

**The Public Attitude towards Restorative Justice: The Impact of Knowledge, Justice  
Orientation, and True Crime Entertainment**

Sophie Jaskiewicz

Department of Psychology (BMS), University of Twente

202000377: Psychology of Conflict, Risk and Safety

Jiska Jonas Van Dijk (MSc)

Dr Iris Van Sintemaartensdijk

June 29, 2023

Wordcount: 9331

### **Abstract**

Research on public opinion of criminal justice reveals the public's lack of understanding regarding non-traditional justice methods, like restorative justice. This relatively new concept opens a window for approaching crime based on restoring victims' needs and rehabilitating offenders. The goal of restorative justice is not to punish the offender but to restore the balance of shared justice values among victim, offender, and community. However, the public's lack of knowledge about restorative justice could make it harder to accurately assess their attitude towards it.

The goal of this research is to investigate whether knowledge of restorative justice has an influence on people's beliefs of restorative justice aspects and whether a restorative justice orientation aligns with people's preference for restorative justice goals. Additionally, due to the rising true crime industry with its podcasts, documentaries, and TV shows, it is investigated whether interest in this type of entertainment negatively influences the public's attitude towards restorative justice.

Results showed that knowledge of restorative justice was related to people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness. Similarly, restorative justice orientation was found to have an influence on whether people prefer restorative justice goals. However, contrary to expectations it was not found that knowledge of restorative justice has an impact on people's belief in the punitiveness of restorative justice. Furthermore, the expected negative influence of true crime entertainment on belief in restorative justice's effectiveness or punitiveness has not been observed. Suggestions for future research, which examine what underlies public attitude towards restorative justice have been made.

## **The Public Attitude towards Restorative Justice: The Impact of Knowledge, Justice Orientation, and True Crime Entertainment**

Public opinion plays an essential role in how the criminal justice system serves justice in response to crime (Maruna & King, 2004; Wood & Gannon, 2013). Any lack of faith people may have towards the criminal justice system might hamper law adherence and inhibit certain justice approaches from being installed and used (Maruna & King, 2003; Marien & Hooghe, 2011; Van Gelder et al., 2015; Wood & Gannon, 2013). Research on public perception of justice states that the public is generally more punitive when it comes to crime (Gade, 2018; Gromet & Darley, 2009; Pickett et al., 2015; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). People judge imposed sentences as being too mild even though Roberts & Hough (2005) identified that people lack a realistic awareness of sentencing procedures and their severity (Elffers et al., 2007; Pickett et al., 2015; Werner et al., 2017). Once people consider alternative punishment or are informed about alternative justice methods, their judgements change to being more restorative (Gromet & Darley, 2009; Roberts, 2004; as cited in Van Gelder et al., 2015). This signifies that sentencing procedures and the many facets of justice are still quite unknown to the public (D'Souza & Shapland, 2012). Since strong attitudes stem from possessing a lot of knowledge about the attitude-object (Holbrook et al., 2005), the identified lack of knowledge may be an interplaying factor in how people view different aspects of justice. It might be especially significant to how people view alternative or more contemporary justice approaches like restorative justice. However, providing information and expanding knowledge signifies that former attitudes could be changed (Gromet & Darley, 2009; Pickett et al., 2015).

It is important to study public opinion of justice to stimulate confidence and respect in the criminal justice system. As a result, those findings might be used to ensure a society which favourably perceives imposed sentences issued by the justice system (Marien &

Hooghe, 2011). Thus, in this research public opinion towards a specific type of justice system will be examined, namely restorative justice. To many, this is still a relatively new type of justice system, but it has been applied more often in recent years (Okimoto et al., 2009; Wenzel et al., 2008). The aim of this study is to answer the research question, “What is the general public’s attitude towards restorative justice?”.

### **Restorative Justice**

Restorative justice is characterised as a justice method focused on restitution rather than punishment (Ahlin et al., 2017). Nascimento and colleagues (2022, p.1) define the concept as “a more flexible, comprehensive, and humanistic perspective of the legal system”. Restorative justice aims to restore the imbalanced relationship between the victim, the offender, and the community (Ahlin et al., 2017; Okimoto et al., 2009; Zehr, 1985). Through a collaborative process, all stakeholders (victim, offender, and community) are set to come to a consensus about what the offender can do to righten the wrong (Gromet & Darley, 2009b; Okimoto et al., 2009; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). While handling offences using restorative justice, a primary concern is to listen to the victim’s needs and look for methods in which the offender can effectively compensate the victim (Suzuki & Yuan, 2021). This compensation has not only the aim of attaining the victim’s needs but also teaching the offender to realise the negative causes of their actions and taking responsibility (Walgrave, 2011). Additionally, this approach is used to minimise the worsening of repercussions for victims and offender recidivism (Sherman et al., 2015a).

To facilitate the understanding of the still rather unknown concept of restorative justice, table 1 provides an overview of the differences between restorative justice and retributive justice, which is the traditional way of dealing with crime and how most people might expect perpetrators to be handled with (Wenzel et al., 2008). The aim is to make the offender suffer by depriving them of things like their freedom (i.e.: sending offenders to

prison) (Markel et al., 2011; Nocella, 2011). In retributive justice, the focus lies less on rehabilitation and more on accountability (Wenzel et al., 2008). However, retributive justice has been criticised for its dismissal of the needs of victims (Hermann, 2017) which restorative justice incorporates (Walgrave, 2011).

**Table 1.**

*Differences between Retributive and Restorative justice*

<b>Restorative Justice</b>	<b>Retributive Justice</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on repair of harm and restoration of relationships</li> <li>• Emphasis on responsibility of the offender for their actions</li> <li>• All stakeholders including victim, offender, and community are involved</li> <li>• Collaborative process</li> <li>• Restitution, community service, or other forms of reparative actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on punishment and deterrence</li> <li>• Emphasis on guilt of the offender</li> <li>• The state is the primary decision-maker</li> <li>• Adversarial process</li> <li>• Imprisonment or other punitive measures</li> </ul>

*Note.* Adapted from *Retributive Justice, Restorative Justice*, by H. Zehr, 1985. Copyright 1985 by MCC U.S. Office of Criminal Justice.

A well-known programme based on restorative justice principles is victim-offender mediation. It involves direct communication between the victim and the offender while a trained mediator monitors the situation (Sherman et al., 2015b; Umbreit et al., 2004). Sherman and colleagues (2015a) also stress the application of so-called restorative justice conferences (RJC). They define RJC as a step further than victim-offender mediation, as it also involves the community in the communicative mediation process (Sherman et al., 2015a). Restorative justice application is mostly found in connection to minor crimes like theft, vandalism, or small traffic violations (not resulting in anyone's death or life-threatening injuries) (Ahlin et al., 2017; Souza & Shapland, 2023). Crimes characterised as violent (e.g., murder, rape, kidnapping, or fraud) are still handled using retributive justice or, very rarely, a mix of both (Abraham, 2010; Gavrielides & Artinopoulou, 2013).

Participation in restorative justice programmes can have a beneficial impact for both victims and offenders. Sherman and colleagues (2015a) found evidence that, in comparison to retributive justice methods, restorative justice methods led to lower instances of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in victims. Furthermore, victims report a lower fear of being re-victimized by their offender, lower intentions for revenge against their offender, and higher satisfaction with having their case handled by restorative justice (Strang, 2000; as cited in Sherman et al., 2015a). Due to restorative justice's nature being collaborative, victims also felt more included in the process, while victims of cases handled by retributive justice reported a feeling of exclusion (Nascimento et al., 2022; Van Willigenburg, 2018).

Offenders whose cases have been solved with restorative justice also reported to be more satisfied than offenders whose cases have been solved using retributive justice (Sherman et al., 2015a). More importantly, instances of self-reflection, and as a result, less re-offending

have been reported by those indicted of a violent crime (Sherman et al., 2015a). Nevertheless, evidence did not show the same results for minor crime offenders (Sherman et al., 2015a).

### **Public Knowledge and Opinion of Restorative Justice**

Despite the evidence regarding restorative justice's benefits and effectiveness, the public's attitude towards restorative justice has not been studied extensively. Maruna and King (2004) criticise existing research of public opinion on justice approaches for being too one-sided. There is a lack of adequate results when it comes to the public attitude towards non-traditional justice methods (Maruna & King, 2004; Saulnier & Sivasubramaniam, 2015).

Generally, previous research states that people prefer a more punitive approach to crime (Van Gelder et al., 2015; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). One explanation for people's punitive orientation could be a lack of knowledge about restorative justice.

### **The Impact of Knowledge**

Identified as relevant to people's attitude formation is the possessed knowledge people have of concepts. A gap in public knowledge of restorative justice and its practices have been identified in a multitude of papers (Maruna & King, 2004; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). These state that people have a lack of awareness of restorative justice and justice in general (Maruna & King, 2004; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). It could explain why sentences are usually classified as being too mild (Elffers et al., 2007; Roberts & Hough, 2005; Warner et al., 2017). The public is not yet aware of the benefits and effectiveness restorative justice has to offer victims and offenders of crimes (D'Souza & Shapland, 2021; Pickett et al., 2015; Roberts & Hough, 2005; Suzuki & Yuan, 2021). More familiarity with the concept could lead to more acceptance towards rehabilitative or alternative justice processes (Maruna & King, 2004). Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) found evidence of the positive influence of knowledge in their research on people's attitudes towards suspended sentences. The participants who had more knowledge of suspended sentences were also more optimistic about its effectiveness (Van

Gelder et al., 2015). The aim of this research is to examine whether the same effect could be observed for knowledge of restorative justice and people's opinion on its effectiveness.

Hence, the first hypothesis in this study will also look at the effect knowledge can have on people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.

*H1: People with more knowledge of restorative justice have a higher belief in its effectiveness.*

Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) also proposed the concept of punitiveness in their article. They classified the concept of punitiveness into different kinds of criminal justice aims that could be evaluated in their punitive nature. According to them, punitiveness could be inspected by assessing people's agreeableness to "deterrence, desert, [...] incapacitation, restorative justice and rehabilitation" (Van Gelder et al., 2015, p.675). The concept was also observed in connection to the knowledge people had of suspended sentences, a non-traditional form of sanction (Van Gelder et al., 2015). Their findings portrayed a positive relationship between knowledge of suspended sentences and people's belief that these were punitive. It could lead to meaningful implications if a similar effect is found in connection to restorative justice. As a result, the second hypothesis is formulated as follows:

*H2: People with more knowledge of restorative justice have a higher belief in its punitiveness.*

### **The Impact of Justice Orientation**

Justice orientation has previously been seen as a concept which describes people's feelings towards unfairness in the world, their opinion on discrimination, and how they plan to atone for their own wrongdoings (Holtz & Harold, 2010). People with a strong justice orientation are said to care a lot if others are treated unfairly (Holtz & Harold, 2010). Okimoto and colleagues (2012) went one step further in their research and examined whether there is evidence for dividing justice orientation into a retributive justice orientation and a restorative justice orientation. They found evidence for this claim and differentiated the orientations



based on people's interpretations of when justice is achieved (Okimoto et al., 2012). A person's justice orientation can be categorised as restorative if they view justice as achieved when a restored balance of violated justice values within affected parties exists (Okimoto et al., 2012). According to Okimoto and colleagues' (2012) research, this justice orientation could be a predictor of which justice approaches are preferred by people. It would be interesting to see if justice orientation would also be a predictor of restorative justice goals. Restorative justice goals are the outcomes of restorative justice approaches. Among restorative justice goals are "restoring the victim, restoring the community, and rehabilitating the offender" (Gromet & Darley, 2009b, p. 4). Gromet and Darley (2009b) found evidence for people being open to restorative justice goals in connection to their wanting to punish an offender for their crime. Therefore, there might be a connection between restorative justice orientation and people's preference for restorative justice goals. Especially a justice orientation more restorative in nature might predict a preference for restorative justice goals. Therefore, a third hypothesis was formulated.

