



## The Jerry Lee Program on Randomized Controlled Experiments in Restorative Justice

**Jerry Lee Center of Criminology**  
**University of Pennsylvania**  
Lawrence Sherman, Director

**Centre for Restorative Justice**  
**Australian National University**  
Heather Strang, Director

**Mission.** The mission of the Jerry Lee Program is to develop evidence-based theory and policy on restorative justice. Using long-term, life-course follow-up of crime victims and offenders who have been randomly assigned to restorative justice or control groups, the program will learn what works, what doesn't, and why.

**What Is Restorative Justice?** The United Kingdom's government defines restorative justice as "a process whereby parties with a stake in a specific offense collectively resolve how to deal with the aftermath of the offense and its implications for the future." This includes crime victims, offenders, their family, friends and other supporters.

**Varieties of Restorative Justice (RJ).** It may be conducted in face-to-face meetings or by "shuttle mediation." RJ may be led by police, probation officers, trained mediators, prosecutors, community leaders, prison staff or others. It may involve three people or three hundred, with or without the supervision of courts and judges, embedded within or completely separate from the criminal justice process. Which of these approaches works best--and why—are key issues for the Jerry Lee Program to address.

**Methods.** Within the context of randomized controlled trials (RCTs), the program's research methods include ethnography, interviews, official records analysis, and other measures of how restorative justice affects people's lives, for better or worse.

**Discoveries So Far.** Three-year follow-up results from the first two RCTs with victims and offenders in Australia, summarized at <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/jerrylee/rjWorkingPaper1.pdf>, show that

- Victims generally are better off with restorative justice than without it
- Offenders generally think restorative justice is fairer than not having it, yet
- Mostly male offenders in Australia getting RJ for **violent** crimes have *less* repeat offending, while male juveniles in the north of England do not.
- Violent female juvenile offenders in the north of England receiving RJ have *less* repeat offending than the females who do not.

- Juvenile offenders in Australia getting RJ for **property** crimes have *more* repeat offending
- Juvenile offenders in the north of England getting RJ for property crimes have *less* repeat offending than those who do not.
- Australian Aboriginals getting RJ for both violent and property crimes have *more* repeat offending than Aboriginals who do not receive RJ.

**Sixteen Tests In Progress.** Since the four experiments in the RISE program (Reintegrative Shaming Experiments) were initiated in collaboration with the Australian Federal Police in 1995, what has become the Jerry Lee Program has initiated a total of 12 RCTs in restorative justice, and has been funded to undertake a total of 16 RCTs, making it the largest coordinated program of controlled experiments in the history of criminology. These tests examine the effects of RJ with and without criminal convictions, at different stages in the criminal justice process, in different kinds of communities, with different age and racial groups of offenders, and for different kinds of offenses. The total sample size is now projected at over **3300 offenders** and **2300 crime victims**.

**Campbell Collaboration Review.** The 25 ongoing tests are part of the Program's systematic review of restorative justice effects on victims and offenders for the Campbell Collaboration ( [www.campbellcollaboration.org](http://www.campbellcollaboration.org) ) under the auspices of the Campbell Crime and Justice Group ( <http://www.aic.gov.au/campbellcj/> ). The purpose of a systematic review is to estimate the average effects of a program across multiple tests of its effects, so that more reliable predictions can be made about how well it works under a variety of conditions.

**Case Law.** The research so far has resulted in the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales advising judges to participate in a randomized controlled trial that could affect their sentencing practices ( <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/jerrylee/jrc/lcjustice.html> ) and two English High Court rulings that prison sentences should be reduced if offenders have volunteered to meet with their victims.

**Financial Supporters.** Since 1994, the research comprising the Jerry Lee Program has been supported by a wide range of governmental agencies, private foundations, and private individuals giving grants to the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania ( <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/jerrylee/> ) and to the Centre for Restorative Justice at the Australian National University's Research School of Social Sciences, REGNET Program ( <http://crj.anu.edu.au/> ).

