, B. (1998). Community is not a place: a new look at community justice initiatives. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 1(1), 71-85.
- McGlynn, C. & Munro, V.E. (eds.) (2010). *Rethinking rape law: international and comparative perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- McGlynn, C., Westmarland, N. & Godden, N. (2012). 'I just wanted him to hear me': sexual violence and the possibilities of restorative justice. *Journal of Law and Society*, 39(2), 213-240.
- McGlynn, C., Westmarland, N. & Johnson, K. (2017). Under the radar: the widespread use of 'Out of Court resolutions' in policing domestic violence and abuse in the United Kingdom. *British Journal of Criminology*, 58(1), 1-16.
- Miller, S. (2011). *After the crime: the power of restorative justice*. London: New York University Press.
- Moore, A., Keenan, M., Moss, R. & Scotland, A. (2021). *Survivors voices national consultation*. Glasgow: Thriving Survivors. Available at: http://www.thrivingsurvivors.co.uk/uploads/1/0/8/6/108624537/restorative_justice_-_survivors_voices_-_consultation_report.pdf.
- Newsom, K. and Myers-Bowman, K., (2017). "I am not a victim. I am a survivor": Resilience as a journey for female survivors of child sexual abuse. *Journal of child sexual abuse*, 26(8), pp.927-947.

- O'Malley, T. (2020). Review of protections for vulnerable witnesses in the investigation and prosecution of sexual offences. Dublin: Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform. Retrieved from http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Review_of_Protections_for_Vulnerable_Witnesses_in%20the_Investigation_and_Prosecution_of_Sexual_Offences.pdf/Files/Review_of_Protections_for_Vulnerable_Witnesses_in%20the_Investigation_and_Prosecution_of_Sexual_Offences.pdf.
- O'Nolan, C., Zinsstag, E. & Keenan, M. (2018). Researching 'under the radar' practices: exploring restorative practices in sexual violence cases. *Temida*, 21-1, 107-130.
- Pali, B. & Madsen, K.S. (2011). Dangerous liaisons? A feminist and restorative approach to sexual assault. *Temida*, 14(1) 49-65.
- Prescott, D., Willis, G. & Ward, T. (in press). Monitoring Therapist Fidelity to the Good Lives Model (GLM). *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.
- Purvis, M. & Ward, T. (2021). An overview of the Good Lives Model: Theory and evidence. In P. Raynor et al., (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Rehabilitative Work in Criminal Justice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Purvis, M., Ward, T., & Shaw, S. (2013). *Applying the Good Lives Model to the case management of sexual offenders: a practical guide for probation officers, parole officers, and case workers*. Brandon: Safer Society Press.
- Purvis, M., Ward, T. & Willis, G.M. (2011). The Good Lives Model in practice: offence pathways and case management. *European Journal of Probation*, 3(2), 4-28.
- Simons, D. (2006). Childhood victimization of sexual abusers: Making sense of the findings. *The Forum*, 18, 1-16.

- Stubbs, J. (2002). Domestic violence and women's safety: feminist challenges to restorative justice. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (eds.), *Restorative justice and family violence* (pp. 42-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, E. (2017). 'I should have been a security consultant': The Good Lives Model and residential burglars. *European Journal of Criminology*, 14, 434-450. DOI: 10.1177/1477370816661743
- Temkin, J. & Krahe, B. (2008). *Sexual assault and the justice gap: a question of attitude*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Topping, A. (2021). MP feels 'vindicated' in not reporting sexual assault to police. *The Guardian* (25 May 2021).
- Umbreit, M.S., Vos, B., Coates, R. & Brown, K. (2003a). *Facing violence: the path of restorative justice and dialogue*. Monsey: Criminal Justice Press.
- Umbreit, M.S., Vos, B., Coates, R. & Brown, K. (2003b). Victim offender dialogue in violent cases: the Texas and Ohio experience. *VOMA Connections*, 14(1), 12-17.
- Van Damme, L., Hoeve, M., Vermeiren, R., Vanderplasschen, W., & Colins, O. F. (2016). Quality of life in relation to future mental health problems and offending: Testing the good lives model among detained girls. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40, 285-294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000177>
- Vetten, L. (2011). Paradox and Policy: Addressing Rape in Post-Apartheid South Africa. In N. Westmarland and G. Gangoli, (eds). *International Approaches to Rape*, Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2011, (169-92).
- Walby, S., et. al., (2015). Law and the Criminal Justice System. In S. Walby et al., *Stopping Rape: Towards a Comprehensive Policy*. Bristol: Bristol University Press (111-172) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv4g1rd0.9>