*H3: People with a higher restorative justice orientation have a preference for restorative justice goals.*

### **The Impact of True Crime Entertainment**

How the public understands justice and forms a justice orientation could be linked to the media. Seeing as media is the primary source of acquiring information about the criminal justice system, reverting to it is the first thing people do to stay updated about current crime and criminal procedures (Dowler et al., 2006; Pickett et al., 2015; Wood & Gannon, 2018). This might also be an explanation for why previous research has reported public opinion to be more punitive (Roberts & Hough, 2005). Due to sensationalism in media (Jewkes, 2015; as cited in Grundlingh, 2017), people are mostly acquainted with prison sentences being the response to crime (Roberts & Hough, 2005). The public wants to see offenders receive

punishment (Wenzel & Okimoto, 2016). The true crime genre provides just that. By also making use of sensationalism, cases characterised by violence and conflict are sought out (Jewkes, 2015; as cited in Grundligh, 2017) not only for news reporting but also for podcast episodes or documentaries.

True crime as a genre, whether it be in the form of podcasts or documentaries, has gained tremendous attention since 2014 (Boling & Hull, 2018). Especially the reporting of true crime cases through the medium of podcasts is gaining a large audience. The international American podcast 'My Favorite Murder with Karen Kilgariff and Georgia Hardstark' has gained immense popularity since its launch in 2016 (Shapiro, 2020). With over 35 million downloads a month, stand-up comedians Karen Kilgariff and Georgia Hardstark have become the second highest paid podcasters, according to Forbes Magazine (Mendoza, 2023; Shapiro, 2020). By talking about crime cases each week, they earned around \$15 million in 2019 alone (Shapiro, 2020). Also, documentaries or TV shows have gained high numbers of viewers (Boling & Hull, 2018; ET Spotlight Special, 2022; Nededog, 2016). The Netflix documentary 'Making a Murderer' has hit over 19 million viewers 35 days after its release (Nededog, 2016). Additionally, the 2022 based-on-real-events series 'Monster: The Jeffrey Dahmer Story' has risen to become the fourth-most watched show on Netflix worldwide (ET Spotlight Special, 2022).

Podcast episode guides and series descriptions demonstrate that events portrayed are usually those involving horrific crimes for which offenders had to serve a long time in prison (Netflix, n.d.; *My Favorite Murder: Episodes*, n.d.). Viewers and listeners state that a reason for consuming true crime content is gaining information about the criminal justice system (Boling & Hull, 2018; Chung & Kim, 2015). However, if people's attitudes are based on their media consumption of true crime entertainment, how can accurate accumulation of knowledge be possible with only violent crimes being talked about? Dowler and colleagues

(2006) stress that adding the element of entertainment to crime and justice might distort a realistic portrayal of those concepts. Hence, people's attitude towards restorative justice might be influenced by frequent consumption of true crime content.

People actively seek information about committed offences to form their attitudes (Roberts & Stalans, 2004). Evidence for this could be found by investigating people's true crime consumption in connection to Attribution Theory. Developed by Heider in the 50s, attribution theory states that people form attitudes based on information they accumulate in their environment (Jackson, 2019; Kassin et al., 2020). If the frequency of associating with a stimulus increases, so does the probability of forming an attitude in favour of that stimulus (Kassin et al., 2020). If we apply this to the current research, we could consider the following example.

Person A is a True Crime fan who seeks out podcasts, documentaries and shows to gain information about crime cases. The cases narrated or portrayed are mostly about murder, kidnapping, or rape (*My Favorite Murder: Episodes*, n.d). In each case in the police captured an offender, they had to serve a court-ordered prison sentence. Therefore, Person A attributes the occurrence of crime to the consequence of a prison sentence. This attribution becomes the baseline for Person A's attitude towards how criminal cases are handled. In conclusion, Person A's attitude towards justice might become punitive in nature due to the consumption of true crime content, in which cases commonly conclude with a prison sentence for the offender.

Considering the True Crime Industry's popularity and people's accumulation of knowledge, it could be assumed that an interest in True Crime might be a predictor of people's opinions on restorative justice. This could have meaningful implications on people's attitude towards restorative justice since it is not usually utilised in connection to violent crimes (Abraham, 2010; Gavrielides & Artinopoulou, 2013). The consumption of true crime

content is a form of acquiring new information, and therefore knowledge, about criminal justice strategies. A connection to the research conducted by Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) could be made. Being interested in true crime could also mean that a person has a certain repertoire of knowledge of retributive justice. Van Gelder and colleagues found evidence for increased belief in the effectiveness of suspended sentences if people were knowledgeable about suspended sentences. Therefore, people's attitude could be in line with what is portrayed in those episodes. It could be assumed that this knowledge, which is based on true crime content, might, contrastingly to Van Gelder and colleagues' (2015) research, be counterproductive to people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness and punitiveness. In this case, a negative effect is assumed. True crime knowledge could mask the positive effect factual knowledge of restorative justice could have on people's attitude towards restorative justice. Two hypotheses have been formulated to test that claim.

*H4: People with a higher interest in True Crime Entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.*

*H5: People with a higher interest in True Crime Entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's punitiveness.*

### **Hypotheses and Research Question**

The summarise, the purpose of this study is to identify underlying factors of public attitude towards restorative justice to ultimately answer the research question, "What is the general public's attitude towards restorative justice?".

A number of possible influences have been identified and presented during the literature review. These influences posed the basis for the following five hypotheses.

*H1: People with more knowledge of restorative justice have a higher belief in its effectiveness.*

*H2: People with more knowledge of restorative justice have a higher belief in its punitiveness.*

*H3: People with a higher restorative justice orientation have a preference for restorative justice goals.*

*H4: People with a higher interest in True Crime Entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.*

*H5: People with a higher interest in True Crime Entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's punitiveness.*

## **Method**

### **Design**

The study used a cross-sectional research design, resulting in quantitative data. The aim was to examine the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables. The dependent variables have been identified to be *Belief in the Punitiveness of Restorative Justice*, *Belief in the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice*, and *Preference for Restorative Justice Goals*. The independent variables utilised were *Knowledge of Restorative Justice*, *Restorative Justice Orientation*, and *Interest in True Crime Entertainment*.

### **Participants**

A total of 178 participants were recruited using snowball and convenience sampling. They were collected through word-of-mouth, social media, and study distribution platforms SONA, SurveyCircle, and SurveySwap. SONA is a programme used by the University of Twente's Psychology faculty so students can collect credits for participating in other students' studies and collect participants for their own studies. SurveySwap and SurveyCircle are free platforms for people to upload their studies and collect participants by participating in other research studies.

Not all listed participants completed the study. Those whose progress was below 75% were excluded from further analyses. This left 151 participants. Most identified as female (*N*

= 109), and the age ranged from 18-61 ( $M = 27$ ). An overview of further participant demographics can be observed in Table 2.

**Table 2.**

*Demographics of all Participants*

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	40	26.4%
Female	109	72.1%
Non-Binary/Third Gender	3	1.3%
<b>Nationality</b>		
Dutch	6	3.9%
German	103	68.2%
Other	42	27.8%
<b>Level of Education</b>		
No formal education	1	.06 %
Primary/ Elementary School	1	.06%
Secondary/ Highschool	44	29.14%
Vocational/ Technical School	11	7.2%
Bachelor's Degree	70	46.3%
Master's Degree	22	14.5%
Doctoral Degree	2	1.3%

*Note.* A more detailed overview of participant nationalities can be found in Appendix A.

## **Materials**

The survey was distributed online. Therefore, every participant needed access to an electronic device capable of connecting to the internet. The programme used to create and conduct the study was Qualtrics. It is a platform allowing researchers and students to create various types of questionnaires. The study was uploaded to the previously mentioned study-distribution platforms (SONA, SurveyCircle, SurveySwap).

Additionally, to ensure a certain level of understanding of restorative justice, a short informative text introducing the concept was included (Wisconsin Law School, n.d.). Later in the data collection, a German translation was provided for participants who were not confident in their English abilities but wanted to participate in the study (see Appendix C). One of the study participants indicated having used the translation. RStudio was used to conduct all statistical analyses connected to the study.

## ***Variables***

**Knowledge of Restorative Justice.** One of the independent variables of the study was Knowledge of Restorative Justice. To measure this construct, participants were presented with two scales which were created by the researcher. One measured familiarity with restorative justice, and the other measured factual knowledge of restorative justice. The familiarity scale included statements like, “I am familiar with Restorative Justice.”. Answer possibilities were presented on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from not at all to extremely.

The statements in the knowledge test (e.g., “Victim-Offender Mediation is the same as Restorative Justice.”) were either correct or incorrect. To ensure the answers given during the knowledge test were not solely based on guessing, an additional item measuring certainty was added after each question (“How certain are you of your answer?”).

The means and standard deviations of the knowledge scale and all those used in the survey will be presented in more detail in the result section.

**Punitiveness and Effectiveness.** Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) measured opinion of suspended sentences by differentiating between the Belief in Punitiveness and the Belief in Effectiveness. In the current study, these two dimensions were used as well. The ten items used by Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) were modified to fit the study purpose. Five statements assessed people's opinion on the punitiveness of restorative justice. Participants were presented with statements like, "I think restorative justice hardly has a deterrent effect". The statements could be answered on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from completely disagree to completely agree.

Factor analysis of the belief in restorative justice's punitiveness (items 1-5) showed two underlying constructs with an Eigenvalue higher than one. The factors were identified to be offenders' experience of restorative justice's punitiveness and restorative justice's punitiveness in general. Four items (items 1, 2, 3, and 5) had relatively high factor loadings onto both factors or a very high factor loading onto one factor ( $FL > .5$ ). Since item four led to a low correlation between the two factors and did not load high on either, it was decided to not use it in further analyses. The other four items formed a reliable scale ( $\alpha = .84$ ).

Five items measured participants' belief in the effectiveness of restorative justice. The answer possibilities were the same as for the punitiveness items. People were presented with items such as, "I believe restorative justice provides offenders with a second chance". A factor analysis showed two underlying factors with an Eigenvalue higher than one. These two constructs seem to measure two types of effectiveness, namely effectiveness connected to the prevention of future crime and effectiveness connected to the rehabilitation of offenders. These two constructs were highly correlated ( $r = .8$ ). Item 7 was found to not load highly onto any factor and was, therefore, dismissed. For this reason, items 6, 8, 9, 10 were used in one scale, having a reliability of Cronbach's alpha being  $\alpha = .84$ .