A partial list of supporters includes the following:

(Australian) Criminological Research Council  
 (Australian) Federal Department of Health  
 Australian Federal Police  
 (US) National Institute of Justice  
 (US) Bureau of Justice Assistance  
 The Home Office of England Wales, United Kingdom  
 Youth Justice Board of England and Wales  
 National Probation Service (England and Wales)  
 Metropolitan Police of London  
 Northumbria Police  
 Thames Valley Police  
 Jerry Lee Foundation  
 Smith Richardson Foundation  
 Esmee Fairbairn Foundation  
 George Pine

### List of RCTs

JLP # Code	City, Years	Victims Face-to-Face	Diversion From Prosecution	Point in Criminal Process	Offense Types Eligible	Offenders Eligible	Sample Size (Cases)
1. JVC	Canberra 1995-2000	Yes	Yes	Arrest	Violence	Ages 12-29	100
2. JPP	Canberra 1995-2000	Yes	Yes	Arrest	Property Crimes, Personal Victims	Ages 12-17	173
3.PCA	Canberra 1995-1197	No	Yes	Arrest	Drinking-Driving	Ages 17-Adult	900
4. JPS	Canberra 1995-2000	No	Yes	Arrest	Shoplifting-Department Stores	Ages 12-17	113
5.NJO	Northumbria 2002-2004	Yes	No	Arrest+ Final Warning	Non-violent crimes	Ages 12-17	100
6.NJA	Northumbria 2002-2004	Yes	No	Arrest + Final Warning	Assaults	Ages 12-17	100
7.NGP	Northumbria 2002-2004	Yes	No	Post-Plea Pre-Sentence	Property Crime	Ages 18+	100
8.NGA	Northumbria 2002-2004	Yes	No	Post-Plea Pre-Sentence	Assaults	Ages 18+	100
9.TVP	Thames Valley 2002-2004	Yes	No	During Prison Term	Violence	Ages 18+	100
10.TVC	Thames Valley 2002-2004	Yes	No	During Probation Term	Violence	Ages 18+	100
11.LOR	London 2002-2004	Yes	No	Post-Plea Pre-Sentence	Robbery	Ages 18+	160
12.LOB	London 2002-2004	Yes	No	Post-plea Pre-Sentence	Burglary	Ages 18+	220
13.LDS	London 2004-2005	No and Yes	Yes	Arrest	Violence + Property	Ages 18+	600
14.LDI	London 2005-2006	No	Yes	Arrest	Violence + Property	Ages 18+	400
15.LDF	London 2005-2006	Yes	Yes	Arrest	Violence + Property	Ages 18+	400
16. LDFI	London 2005-2006	Yes and No	Yes	Arrest	Violence + Property	Ages 18+	400

#### Key to Codes

1. JVC---Juvenile Violent Crime (RISE), Canberra
2. JPP—Juvenile Personal Property (RISE), Canberra

3. PCA—Prescribed Content of Alcohol while driving (RISE), Canberra
4. JPS—Juvenile Property-Shoplifting (from large department stores) (RISE), Canberra
5. NJO—Northumbria Juvenile Other (than assault) final warnings
6. NJA—Northumbria Juvenile Assault final warnings
7. NGP—Northumbria Guilty Plea for Property offences, by adult offenders in Magistrates' Courts
8. NGA—Northumbria Guilty Plea for Assaults, by adult offenders in Magistrates' Courts
9. TVP—Thames Valley Prison sentences cases, all adult offenders sentenced for violent crime
10. TVC-- Thames Valley Community sentences cases, all adult offenders sentenced for violent crime
11. LOR—London Robbery Guilty Pleas, pre-sentencing of adult offenders in Crown Court
12. LOB—London Burglary Guilty Pleas, pre-sentencing of adult offenders in Crown Court
13. LDO—London Diversion Overall comparison of cases prosecuted versus cases diverted to any form of RJ, all with moderately serious property and violent crimes by adult offenders against adult victims (same for 14, 15 and 16)
14. LDI—London Diversion Indirect (not face-to-face) RJ compared to prosecution
15. LDF—London Diversion Face-to-Face RJ compared to prosecution
16. LDFI—London Diversion Face-to-Face RJ compared to Indirect (not face-to-face) RJ

### **Publications to Date.**

#### Books

\*Heather Strang 2002, *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 298 plus xx pp.