- Walklate, S. (2004). *Gender, crime and criminal justice* (2nd ed.). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Walgrave, L. (2008). *Restorative justice, self-interest and responsible citizenship*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Walgrave, L. (2020). Restorative justice domesticated. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 3(3) pp. 431-438.
- Walgrave, L. (2021). *Being consequential about restorative justice*. The Hague: Eleven
- Walker, M. (2006). *Moral repair: reconstructing moral relations after wrongdoings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, T. (2002a). Good lives and the rehabilitation of sexual offenders: Promises and problems. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 513-528.
- Ward, T. (2002b). The management of risk and the design of good lives. *Australian Psychologist*, 37, 172-179.
- Ward, T. (2010). The Good Lives model of offender rehabilitation: Basic assumptions, aetiological commitments, and practice implications. In F. McNeill, P. Raynor, and C. Trotter (eds.), *Offender supervision: new directions in theory, research and practice*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Ward, T. (2017). Restorative justice and the dual role problem confronting practitioners. In E. Zinsstag, & M. Keenan, (eds.), *Restorative responses to sexual violence: legal, social and therapeutic dimensions* (pp. 92-107) Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ward, T. & Brown, M. (2004). The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, 10, 243-257.
- Ward, T. & Durrant, R. (2021). Practice Frameworks in Correctional Psychology: Translating Causal theories and Normative Assumptions into Practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 58. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101612

- Ward, T. & Fortune, C.-A. (2016). The role of dynamic factors in the explanation of offending. In *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 29, 79-88.
- Ward, T. & Gannon, T. (2006). Rehabilitation, etiology, and self-regulation: The Good Lives Model of sexual offender treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 77-94.
- Ward, T. & Hudson, S. (2000) A self-regulation model of relapse prevention. In D.R. Lawes, S.M. Hudson & T. Ward (eds.), *Remaking relapse prevention with sex offenders: A sourcebook* (pp. 79-101). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ward, T. & Langlands, R. (2009). Repairing the rupture: Restorative justice and offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 205-214.
- Ward, T. & Marshall, W.L. (2004). Good lives, etiology and the rehabilitation of sex offenders: a bridging theory. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 10, 153-169.
- Ward, T. & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: beyond the risk assessment paradigm*. London: Routledge.
- Ward, T. & Stewart, C. A. (2003). Criminogenic needs and human needs: a theoretical model. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, 9, 125-143.
- Ware, J., & Bright, D. A. (2008). Evolution of a treatment programme for sex offenders: Changes to the NSW Custody-Based Intensive Treatment (CUBIT). *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 15, 340-349. DOI: 10.1080/13218710802014543
- Webb, L., Craissati, J. & Keen, S. (2007). Characteristics of internet child pornography offenders: a comparison with child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19(4), 449-465.
- Woessner, G. (2017). On the relationship between restorative justice and therapy in cases of sexual violence. In E. Zinsstag & M. Keenan, (eds.) (2017) *Sexual violence and restorative justice: legal, social and therapeutical dimensions*. London: Routledge. PP 248-264.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: a new focus for crime*. Waterloo: Herald Press.

Zinsstag, E. (2017) 'How appropriate is the use of restorative justice in cases of sexual violence?' in *Scottish Justice Matters*, 5(1), 30-33.

Zinsstag, E. & Busck-Nielsen, V. (2017). Wartime sexual violence and conventional and restorative justice responses: the potential of a 'blended approach' within transitional justice. In E. Zinsstag & M. Keenan (eds.), *Restorative responses to sexual violence: legal, social and therapeutic dimensions* (pp. 15-27). London Routledge.

Zinsstag, E. & Keenan, M. (eds.) (2017) *Sexual violence and restorative justice: legal, social and therapeutical dimensions*. London: Routledge.

Zinsstag, E. & Vanfraechem, I. (eds.) (2012). *Conferencing and restorative justice: international practices and perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.