**Restorative and Retributive Justice Orientation.** Restorative and retributive justice orientation was measured using the Justice Orientation Scale (Okimoto et al., 2012). Twelve items were presented to participants, half of which measured the level of retributive orientation (e.g., “The only way to restore justice is to punish the offender.”) and half of which measured the level of restorative justice orientation (e.g., “Justice is restored when an offender has learnt to endorse the values violated by the incident.”). Like for previous scales, participants were able to agree or disagree with the statements on a 7-point Likert scale. These scales are shown to be valid and reliable for measuring retributive ( $\alpha = .88$ ) and restorative justice ( $\alpha = .85$ ) (Okimoto et al., 2012).

**Preference for Restorative Justice Goals.** To the researcher’s knowledge, no scale measuring preference for justice goals existed. Thus, a new scale was created. A preference for justice goals can be understood as a concept which measures whether people prefer retributive goals (e.g., “Offenders should be punished and suffer their sentence in prison.”) or whether people prefer restorative justice goals (e.g., “Offenders should be kept responsible for their crime, but still be allowed to regain their old status as a member of a community.”). Six items were constructed to measure the preference for restorative justice goals (e.g., “I believe offenders should be given a chance to reintegrate into society.”). If participants scored high on this scale, it would indicate a preference for restorative justice goals.

In the factor analysis, two items were identified to be negatively correlated to the entire scale. However, those were already reverse-coded items (Items 2 and 6). To increase the validity of the scale, it was decided to drop these items. After dismissal, two factors showed an Eigenvalue of higher than one, and they were correlated with each other ( $r = .5$ ). It was identified that two distinct concepts are being measured with this scale, namely the victims’ needs and offender reintegration into society. The remaining four items showed to be

a valid scale by either loading very high on one factor or moderately high on both factors ( $FL > .4$ ). Reliability of Cronbach's alpha was identified to be high ( $\alpha = .78$ ).

**Interest in True Crime Entertainment.** An independent variable in this study is people's interest in true crime entertainment. A scale including six items measuring the level of interest was constructed to assess this concept. Participants had to answer items like, "I often actively seek out information about True Crime cases." on a 7-point Likert scale (completely disagree to completely agree). A high score on this scale would indicate that people are actively interested in the true crime genre.

The factor analysis resulted in two factors with an Eigenvalue higher than one. However, two of the six items did not load sufficiently onto either of the factors. Hence, they were dropped from further analyses. The dismissal of the two items led to a high correlation of the factors ( $r = 0.8$ ), which were identified as interest in true crime and consumption of true crime content. The remaining four items (items 1, 2, 4, and 6) loaded highly on the factors and were used for the main analysis. The scale containing four items showed to be reliable with a Cronbach's alpha of  $\alpha = .91$ .

**Restorative Justice Responses (former Penal Attitude Scale).** A section of the Penal Attitude scale by De Keijser (2000; as cited by Van Gelder et al., 2015) has been included in the survey to assess the participants' opinions on restorative justice responses to crime (RJR). The original scale has been modified in the way that items not assessing restorative justice have been omitted. This left the scale with six items (e.g., "I believe the resolution to conflict is a neglected goal within our criminal justice system.") ( $\alpha = .7$ ). Answer possibilities were presented on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from completely disagree to completely agree.

The scale was not relevant to the main analysis as it did not measure any concept mentioned in the hypotheses. All scales encompassed in this study can be found in Appendix B.

### **Procedure**

Ethical approval of the study was granted by the University of Twente's Ethics Committee before the beginning of the data collection. After accessing the survey, participants were given a brief introduction to the study. Included was a short informative text about the study purpose, data collection procedure, and the participants' rights of withdrawal. Participants had to give consent before starting with the survey. Additionally, before answering the scales relevant for analysis, a short questionnaire regarding demographic data (Age, Gender Identity, Level of Education, and Nationality) had to be filled out.

The first scale presented to participants was the four-statement familiarity scale. What followed was the scale assessing people's factual knowledge about restorative justice. Each knowledge question was followed by the abovementioned certainty item. On the next survey page, participants read an informative text about restorative justice before continuing to answer statements. This ensured an adequate level of familiarity with restorative justice to answer statements assessing their agreeableness. After, participants were presented with the RJR scale, also used by Van Gelder and colleagues (2015). Next presented was the scale assessing participants' belief in punitiveness and effectiveness of restorative justice. The following page revealed twelve statements regarding justice orientation, followed by six items measuring preference for justice goals. The last 7-point Likert scale required to be answered was about interest in true crime entertainment. It was followed by two multiple-choice questions about the frequency of consuming true crime content. A text-entry box for additional remarks, feedback, or recommendations was provided to participants.

Participants who partook in the study via SurveyCircle or SurveySwap were granted participation codes on the following page. The study ended with a thank you message as well as the contact information of the researcher and research supervisor.

### **Results**

Before testing the hypothesis, descriptive statistics are shown to examine the data (Table 3). Except for the familiarity and knowledge scale, the means of the remaining scales seem to be relatively in the middle ( $M > 3.93$ ). The low familiarity ( $M = 2.49$ ) and knowledge of restorative justice scale ( $M = .54$ ) means indicate that the majority of participants received a low score signifying a gap in knowledge about restorative justice.

**Table 3.***Descriptive Statistics of the Restorative Justice Survey*

<b>Variable</b>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Familiarity</i>	151	2.5	1.5	—						
				—						
<i>Knowledge of Restorative Justice</i>	151	.54	.15	-.06	—					
<i>RJR (former Penal Attitude)</i>	151	4.7	.87	.03	.18*	—				
<i>Belief in Punitiveness</i>	151	4.1	1.2	-.14	-.15	.04	—			
<i>Belief in Effectiveness</i>	151	4.9	1.1	.17*	.23**	.47***	.25***	—		
<i>Justice Orientation</i>	151	4.3	.77	.01	.07	.35***	.51***	.45***	—	
<i>Preference for restorative Justice Goals</i>	151	5.6	.98	.05	.38***	.45***	-.10	.54***	.24**	—
										—
<i>Interest in True Crime Entertainment</i>	151	3.9	1.62	.13	.06	.14	-.09	.16*	-.05	.18*

Note. \*  $p < .05$ .\*\*  $p < .01$ .\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

### Simple regression analyses

Five separate analyses have been performed to test the hypotheses and later answer the research question. To observe the effect the independent variables have on their respective dependent variables, total effects were computed.

The first hypothesis stated that *people with more knowledge of restorative justice believe more in the effectiveness of restorative justice*. In this case, belief in effectiveness was the dependent variable, and knowledge of restorative justice was the independent variable. The outcomes showed that the model was significant but only explained 5.4% of the variance ( $R^2 = .054$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 8.584$ ,  $p = .003$ ). Furthermore, the relationship was positive, meaning that the knowledge of restorative justice predicts people's belief in its effectiveness ( $b = 1.68$ ,  $t = 2.93$ ,  $SE = .57$ ,  $p = .003$ ). Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

The second hypothesis, *people with more knowledge of restorative justice have a higher belief in its punitiveness*, with knowledge of restorative justice being the independent variable again and belief in restorative justice's punitiveness being the dependent variable, was also inspected. The relationship was found to be insignificant ( $R^2 = 0.021$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 3.215$ ,  $p = .075$ ). This means that knowledge of restorative justice is not predictive of whether people believe restorative justice is punitive. Hence, the hypothesis got rejected.

Regression analysis of the third hypothesis, *people with higher restorative justice orientation have a preference for restorative justice goals* resulted in the hypothesis being accepted. The relationship between justice orientation (independent variable) and preference for justice goals (dependent variable) was significant ( $R^2 = .059$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 9.416$ ,  $p = .002$ ). Participants' justice orientation, therefore, did predict their preference for restorative justice goals ( $b = .310$ ,  $t = 3.069$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p = .002$ ).

The next hypothesis stated that *people with a higher interest in True Crime Entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's effectiveness*. The relationship

between the independent variable (Interest in true crime) and the dependent variable (belief in restorative justice's effectiveness) was significant ( $R^2 = .026$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 4.013$ ,  $p = .047$ ). However, against expectations, a positive relationship existed between the variables ( $b = .108$ ,  $t = 2.003$ ,  $SE = .05$ ,  $p = .003$ ). This means that people with a higher interest in true crime entertainment have a higher belief in restorative justice's effectiveness. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

The last hypothesis stated that *people with a higher interest in true crime entertainment have a lower belief in restorative justice's punitiveness*. The outcomes showed that the model is insignificant ( $R^2 = .008$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 1.281$ ,  $p = .259$ ). Interest in true crime did not predict that people have a lower belief in restorative justice's punitiveness.

### **Additional analyses**

Based on the correlations found in the descriptive statistics table (Table 3), further simple regression analyses have been conducted to test the significant relationships of variables relevant to this study. Maruna and King (2004) state that there might be a discrepancy between people's attitudes towards justice approaches or their preferred justice goals and the effectiveness of those approaches. They give the example that someone who has a positive attitude towards the death penalty will still support it even if there is evidence against its effectiveness (Maruna & King, 2004). It would be interesting to see whether the significant correlations support their findings or whether justice orientation or preference for justice goals are linked positively with belief in effectiveness. Furthermore, the concept of punitiveness seems to be misunderstood, and people who have a rehabilitative orientation might also be supportive of sentences being punitive (Maruna & King, 2004). That might be why justice orientation and belief in punitiveness could also have meaningful implications based on the direction of their relationship.

A significant relationship between restorative justice orientation (independent variable) and belief in restorative justice's punitiveness (dependent variable) have been found ( $R^2 = .263$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 53.3$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The R-squared signifies that 26.3% of the people's belief in restorative justice's punitiveness can be explained by their restorative justice orientation. Hence, the more restorative a person's justice orientation is, the more punitive they believe restorative justice to be ( $b = .796$ ,  $t = 7.3$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Also interesting for this research is the significant relationship found between restorative justice orientation (independent variable) and people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness (dependent variable) ( $R^2 = .198$ ,  $F(1, 149) = 36.9$ ,  $p < .001$ ). 19.8% of the model is explained by restorative justice orientation, and the relationship was found to be positive ( $b = .624$ ,  $t = 6.07$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p < .001$ ). That means that, like for belief in restorative justice's punitiveness, a more restorative justice orientation means a higher belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.

Lastly, a significant relationship between belief in restorative justice's effectiveness and preference for restorative justice goals was observed. Treating preference for restorative justice goals as the independent variable, a strong positive relationship was found ( $b = .589$ ,  $t = 7.74$ ,  $SE = .07$ ,  $p < .001$ ). 28.7% of the model could be explained by people's preference for restorative justice goals. Therefore, people who prefer more restorative justice goals also have a higher belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of what underlies people's attitude towards restorative justice. In a cross-sectional online study, people were assessed on their knowledge of restorative justice, their opinions on justice statements, and their self-perceived interest in true crime entertainment. The findings aimed at filling the lack of research in the domain of restorative justice and public opinion and have found useful



implications for answering the research question, “What is the general public’s attitude towards restorative justice?”.