#### Journal Articles

\*Lawrence W. Sherman. 2003 "Reason for Emotion: Reinventing Justice with Theories, Innovations and Research. 2002 ASC Presidential Address" *Criminology* 41 (1): 1-38.

\*Heather Strang & Lawrence W Sherman, 2003, 'Repairing the Harm: Victims and Restorative Justice' *Utah Law Review*, vol. 2003, no 1, pp 15–42.

\*Lawrence W Sherman & Heather Strang, 2004, 'Verdicts or Inventions? Interpreting Results from Randomized Controlled Experiments in Criminology' *American Behavioral Scientist* (special issue devoted to Experimental Methods in the Political Sciences edited by Donald P Green and Alan S Gerber, Yale University), vol 47, no 5, pp 575–607.

Lawrence W. Sherman & Heather Strang, 2004. 'Experimental Ethnography: The Marriage of Qualitative and Quantitative Research.' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 595, pp. 204-222.

#### Book Chapters

\*Heather Strang & Lawrence W Sherman forthcoming, 'Does Restorative Justice Reduce Victimization?', in B Welsh and D Farrington (eds) *Preventing Crime: What Works for Children, Offenders, Victims and Places*. Belmont, Ca, Wadsworth Publishing (accepted November 2003)

\*Heather Strang forthcoming, 'Is Restorative Justice Imposing its Agenda on Victims?' in H Zehr and B Toews (eds) *Critical Issues in Restorative Justice*, New York, Criminal Justice Press (accepted November 2003).

\*Lawrence W Sherman, Heather Strang & Daniel J Woods 2003, 'Captains of Restorative Justice: Experience, Legitimacy and Recidivism by Type of Offence' in E G M Weitekamp and H J Kerner (eds) *Restorative Justice in Context: International Practice and Directions*, Willan Publishing, Devon UK, pp 229–256.

\*Heather Strang 2001, 'Justice for Victims of Young Offenders: the Centrality of Emotional Harm and Restoration', in A Morris & G Maxwell (eds) *Restorative Conferencing for Young Offenders*, Hart Publishing, Oxford. Reprinted in 2003 G Johnstone (ed) *A Restorative Justice Reader: Texts, Sources, Context*, Cullompton, Devon, Willan Publishing.

\*Heather Strang 2000, 'The Future of Restorative Justice', in D Chappell and P Wilson (eds) *The Australian Criminal Justice System: 2000 and Beyond*, Butterworths, Sydney, pp 22-33.

### Other Publications

\*Heather Strang 1999 'Restorative Justice: Current Developments and Research Findings, in *Proceedings of the Australian Institute of Criminology Symposium on Crime*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

\*Heather Strang 1999, 'Research on Conferencing: the Canberra Experiments', in A. Morris and G. Maxwell *Youth Justice in Focus*, Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

\*Heather Strang, Geoffrey C Barnes, John Braithwaite and Lawrence W Sherman. 1999. *Experiments in restorative policing: a progress report on the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE)*. Canberra: Australian National University pp. 132.  
<http://www.aic.gov.au/rjustice/rise/progress/1999.html>

\*Lawrence W. Sherman 1999. "Restorative Policing: The Canberra, Australia Experiment" pp. 195-208 in Corina Sole Brito and Tracy Allan, eds., *Problem-Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum

\*Heather Strang 2000, *Restorative Justice in Australia*, A Report to the Criminology Research Council. Ms 38 pp. ([www.aic.gov.au/rjustice](http://www.aic.gov.au/rjustice)).

Lawrence Sherman and Heather Strang, in collaboration with Daniel J. Woods, Caroline M. Angel, Geoffrey C. Barnes, Nova Inkpen, Dorothy Newbury-Birch and Sarah Bennett. *Restorative Justice: What We Know and How We Know It*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Jerry Lee center of Criminology,  
<http://www.sas.upenn.edu/jerrylee/rjWorkingPaper1.pdf>.