Findings have shown that, indeed, knowledge of restorative justice is a predictor of people’s belief in its effectiveness. However, this predictive relationship could not be found for belief in restorative justice’s punitiveness. Furthermore, justice orientation was identified to positively predict people’s preference for restorative justice goals, meaning the two concepts are compatible. People’s interest in true crime entertainment proved to have an effect on people’s belief in restorative justice’s effectiveness, but its positive direction was against the previous expectation of a negative relationship. No relationship between interest in true crime and belief in restorative justice’s punitiveness was discovered.

### **The Implications of Knowledge**

The results of the present study show that that people with more knowledge of restorative justice also had a higher belief in the effectiveness of this type of justice. This is in line with Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) who found this effect for knowledge of suspended sentences on the belief in its effectiveness. This can have several implications. First, in line with previous research, which states that people possess a lack of knowledge about restorative justice are the implications made in the descriptive statistics. These portrayed a low participant score on the knowledge test. This provides further evidence for the existence of a gap in public knowledge of restorative justice. Secondly, an influence of knowledge of restorative justice on the belief in restorative justice’s effectiveness was identified. Therefore, enhancing knowledge could lead to a more supportive stance towards restorative justice. This might, in turn, strengthen the trust and confidence people have towards the criminal justice system in general. Furthermore, it might resolve the public wrongfully judging criminal sentencing as being not severe enough (Elffers et al., 2007; Roberts & Hough, 2005; Warner et al., 2017). In a follow-up experiment, it would be

interesting to test, if people who have been extensively educated about various justice approaches and therefore possess a rich knowledge of justice would also garner a positive attitude towards the effectiveness of restorative justice and restorative justice in general.

Contrastingly to the low knowledge scores, people scored rather high on the belief in restorative justice's effectiveness scale. These findings could also be explained by previous research since Gromet and Darley (2009b) found that once people have time to consider alternative justice goals, their punitive expectations of sentencing practices reduce.

Connecting it more directly to this study's finding, the assumption could be made that once participants were presented with restorative justice's effectiveness statement, they might have considered these more closely and agreed to them being more effective. Their attitude towards the effectiveness could have been positively impacted by them considering or pondering their agreeableness to the statements. The findings, in connection to the first hypothesis, show that knowledge enhancement within the community should be prioritised as it might lead to more support of restorative justice.

Contrary to expectations and to the findings of Van Gelder and colleagues (2015), it was not found that people with higher knowledge of restorative justice had a higher belief in restorative justice's punitiveness. The results could imply that since restorative justice is not focused on punishing offenders but rehabilitating them (Roberts & Stalans, 2004), participants disagreed with the punitiveness statements connected to restorative justice. Instead of people with more knowledge viewing restorative justice as punitive, they much rather view it as what it is defined to be, namely, a rehabilitative measure which aims at reconstructing the victim's and the offender's relationship with each other and their respective community (Egash, 1977; as cited in Gade, 2018; Roberts & Stalans, 2004). Egash (1977; as cited in Gade, 2018), who is considered as being the first to introduce restorative justice to the scope of research, stressed the distinction between retributive justice, which is focused on

punishment and restorative justice, which emphasises rehabilitation of the victim's needs and the offender's compensation. This might demonstrate an alignment with the principles and values of restorative justice, which are mediation, "equal concern for all stakeholders [, and] respect for the fundamental human rights" (Braithwaite, 2003, p. 9). Furthermore, the results might also indicate people's favourable support of restorative justice's less punitive and more restorative measures.

### **The Implications of Justice Orientation**

This research also showed that participants who had a higher restorative justice orientation preferred restorative justice goals. This provides evidence for the assumption that people's justice orientation is compatible with their preference regarding justice aims. Okimoto and colleagues' (2012) research on justice orientation and people's preference for justice approaches showed similar results. This research's results further corroborate the predictive value of a person's justice orientation, not only regarding the preferred justice approach but also in regard to the preferred justice outcomes. Okimoto and colleagues (2012) state that people with a restorative justice orientation view justice as being well executed when previously violated values, shared between victim, offender, and community, are re-established. This re-establishment of shared values can also be identified as a goal of restorative justice (Okimoto et al., 2009; Wenzel et al., 2008). If people's expectations of achieved justice and justice goals share the same essence, then it was right to expect a positive relationship between the two concepts.

Additionally, these findings also show that if people are presented with diverse punishment goals, and have time to consider their preference, they might change it to a more non-retributive type of preference (Twardawski et al., 2020). Since this study's participants were not only presented with a short informative text about restorative justice but also had to answer questions and statements regarding their opinion of this type of justice, they were

exposed to information about restorative justice and had time to consider more restorative approaches to crime. This might be an explanation why participant scores of the justice orientation scale and, especially, the preference for justice goals scales indicated higher values. While partaking in the survey, people might have considered and adjusted their justice orientation to be more retributive before answering the preference for justice goals scale. As a result, their preference for re-establishing disrupted, but previously shared community values might have become stronger.

### **The Implications of True Crime Entertainment**

It was also found that, contrary to expectation, people with a higher interest in true crime entertainment had higher belief in the effectiveness of restorative justice. Due to true crime entertainment's focus being on violent crimes in true crime podcasts and shows (*My Favorite Murder: Episodes*, n.d; Netflix, n.d.), the assumption was that people would have a more negative stance towards the effectiveness of restorative justice. Nonetheless, that was not the case. An explanation for these results could be that podcasts and documentaries not only talk about and show the crime that was committed but also narrate the offender's background (*My Favorite Murder: Episodes*, n.d.). Their childhood, psychological state and reaction to their committed crime is discussed, which could victimise the offender (Gray & Schein, 2011). However, automatically when talking about victims, a more sympathetic type of language is used (Gray & Schein, 2011). Consequently, people could feel pity towards the offender and understand that applying rehabilitative measures might be more effective (Gray & Schein, 2011).

The study also did not find a relationship between interest in true crime and belief in restorative justice's punitiveness. It was assumed that people who were highly interested in true crime entertainment had a lower belief in restorative justice's punitiveness.

Based on the findings for people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness and punitiveness, it would be interesting to test whether listening to background information of violent offenders has an effect on people supporting restorative justice in connection to their case. This could be done in a future experiment in which participants have to listen to a true crime podcast or watch an episode of a true crime documentary discussing the offender's background. That way, participants would be primed with true crime content, and it could be assessed if that content leads to restorative justice being perceived as punitive/effective or not. To further increase the reliability of potential future findings, a control group which was not primed with true crime content could also be assessed.

### **The Implications of the Additional Analyses**

The previously discussed findings provide many implications for what may underlie or predict the public's attitude towards restorative justice. However, the predictive variables' only explaining a small amount of variance in the outcomes indicate the presence of possible other variables which might affect the public's attitudes, beliefs, or preferences in the domain of restorative justice. Some of those predictive variables were identified in the additional analyses section. Variables which explained a bigger portion of variance were found and tested.

For instance, a relationship between restorative justice orientation and people's belief in restorative justice's punitiveness was found. This could imply that people who view justice through a more restorative lens might also consider it to be more punitive. Therefore, it might not be knowledge which is predictive of belief in restorative justice's punitiveness but instead justice orientation.

A higher predictability was also found between restorative justice orientation and people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness. A bigger portion of the model was explained by restorative justice orientation than by knowledge of restorative justice. Hence, if

people view justice, like Okimoto and colleagues (2012) say, in light of offender rehabilitation and victim-needs restoration, they will have a more positive view of their effectiveness. Connecting the findings for justice orientation on belief in punitiveness and effectiveness, a connection to Okimoto and colleagues' (2012) research could be made. They state that people's attitudes towards the severity of criminal sentences and their justice orientation are linked. It may be that people with a restorative justice orientation evaluate the severity of restorative sentences to be more severe due to those sentences being in line with their perception of when justice is achieved. Furthermore, the same goes for effectiveness. The effectiveness of restorative justice measures may be evaluated higher by people who have a restorative justice orientation. To confirm these findings and its emerging assumptions, further research should be conducted.

This research also showed that belief in restorative justice's effectiveness was related to the preference for restorative justice goals. This is interesting because Latimer and colleagues (2005) measured the effectiveness of restorative justice based on restorative justice goals. This signifies the connection between the two concepts and why this research has identified a strong positive relationship between the two. Gromet and Darley (2009b) have identified the three justice goals to be "restoring the victim, restoring the community, and rehabilitating the offender" (p.4). If these goals are identified to have been achieved, then restorative justice would be effective.

The correlation has been further investigated due to Maruna & Kings's (2004) research which states that people's preferences and attitudes, as well as people's belief in effectiveness and attitudes, do not have to align. Against those findings, the previously identified correlations and analyses have shown that justice orientation and belief in effectiveness and punitiveness are positively related, just like people's belief in restorative justice's effectiveness and their preferred justice goals.

Still, future research on the effectiveness of restorative justice and restorative justice goals, as well as restorative justice orientation and belief in restorative justice's punitiveness and effectiveness, should be conducted to confirm these findings.

### **Strengths, Limitations and Recommendations**

As can be seen in the previous paragraphs, the study offers insightful information on the public's attitude towards restorative justice. By introducing the idea of true crime entertainment having a possible impact on public perception of approaches to crime and justice in general, a yet not researched domain has been opened. Due to the rising popularity of the genre, further research should be conducted to uncover what exposure to true crime cases does to the public. The ever-growing production and consumption of serial-killer documentaries could lead to many interesting insights, such as the victimisation of offenders. Jennings and colleagues (2012) found an overlap between the experiences of offenders and victims of crime. And Gray and Schein (2011) noted the connection between sympathetic language use and narrating victim stories. Connecting this to true crime entertainment, which in its shows and podcast episodes does not talk about the crime itself but also about the childhood of offenders (My Favorite Murder: Episodes, n.d.), could influence how the audience perceives perpetrators.

Next to opening this new field of interesting research, this study provided further evidence for the importance of public knowledge of justice in connection to the attitudes they have. Furthermore, a connection between justice orientation and justice goals adjoining Okimoto and colleagues' (2012) findings regarding justice orientation and preference for justice goals was observed.

However, in addition to the strengths, a number of limitations could be identified. A participant-related limitation is cultural differences which were not accounted for in this research. The nationalities of the participants presented in this research are very diverse.

Different cultural values may lead to not generalisable or insignificant results in the analyses. Furthermore, participants could have grown up with differing justice systems in line with their countries' laws and political situations. As a result, people of different nationalities might have a different understanding of justice (Liu & Palermo, 2009). Recommended is to do a comparative cross-sectional study in which groups with different cultures are compared. Alternatively, separate studies which draw their sample from a more Western-centred or Eastern-centred population could be conducted. Doing this will allow for a more detailed insight into the attitude of specific groups of people sharing one or more characteristics.

A second limitation connected to this study is that participants were provided with a short informative text about restorative justice in the online survey. It was presented to participants after completion of the knowledge test to avoid differing interpretations of the concept. The text might have steered participants' understanding and attitude of restorative justice in a, for the researcher favourable direction. Van Gelder and colleagues (2015) have identified the same limitation. They stated that providing their sample with information on suspended sentences might have had a priming effect on the answers they gave for the scale statements (Van Gelder et al., 2015). Consequently, this research may not reflect how people in the real world perceive or comprehend restorative justice. There, they would not have access to the same informative text. The results may be more relevant and applicable to those who had comparable already existing knowledge of the concept. Consequently, the findings may not necessarily reflect the general public. Future research should be conducted to observe the impact of providing or withdrawing that information from participants. This could be done in an experiment in which the results of two groups are compared. Subsequently, this would provide evidence for or against the biased influence of the informative text.

The last limitation identified within the scope of this research is the utilisation of not previously tested questionnaires. Two questionnaires assessing people's preference for justice



goals and people's interest in true crime entertainment have been created by the researcher to answer some of the relevant hypotheses. Additionally, Van Gelder and colleagues' (2015) questionnaire assessing punitiveness and belief in effectiveness was adjusted to fit the concept of restorative justice. Factor analyses have been conducted with the collected data from the main analysis sample. It is recommended that in the case of implementing new questionnaires, factor analyses are conducted with data collected through a pilot study. This allows actual research to be more accurate because items that do not measure the target concept have been dismissed or adjusted accordingly (Birch et al., 2001). If the scope and time management of future studies allows it, pilot studies with smaller samples should be executed to formulate valid and reliable scales. If this were implemented, more accurate results might be obtained. The inclusion of statements which do not measure the variable of interest could also lead to a misinterpretation of what participants think they are being assessed on. Having accurate and reliable scales measuring the construct of interest could support the insights gained through this research. It could be expected that knowledge would be a more accurate predictor of belief in the effectiveness and punitiveness of restorative justice, in line with Van Gelder and colleague's (2015) research on suspended sentences.

A recommendation for future research is to test the extensive impact of knowledge on attitude in a longitudinal study. Attitudes have been identified to be flexible instead of fixed, so cross-sectional studies might not accurately measure people's opinions (Flanagan, 1996; as cited in Maruna & King, 2004). Longitudinal studies are said to have an interpretative advantage (Finkel, 1995; as cited in Brown et al., 2007) by testing participants on various occasions. The longitudinal study could focus on enhancing justice knowledge by either engaging participants in courses teaching about justice or by making participants self-study different justice approaches. Additionally, participants could be asked to sit in court processes to gain more accurate knowledge about justice approaches. Pickett and colleagues (2015)

stated that knowledge about justice approaches could only be accurate if the person is directly exposed to criminal justice by either working for the justice system or by being an offender themselves. Next to that, it would be recommended to continuously test people's knowledge as well as assess their attitudes. Over time, results of the knowledge tests and attitude surveys could be analysed to identify the impact knowledge enhancement has on people's first assessed attitudes towards justice. This could provide more evidence for the importance of filling the gap in knowledge and the causal nature of knowledge on attitude formation.

### **Conclusion**

The findings and implications of this study have provided relevant new insights into the understanding of the public's opinion of restorative justice. It can be said that understanding public attitude towards restorative justice is complex. However, predictors of what might shape people having a positive attitude towards restorative justice have been found, like knowledge of restorative justice, as well as restorative justice orientation. It is a step forward into non-traditional justice methods becoming more commonplace in the criminal justice system. With more research in this direction, the public might become more open-minded towards the application of restorative justice. Policymakers could consider enhancing public knowledge of restorative justice using media by distributing balanced information on restorative justice programmes. This could lead to a deeper public understanding of the concept and could therefore lead to a supported criminal justice system which prioritises the needs of victims and the re-socialisation of offenders back into their communities.

## References

- Abraham, M. (2010). Restorative Justice and Violence Against Women. *Contemporary Sociology*, 39(6), 735–736. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094306110386886mm>
- Ahlin, E. M., Gibbs, J. L., Kavanaugh, P. R., & Lee, J. (2017). Support for Restorative Justice in a Sample of U.S. University Students. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(2), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x15596386>
- Birch, L. L., Fisher, J., Grimm-Thomas, K., Markey, C. N., Sawyer, R. G., & Johnson, S. C. (2001). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Child Feeding Questionnaire: a measure of parental attitudes, beliefs and practices about child feeding and obesity proneness. *Appetite*, 36(3), 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.2001.0398>
- Boling, K. S., & Hull, K. (2018). *Undisclosed Information—Serial Is My Favorite Murder: Examining Motivations in the True Crime Podcast Audience*. *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*, 25(1), 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376529.2017.1370714>
- Braithwaite, J. (2003). Principles of restorative justice. In A. Von Hirsch, J. V. Roberts, A. Bottoms, K. Roach, & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative justice and criminal justice: Competing or reconcilable paradigms?* Hart Publishing.
- Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S., & Stace, K. (2006). Intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes: a longitudinal study. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(4), 692–703. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.384>
- Chung, M., & Kim, D. H. (2015). College Students' Motivations for Using Podcasts. *The Journal of Media Literacy Education*. <https://doi.org/10.23860/jmle-7-3-2>
- Dowler, K., Fleming, T. R., & Muzzatti, S. L. (2006). Constructing Crime: Media, Crime, and Popular Culture. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48(6), 837–850. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.48.6.837>

- D'Souza, N., & Shapland, J. (2021). The exclusion of serious and organised offenders and their victims from the offer of restorative justice: Should this be so and what happens when the offer is put on the table? *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 23(1), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958211021703>
- Elffers, H., De Keijser, J., Van Koppen, P., & Van Haeringen, L. (2007). Newspaper juries. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 3(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-007-9029-x>
- ET Spotlight Special. (2022, October 12). “Monster: The Jeffrey Dahmer Story” becomes second most viewed English series on Netflix. *The Economic Times*. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/us/monster-the-jeffrey-dahmer-story-becomes-second-most-viewed-english-series-on-netflix/articleshow/94818193.cms>
- Gade, C. B. N. (2018). “Restorative Justice”: History of the Term’s International and Danish Use. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 27–40). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73019-6\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73019-6_3)
- Gavrielides, T., & Artinopoulou, V. (2013). Restorative Justice and Violence Against Women: Comparing Greece and The United Kingdom. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 8(1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-011-9123-x>
- Gray, K., & Schein, C. (2011). When Your Life is on the Line, Be a Victim, Not a Hero. © *American Society of Trial Consultants 2011*, 26(6), 8–21.
- Gromet, D. M., & Darley, J. M. (2009a). Retributive and restorative justice: Importance of crime severity and shared identity in people’s justice responses. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 61(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530802607662>
- Gromet, D. M., & Darley, J. M. (2009b). Punishment and Beyond: Achieving Justice Through the Satisfaction of Multiple Goals. *Law & Society Review*, 43(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00365.x>

- Grundlingh, L. (2017). Identifying Markers of Sensationalism in Online News Reports on Crime. *Language Matters (Pretoria)*, 48(2), 117–136.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2017.1341543>
- Hermann, D. (2017). Restorative Justice and Retributive Justice: An Opportunity for Cooperation or an Occasion for Conflict in the Search for Justice. *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*, 16(1), 11.  
<https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1889&context=sj>  
sj
- Holbrook, A., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. (2005). Attitude Importance and the Accumulation of Attitude-Relevant Knowledge in Memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 749–769.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.749>
- Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2010). Interpersonal Justice and Deviance. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 339–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310390049>
- Jackson, M. (2019). Utilizing attribution theory to develop new insights into tourism experiences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 176–183.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.04.007>
- Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., & Reingle, J. M. (2012). On the overlap between victimization and offending: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(1), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.09.003>
- Kassin, S., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2020). *Social Psychology*. Cengage Learning.
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A Meta-Analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127–144.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505276969>

- Liu, J., & Palermo, G. B. (2009). Restorative justice and Chinese traditional legal culture in the context of contemporary Chinese criminal justice reform. *Asia Pacific Journal of Police & Criminal Justice*, 7(1), 49–68.
- Marien, S., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Does political trust matter? An empirical investigation into the relation between political trust and support for law compliance. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(2), 267–291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2010.01930.x>
- Markel, D., Flanders, C., & Gray, D. (2011). Beyond Experience: Getting Retributive Justice Right. *California Law Review*, 99(2), 605. <https://doi.org/10.15779/z38q40s>
- Maruna, S., & King, A. (2004). Public opinion and community penalties. In T. Bottoms, S. Rex, & G. Robinsons (Eds.), *Alternatives to prison: Options for an insecure society* (pp. 83–112). Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Mendoza, J. (2023). The Untold Truth Of My Favorite Murder. *Grunge*.  
<https://www.grunge.com/466680/the-untold-truth-of-my-favorite-murder/>
- My Favorite Murder: Episodes*. (n.d.). <https://myfavoritemurder.com/episodes>
- Nascimento, A. M., Andrade, J., & De Castro Rodrigues, A. (2022). The Psychological Impact of Restorative Justice Practices on Victims of Crimes—a Systematic Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(3), 1929–1947.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221082085>
- Nededog, J. (2016, February 13). Here’s how popular Netflix’s “Making a Murderer” really was according to a research company. *Business Insider*.  
<https://www.businessinsider.com/netflix-making-a-murderer-ratings-2016-2?international=true&r=US&IR=T#:~:text=After%20its%20first%20week%2C%20the,media%20surrounding%20the%20series%20increased.>

- Netflix. (n.d.). *Watch DAHMER | Netflix Official Site*. <https://www.netflix.com/nl-en/title/81287562>
- Nocella, A. J. (2011). An Overview of the History and Theory of Transformative Justice. *Peace and Conflict Review*.  
<http://www.review.upeace.org/pdf.cfm?articulo=124&ejemplar=23>
- Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Feather, N. T. (2009). Beyond Retribution: Conceptualizing Restorative Justice and Exploring its Determinants. *Social Justice Research*, 22(1), 156–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-009-0092-5>
- Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Feather, N. T. (2012). Retribution and Restoration as General Orientations towards Justice. *European Journal of Personality*, 26(3), 255–275.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.831>
- Pickett, J. T., Mancini, C., Mears, D. P., & Gertz, M. (2015). Public (Mis)Understanding of Crime Policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 26(5), 500–522.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403414526228>
- Roberts, J. V., & Hough, M. (2005). The State of the Prisons: Exploring Public Knowledge and Opinion. *The Howard Journal*, 44(3), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2005.00373.x>
- Roberts, J. V., & Stalans, L. J. (2004). Restorative Sentencing: Exploring the Views of the Public. *Social Justice Research*, 17(3), 315–334.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sore.0000041296.99271.52>
- Saulnier, A., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2015). Restorative Justice. *New Criminal Law Review*, 18(4), 510–536. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nclr.2015.18.4.510>
- Shapiro, A. (2020, February 3). Crime Does Pay: ‘My Favorite Murder’ Stars Join Joe Rogan As Nation’s Highest-Earning Podcasters. *Forbes*.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielshapiro/2020/02/03/crime-does-pay-my-favorite-murder-stars-join-joe-rogan-as-highest-earning-podcasters/#183a61da1377>

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Barnes, G. D., Woods, D. P., Bennett, S., Inkpen, N., Newbury-Birch, D., Rossner, M., Angel, C. M., Mearns, M., & Slothower, M. (2015a). Twelve experiments in restorative justice: the Jerry Lee program of randomized trials of restorative justice conferences. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *11*(4), 501–540. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9247-6>

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. P., & Ariel, B. (2015b). Are Restorative Justice Conferences Effective in Reducing Repeat Offending? Findings from a Campbell Systematic Review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *31*(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9222-9>

Suzuki, M., & Yuan, X. (2021). How Does Restorative Justice Work? A Qualitative Metasynthesis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *48*(10), 1347–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854821994622>

Twardawski, M., Tang, K. L., & Hilbig, B. E. (2020). Is It All About Retribution? The Flexibility of Punishment Goals. *Social Justice Research*, *33*(2), 195–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-020-00352-x>

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. M., & Vos, B. (2004). Victim-offender mediation: Three decades of practice and research. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *22*(1–2), 279–303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.102>

University of Wisconsin Law School. (n.d.). *About Restorative Justice* | University of Wisconsin Law School. <https://law.wisc.edu/fjr/rjp/justice.html>

Van Gelder, J., Aarten, P., Lamet, W., & Van Der Laan, P. H. (2015). Unknown, Unloved? Public Opinion on and Knowledge of Suspended Sentences in the Netherlands. *Crime & Delinquency*, *61*(5), 669–689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128711426537>



- Van Willigenburg, T. (2018). Restorative justice as empowerment: how to better serve the goals of punitive retribution. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(2), 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.5553/ijrj/258908912018001002006>
- Walgrave, L. (2011). *Investigating the Potentials of Restorative Justice Practice*. Washington University Open Scholarship.  
[http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law\\_journal\\_law\\_policy/vol36/iss1/6](http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_journal_law_policy/vol36/iss1/6)
- Warner, K., Davis, J., Spiranovic, C., Cockburn, H., & Freiberg, A. (2017). Measuring jurors' views on sentencing: Results from the second Australian jury sentencing study. *Punishment & Society*, 19(2), 180–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474516660697>
- Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T. G., Feather, N. T., & Platow, M. J. (2008). Retributive and restorative justice. *Law And Human Behavior*, 32(5), 375–389.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9116-6>
- Wenzel, M., & Okimoto, T. G. (2016). Retributive Justice. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 237–256).  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3216-0\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3216-0_13)
- Wood, J., & Gannon, T. A. (2013). *Public Opinion and Criminal Justice: Context, Practice and Values*. Routledge.
- Zehr, H. (1985). Retributive Justice, Restorative Justice. In *New Perspectives on Crime and Justice: Occasional Papers of the MCC Canada Victim Offender Ministries Program and the MCC U.S. Office of Criminal Justice* (Issue 4).

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### *Participant Nationalities (Detailed Version)*

<b>Nationalities</b>	<i>Total (N)</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Dutch	6	.039
German	103	.682
American	15	.099
Austrian	6	.039
Belarusian	1	.006
British	1	.006
Bulgarian	1	.006
Canadian	2	.013
Hungarian	1	.006
Indian	1	.006
Italian	1	.006
Latvian	1	.006
Luxembourgish	1	.006
Pakistani	1	.006
Polish	2	.013
Russian	1	.006
South Korean	1	.006
Spanish	1	.006
Swiss	1	.006
Turkish	2	.013
Other	2	.013

## Appendix B

*Complete Qualtrics survey.*

Demographic data:

What is your age? (E.g: 21)

---

Which gender do you identify with?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary/Third Gender
- Prefer not to say

What is your highest level of finished education?

- No formal education
  - Primary/Elementary School
  - Secondary/Highschool
  - Vocational/Technical school
  - Bachelor's Degree
  - Master's Degree
  - Doctoral Degree
  - Other (Please Specify below)
- 

What is your nationality?

- Dutch
  - German
  - Other (Please specify below)
- 

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



First of all, I would like to know how familiar you are with restorative justice.

Please answer the following statements by indicating to what extent you agree with them.

**Answer Options (left to right):**

**Not at all | Slightly | Somewhat | Moderately**

**Mostly | Very | Extremely**

1. I am familiar with Restorative Justice.
2. I have experience with Restorative Justice.
3. I believe to know what Restorative Justice is.
4. I can explain what restorative Justice is.

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



Now I am going to test your knowledge of Restorative Justice.

Below you can find seven statements about restorative justice. Please indicate whether those are correct or incorrect and state how certain you are of your answer.

1. Offenders whose cases have been handled with Restorative Justice have a lower risk of re-offending compared to offenders whose cases have been handled with Retributive Justice.

**Answer Options:**

**Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

2. Victim-offender mediation is the same as Restorative Justice.

**Answer Options:**

**Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

3. In Restorative Justice the victim(s) and the community play an active role in the rehabilitation of harm done by the offender.

**Answer Options:**

**Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

4. The aim of Restorative Justice is to punish the offender.

**Answer Options:**

**Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

5. Restorative Justice ensures that the offender can never regain their old status within their community.

**Answer Options:**

**Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

6. In Restorative Justice victims have the opportunity to express the harm impacted on them by the offender and are allowed to ask for specific forms of compensation.

**Answer Options:****Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

7. When a case is handled using Restorative Justice the offenders never get a sentence.

**Answer Options:****Correct | Incorrect**

How certain are you of your answer?

**Answer options (left to right):**

**Very Uncertain | Uncertain | Neutral | Certain | Very Certain**

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



Restorative justice is, for a lot of people, a new form of justice, applied within the criminal justice system. Instead of directly punishing the offender, this process is aimed to restore the damage done and the relationships harmed. Within this form of justice all of those involved in a crime, the victim, the offender, and the community actively participate in restoring the damage done. Most often by means of a dialogue, parties together try to come to an agreement. In that process victims have the opportunity to ask questions. Offenders can actively take responsibility, show regret and apologize. This can help parties process the crime and lower the risk of re-offending.

With this scale your opinion on responses to crime is measured.

Therefore, I would like to ask you to carefully read the following statements and indicate whether you agree with them or not.

**Answer options for the following questions (left to right):**

**Completely Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Completely Agree**

1. I think a criminal process can only be qualified as a success when both offender and victim are satisfied with the outcome.
2. I believe the best form of punishment is one which, given the harm caused by the crime, maximises the possibilities for restitution and compensation.
3. I believe the resolution to conflict is a neglected goal within our criminal justice system.

4. I think criminal prosecution is superfluous in situations where offender and victim have, as a result of mutual consultation arrived at a solution to the conflict.
5. I think in establishing type and severity of punishment, the possibilities for resocialization should play a dominant role.
6. I believe officials in the criminal justice system have the moral duty to help criminals to get back on the right track.

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



I would like you to answer the following items indicating your opinion on the punitiveness of restorative justice as well as your belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.

Please answer the statements by indicating whether you agree with them or not.

**Answer options for the following questions (left to right):**

**Completely Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Completely Agree**

1. I think that Restorative Justice is not an adequate punishment for offenders.
2. I believe that offenders do not really experience restorative justice as a punishment.
3. I think restorative justice hardly has a deterrent effect.
4. I think restorative justice responses to crime would be detrimental to public confidence in the judiciary.
5. I think restorative justice responses to crime are not severe enough to be effective.
6. I believe restorative justice is an effective means of preventing future criminal behaviour of an offender.
7. I think restorative justice provides offenders with a chance to improve their lives.
8. I believe restorative justice offers more possibilities for offenders to stay on the right track than the traditional justice system.
9. I believe restorative justice is effective for changing criminal behaviour of individuals.
10. I believe restorative justice provides offenders with a second chance.

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



With this scale I would like to further assess your justice orientation.

Please answer the following statements by indicating whether you agree with them or not.

**Answer options for the following questions (left to right):**

**Completely Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Completely Agree**

1. As a matter of fairness, an offender should be penalised.
2. The only way to restore justice is to punish an offender.
3. Justice is served when an offender is penalised.
4. Only a punishment restores the justice disrupted by an incident.
5. For the sake of justice, some degree of suffering has to be inflicted on an offender.
6. An offender deserves to be penalised.
7. For justice to be reinstated, the affected parties need to achieve agreement about the values violated by an incident.
8. To restore justice, the offender and I need to reaffirm consensus on our values and rules.

9. Without an offender's sincere acknowledgement of having acted inappropriately, the injustice is not completely restored.
10. A sense of justice requires that the offender has learnt to endorse the values violated by the incident.
11. Justice is restored when an offender has learnt to endorse the values violated by the incident.
12. For a sense of justice, we all, including the offender and I, need to reaffirm our belief in shared values.

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



To assess the public's attitude on restorative justice in general, it is also important to investigate what people think regarding its justice goals.

Therefore, I would like you to truthfully indicate whether you agree with the following items or not.

**Answer options for the following questions (left to right):**

**Completely Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Completely Agree**

1. I think with crimes, meeting the victim's needs should be a priority.
2. I believe offenders should suffer as much as possible for the crime they have committed.
3. I believe offenders should be given a chance to reintegrate into society.
4. I think offenders should recognize and take responsibility for the harm they have caused the victim.
5. I think justice should involve all parties that have been affected by the crime.
6. I believe offenders should be punished to maintain social order.

Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.



Nowadays many people seem interested in True Crime. I want to investigate the impact of consuming True Crime on people's opinion towards Restorative Justice.

Therefore, I would like to ask you to indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.

**Answer options for the following statements (left to right):**

**Completely Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Completely Agree**

1. I consider myself highly interested in the True Crime genre.
2. I enjoy consuming True Crime content such as listening to podcasts or watching documentaries.

3. I find consuming True Crime Entertainment to be unsettling.
4. I often actively seek out information about True Crime cases.
5. I do not engage with True Crime content on social media or other platforms.
6. I like consuming True Crime to stay informed about current and past events and listen to/watch/read about victim's experiences.

If you consume True crime podcasts, how often do you listen to podcasts?

Answer options:

- Never
- Almost Never
- Sometimes (Maybe once per month)
- Occasionally (Once every week)
- Often

Almost Every Day

If you consume True Crime through shows/documentaries, how often do you watch those shows/documentaries?

Answer options:

- Never
- Almost Never
- Sometimes (Maybe once per month)
- Occasionally (Once every week)
- Often
- Almost Every Day

If you have any comments, feedback, or (true crime) recommendations, please write them down below.

---

Click on the bottom right corner to complete the study.



## Appendix C


*Translation provided to non-English speaking participants.*

### Englisch


### Deutsch

<p>Dear participant,</p> <p>Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study connected to my bachelor's thesis on public attitude towards restorative justice. I am conducting research to assess how people feel toward different aspects of the criminal justice system and how that system responds to crime.</p> <p>If you decide to consent and proceed with the study, I would like to ask you to answer each presented statement truthfully.</p> <p>Please note that participation in this study is voluntary and you are under no obligation to take part. Furthermore, if you do decide to proceed with the study all responses will be anonymous and kept confidential between the researcher and the research supervisor. You can withdraw at any moment without giving a reason and will not face any consequences. Collected responses have the sole purpose of enriching the data analysis part of the study and will be deleted after completion of the bachelor's thesis project.</p> <p>This study will take approximately 15 minutes, however you are free to spend as much time as needed filling out the survey.</p> <p>To participate, simply indicate that you consent to participation and click on the arrow on the bottom right corner. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study do not hesitate to contact me or my supervisor.</p> <p>Researcher: Sophie Jaskiewicz s.jaskiewicz@student.utwente.nl</p> <p>Supervisor: Jiska Jonas- Van Dijk j.jonas-vandijk@utwente.nl</p> <p>P.S.: This study contains a completion code for <b>SurveySwap</b> and <b>SurveyCircle</b></p>	<p>Sehr geehrte Teilnehmerin, sehr geehrter Teilnehmer,</p> <p>vielen Dank für Ihre Bereitschaft, an dieser Studie im Zusammenhang mit meiner Bachelorarbeit zur Meinung oder Öffentlichkeit von restaurativer Gerechtigkeit teilzunehmen. Ich führe diese Studie durch, um zu beurteilen, wie Menschen zu verschiedenen Aspekten des Strafsystems und dessen Umgang mit Straftätern stehen.</p> <p>Wenn sie sich entscheiden, zuzustimmen und mit der Studie fortzufahren, bitte ich Sie, jede vorgelegte Aussage wahrheitsgemäß zu beantworten.</p> <p>Bitte beachten Sie, dass die Teilnahme an dieser Studie freiwillig ist und Sie nicht verpflichtet sind daran teilzunehmen. Wenn Sie sich jedoch entscheiden mit der Studie fortzufahren werden alle Antworten anonymisiert und zwischen dem Forscher und Forschungsleiter vertraulich behandelt. Sie können jeder Zeit ohne Grund Ihre Teilnahme zurückziehen ohne, dass Konsequenzen auf Sie zukommen. Die gesammelten Daten dienen ausschließlich der Bereicherung der folgenden Datenanalyse und werden nach Abschluss der Bachelorarbeitsprojekts gelöscht.</p> <p>Die Studie dauert ungefähr 15 Minuten, aber Sie können sich gerne so viel Zeit nehmen, wie Sie benötigen, um die Umfrage auszufüllen.</p> <p>Um teilzunehmen, geben Sie bitte an, dass Sie der Teilnahme zustimmen und klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts. Wenn Sie Fragen oder Bedenken bezüglich der Studie haben, zögern Sie nicht mich oder meine Studienleitung zu kontaktieren.</p> <p>Forscherin: Sophie Jaskiewicz s.jaskiewicz@student.utwente.nl</p> <p>Forschungsleitung: Jiska Jonas- Van Dijk j.jonas-vandijk@utwente.nl</p> <p><b>P.S: Die Personen, die dieses Dokument als Übersetzung verwenden vermerken dies bitte am Ende der Studie. Es wird ein Kommentar-Kasten</b></p>
--	--

	<p>bereitgestellt, in dem Sie das Wort „Übersetzung“ notieren. Vielen Dank.</p>
<p>Please answer to following question: I agree that I read the informend consent. I am aware that my participation in this study is voluntary, that my data will be anonymous, and that I can withdraw at any moment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I consent and wish to proceed.</li> <li>• No, I do not consent</li> </ul>	<p>Bitte beantworten Sie die folgende Frage: Ich stimme zu, dass ich die Einverständniserklärung gelesen habe. Mir ist bewusst, dass meine Teilnahme an dieser Studie freiwillig ist, dass meine Daten anonym bleiben, und dass ich meine Teilnahme jederzeit zurückziehen kann.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ja, ich stimme zu und möchte fortfahren.</li> <li>• Nein, ich stimme nicht zu</li> </ul>


What is your age? (E.g: 21)	Wie alt sind Sie? (z.B.: 21)
<p>Which gender do you identify with?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Male</li> <li>• Female</li> <li>• Non-binary/Third Gender</li> <li>• Prefer not to say</li> </ul>	<p>Mit welchem Geschlecht identifizieren Sie sich?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Männlich</li> <li>• Weiblich</li> <li>• Non-binär/ drittes Geschlecht</li> <li>• Keine Angabe</li> </ul>
<p>What is your highest level of finished education?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No formal education</li> <li>• Primary/Elementary School</li> <li>• Secondary/Highschool</li> <li>• Vocational/Technical school</li> <li>• Bachelor's Degree</li> <li>• Master's Degree</li> <li>• Doctoral Degree</li> <li>• Other (Please Specify below)</li> </ul> <p>_____</p>	<p>Was ist Ihr höchster abgeschlossener Bildungsabschluss?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keine formelle Ausbildung</li> <li>• Grundschule</li> <li>• Sekundarschule/Gymnasium</li> <li>• Berufs-/ Technische Schule</li> <li>• Bachelorabschluss</li> <li>• Masterabschluss</li> <li>• Doktorgrad</li> <li>• Andere (Bitte unten angeben)</li> </ul> <p>_____</p>
<p>What is your nationality?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dutch</li> <li>• German</li> <li>• Other (Please specify below)</li> </ul> <p>_____</p>	<p>Was ist Ihre Nationalität?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Niederländisch</li> <li>• Deutsch</li> <li>• Andere (Bitte unten angeben)</li> </ul> <p>_____</p>
<p>Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.</p> 	<p>Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren</p>

<p>First of all, I would like to know how familiar you are with restorative justice.</p>	<p>Zunächst möchte ich wissen, wie vertraut Sie mit restaurativer Gerechtigkeit sind.</p>
--	---

<p>Please answer the following statements by indicating to what extent you agree with them.</p> <p><b>Answer Options (left to right):</b>  <b>Not at all   Slightly   Somewhat   Moderately Mostly   Very   Extremely</b></p>	<p>Bitte beantworten Sie die Folgenden Aussagen, indem Sie angeben, inwieweit Sie zustimmen.</p> <p><b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen (links nach rechts):</b>  <b>Überhaupt nicht   Leicht   Einigermaßen   Mäßig   Größtenteils   Sehr   Extrem</b></p>
I am familiar with Restorative Justice.	Ich bin vertraut mit restaurativer Gerechtigkeit.
I have experience with Restorative Justice.	Ich habe Erfahrung mit restaurativer Gerechtigkeit.
I believe to know what Restorative Justice is.	Ich glaube zu wissen, was restaurative Gerechtigkeit ist.
I can explain what restorative Justice is.	Ich kann erklären, was restaurative Gerechtigkeit ist.
<p>Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.</p> 	Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren


<p>Now I am going to test your knowledge of Restorative Justice.</p> <p>Below you can find seven statements about restorative justice. Please indicate whether those are correct or incorrect and state how certain you are of your answer.</p>	<p>Jetzt werde ich Ihr Wissen über restaurative Gerechtigkeit testen.</p> <p>Nachfolgend finden Sie sieben Aussagen zu restaurativer Gerechtigkeit. Bitte geben Sie an, ob diese richtig oder falsch sind und geben Sie an, wie sicher Sie sich Ihrer Antwort sind.</p>
<p>Offenders whose cases have been handled with Restorative Justice have a lower risk of re-offending compared to offenders whose cases have been handled with Retributive Justice.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b>  <b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Täter, deren Fälle durch restaurative Gerechtigkeit behandelt wurden, haben im Vergleich zu Tätern, deren Fälle mit vergeltender Gerechtigkeit behandelt wurden, ein geringeres Risiko erneut straffällig zu werden.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b>  <b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b>  <b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b>  <b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>
<p>Victim-offender mediation is the same as Restorative Justice.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b>  <b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Opfer-Täter-Mediation ist dasselbe wie restaurative Gerechtigkeit.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b>  <b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b>  <b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b>  <b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>

<p>In Restorative Justice the victim(s) and the community play an active role in the rehabilitation of harm done by the offender.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b></p> <p><b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Im Rahmen restaurativer Gerechtigkeit spielen das Opfer sowie die Gemeinschaft eine aktive Rolle bei der Wiedergutmachung des Schadens, der durch den Täter verursacht wurde.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b></p> <p><b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>
<p>The aim of Restorative Justice is to punish the offender.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b></p> <p><b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Das Ziel restaurativer Gerechtigkeit ist es den Täter zu bestrafen.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b></p> <p><b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>
<p>Restorative Justice ensures that the offender can never regain their old status within their community.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b></p> <p><b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Restaurative Gerechtigkeit stellt sicher, dass Täter niemals ihren alten Status innerhalb ihrer Gemeinschaft wiedererlangen können.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b></p> <p><b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>
<p>In Restorative Justice victims have the opportunity to express the harm impacted on them by the offender and are allowed to ask for specific forms of compensation.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b></p> <p><b>Correct   Incorrect</b></p>	<p>Im Rahmen der restaurativen Gerechtigkeit haben Opfer die Möglichkeit, den durch die Täter verursachten Schaden auszudrücken und können um bestimmte Formen der Entschädigung bitten.</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b></p> <p><b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b></p>
<p>How certain are you of your answer?</p> <p><b>Answer options (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b></p>	<p>Wie sicher sind Sie sich Ihrer Antwort?</p> <p><b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b></p>
<p>When a case is handled using Restorative Justice the offenders never get a sentence.</p> <p><b>Answer Options:</b></p>	<p>Die Anwendung restaurativer Gerechtigkeit bei (Kriminal-) Fällen führt nie zu einer gerichtlichen Verurteilung des Täters.</p>


<b>Correct   Incorrect</b>	<b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten:</b>
How certain are you of your answer?	<b>Korrekt   Inkorrekt</b>
<b>Answer options (left to right):</b>	<b>Antwort-Möglichkeiten (links nach rechts):</b>
<b>Very Uncertain   Uncertain   Neutral   Certain   Very Certain</b>	<b>Sehr unsicher   Unsicher   Neutral   Sicher   Sehr sicher</b>
Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study. 	Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren

Restorative justice is, for a lot of people, a new form of justice, applied within the criminal justice system. Instead of directly punishing the offender, this process is aimed to restore the damage done and the relationships harmed. Within this form of justice all of those involved in a crime, the victim, the offender, and the community actively participate in restoring the damage done. Most often by means of a dialogue, parties together try to come to an agreement. In that process victims have the opportunity to ask questions. Offenders can actively take responsibility, show regret and apologize. This can help parties process the crime and lower the risk of re-offending.	Restaurative Gerechtigkeit ist für viele Menschen eine neue Form der Justiz, die im Strafrechtssystem angewendet wird. Anstatt den Täter direkt zu bestrafen, zielt dieser Prozess darauf ab den angerichteten Schaden und die beeinträchtigten Beziehungen (zwischen Opfer, Täter und der Gemeinschaft) wiederherzustellen. Innerhalb dieser Form der Gerechtigkeit beteiligen sich alle die von dem Verbrechen betroffen waren (das Opfer, der Täter, und die Gemeinschaft) aktiv an der Restaurierung des angerichteten Schadens. Oftmals versuchen die alle Parteien in Form von Dialogen gemeinsam zu einer Einigung zu gelangen. In diesem Prozess haben die Opfer die Möglichkeit Fragen zu stellen, während die Täter aktiv Verantwortung übernehmen, Reue zeigen, und sich entschuldigen. Dies kann dazu beitragen, dass alle Parteien das Verbrechen verarbeiten können und das Risiko erneuter Straffälligkeiten sinkt.
--	--



With this scale your opinion on responses to crime is measured.	Mit den nächsten Aussagen wird Ihre Meinung zu Reaktionen auf Kriminalität gemessen.
Therefore, I would like to ask you to carefully read the following statements and indicate whether you agree with them or not.	Daher möchte ich Sie bitten, die folgenden Aussagen sorgfältig zu lesen und anzugeben, ob Sie ihnen zustimmen oder nicht.
<b>Answer options for the following questions (left to right):</b>	<b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen sind (links nach rechts):</b>
<b>Completely Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Neutral   Slightly Agree   Agree   Completely Agree</b>	<b>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu   Stimme nicht zu   Stimme eher nicht zu   Neutral   Stimme eher zu   Stimme zu   Stimme voll und ganz zu</b>
I think a criminal process can only be qualified as a success when both offender and victim are satisfied with the outcome.	Ich denke, dass ein Strafprozess nur dann als Erfolg bezeichnet werden kann, wenn sowohl der Täter als auch das Opfer mit dem Ergebnis zufrieden sind.
I believe the best form of punishment is one which, given the harm caused by the crime,	Meiner Überzeugung nach ist die beste Strafe diejenige, die ausgehend vom Schaden, der durch das Verbrechen verursacht wurde, die Möglichkeit

maximises the possibilities for restitution and compensation.	für Wiedergutmachung und Entschädigung maximiert.
I believe the resolution to conflict is a neglected goal within our criminal justice system.	Meiner Meinung nach wird das Ziel der Konfliktlösung in unserem Strafrechtssystem vernachlässigt.
I think criminal prosecution is superfluous in situations where offender and victim have, as a result of mutual consultation arrived at a solution to the conflict.	Ich denke, dass eine strafrechtliche Verfolgung in Situationen, in denen Täter und Opfer durch gegenseitige Beratung eine Lösung für den Konflikt gefunden haben, überflüssig ist.
I think in establishing type and severity of punishment, the possibilities for resocialization should play a dominant role.	Meiner Meinung nach sollten bei der Festlegung der Art und Schwere der Strafe die Möglichkeiten zur Resozialisierung eine dominante Rolle spielen.
I believe officials in the criminal justice system have the moral duty to help criminals to get back on the right track.	Ich glaube, dass Beamte im Strafrechtssystem die moralische Pflicht haben, Kriminellen zu helfen, wieder auf den richtigen Weg zu kommen.
Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study. 	Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren

<p>I would like you to answer the following items indicating your opinion on the punitiveness of restorative justice as well as your belief in restorative justice's effectiveness.</p> <p>Please answer the statements by indicating whether you agree with them or not.</p> <p><b>Answer options for the following questions (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Completely Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Neutral   Slightly Agree   Agree   Completely Agree</b></p>	<p>Ich möchte Sie bitten, die folgenden Aussagen zu beantworten, um Ihre Meinung zum Bestrafungsgrad restaurativer Gerechtigkeit sowie Ihre Meinung der Wirksamkeit von restaurativer Gerechtigkeit zum Ausdruck zu bringen.</p> <p>Bitte beantworten Sie die Aussagen, indem Sie angeben, ob Sie ihnen zustimmen oder nicht.</p> <p><b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen sind (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu   Stimme nicht zu   Stimme eher nicht zu   Neutral   Stimme eher zu   Stimme zu   Stimme voll und ganz zu</b></p>
I think that Restorative Justice is not an adequate punishment for offenders.	Ich denke, dass restaurative Gerechtigkeit keine angemessene Bestrafung für Straftäter ist.
I believe that offenders do not really experience restorative justice as a punishment.	Meiner Ansicht nach empfinden Straftäter restaurative Gerechtigkeit nicht wirklich als Strafe.
I think restorative justice hardly has a deterrent effect.	Ich denke restaurative Gerechtigkeit hat kaum eine abschreckende Wirkung.
I think restorative justice responses to crime would be detrimental to public confidence in the judiciary.	Meiner Ansicht nach könnten restaurative Gerechtigkeits- Maßnahmen bei Straftaten das öffentliche Vertrauen in die Justiz beeinträchtigen.
I think restorative justice responses to crime are not severe enough to be effective.	Meiner Meinung nach sind restaurative Gerechtigkeits- Maßnahmen/Methoden nicht streng genug, um effektiv zu sein.
I believe restorative justice is an effective means of preventing future criminal behaviour of an offender.	Ich glaube, dass restaurative Gerechtigkeit effektiv ist, um zukünftiges kriminelles Verhalten von Tätern zu verhindern.
I think restorative justice provides offenders with a chance to improve their lives.	Ich denke, dass restaurative Gerechtigkeit Täter die Möglichkeit bietet, ihr Leben zu verbessern.
I believe restorative justice offers more possibilities for offenders to stay on the right track than the traditional justice system.	Ich glaube, dass restaurative Gerechtigkeit für Täter mehr Möglichkeiten bietet, auf dem richtigen Weg zu bleiben, als das traditionelle Justizsystem.

I believe restorative justice is effective for changing criminal behaviour of individuals.	Meiner Überzeugung nach ist restaurative Gerechtigkeit effektiv, um das kriminelle Verhalten einzelner zu ändern.
I believe restorative justice provides offenders with a second chance.	Meiner Ansicht nach bietet restaurative Gerechtigkeit Straftätern eine zweite Chance.
Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study. 	Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren.

<p>With this scale I would like to further assess your justice orientation. Please answer the following statements by indicating whether you agree with them or not.</p> <p><b>Answer options for the following questions (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Completely Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Neutral   Slightly Agree   Agree   Completely Agree</b></p>	<p>Mit den folgenden Aussagen möchte ich Ihre Gerechtigkeitsorientierung weiter einschätzen. Bitte beantworten Sie die folgenden Aussagen, indem Sie angeben, ob Sie ihnen zustimmen oder nicht.</p> <p><b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen sind (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu   Stimme nicht zu   Stimme eher nicht zu   Neutral   Stimme eher zu   Stimme zu   Stimme voll und ganz zu</b></p>
As a matter of fairness, an offender should be penalised.	Aus Gründen der Fairness sollten ein Straftäter bestraft werden.
The only way to restore justice is to punish an offender.	Die einzige Möglichkeit, Gerechtigkeit wiederherzustellen, besteht darin, einen Täter zu bestrafen.
Justice is served when an offender is penalised.	Gerechtigkeit wurde vollzogen, wenn ein Straftäter bestraft wurde.
Only a punishment restores the justice disrupted by an incident.	Nur eine Bestrafung stellt die durch einen Vorfall gestörte Gerechtigkeit wieder her.
For the sake of justice, some degree of suffering has to be inflicted on an offender.	Um der Gerechtigkeit willen, muss einem Täter ein gewisses Maß an Leid zugefügt werden.
An offender deserves to be penalised.	Ein Straftäter verdient es bestraft zu werden.
For justice to be reinstated, the affected parties need to achieve agreement about the values violated by an incident.	Damit Gerechtigkeit wiederhergestellt werden kann, müssen sich die betroffenen Parteien darüber einigen welche Werte durch den Vorfall verletzt wurden.
To restore justice, the offender and I need to reaffirm consensus on our values and rules.	Zur Wiederherstellung der Gerechtigkeit müssen der Täter und ich eine Übereinstimmung in Bezug auf unsere Werte und Regeln erneut herstellen.
Without an offender's sincere acknowledgement of having acted inappropriately, the injustice is not completely restored.	Ohne ein aufrichtiges Eingeständnis des Fehlverhaltens seitens des Täters kann Gerechtigkeit nicht vollständig wiederhergestellt werden.
A sense of justice requires that the offender has learnt to endorse the values violated by the incident.	Ein Gerechtigkeitsempfinden erfordert, dass der Täter gelernt hat, die durch den Vorfall verletzten Werte zu respektieren.
Justice is restored when an offender has learnt to endorse the values violated by the incident.	Gerechtigkeit ist wiederhergestellt, wenn der Täter gelernt hat, die im Vorfall verletzten Werte zu respektieren.
For a sense of justice, we all, including the offender and I, need to reaffirm our belief in shared values.	Für ein Gerechtigkeitsempfinden ist es erforderlich, dass wir alle, einschließlich des Täters und mir, unsere Überzeugung von gemeinsamen Werten erneut bekräftigen.

<p>Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.</p> 	<p>Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren.</p>
<p>To assess the public's attitude on restorative justice in general, it is also important to investigate what people think regarding its justice goals.</p> <p>Therefore, I would like you to truthfully indicate whether you agree with the following items or not.</p> <p><b>Answer options for the following questions (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Completely Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Neutral   Slightly Agree   Agree   Completely Agree</b></p>	<p>Um die Einstellung der Öffentlichkeit zu Restaurativer Gerechtigkeit im Allgemeinen zu beurteilen, ist es auch wichtig zu untersuchen, was die Öffentlichkeit über Gerechtigkeits-Ziele denkt.</p> <p>Daher möchte ich Sie bitten, wahrheitsgemäß anzugeben, ob Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen oder nicht.</p> <p><b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen sind (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu   Stimme nicht zu   Stimme eher nicht zu   Neutral   Stimme eher zu   Stimme zu   Stimme voll und ganz zu</b></p>
<p>I think with crimes, meeting the victim's needs should be a priority.</p>	<p>Ich denke, bei Verbrechen sollte man den Bedürfnissen der Opfer entgegenkommen.</p>
<p>I believe offenders should suffer as much as possible for the crime they have committed.</p>	<p>Ich glaube, dass Täter so viel wie möglich für das Verbrechen, das sie begangen haben, leiden sollten.</p>
<p>I believe offenders should be given a chance to reintegrate into society.</p>	<p>Ich bin der Meinung, dass Straftäter eine Chance erhalten sollten, sich wieder in die Gesellschaft zu integrieren.</p>
<p>I think offenders should recognize and take responsibility for the harm they have caused the victim.</p>	<p>Ich denke, Täter sollten den Schaden, den sie dem Opfer zugefügt haben erkennen und Verantwortung dafür übernehmen.</p>
<p>I think justice should involve all parties that have been affected by the crime.</p>	<p>Ich denke, die Justiz sollte alle Parteien einbeziehen, die von dem Verbrechen betroffen sind.</p>
<p>I believe offenders should be punished to maintain social order.</p>	<p>Ich glaube, dass Straftäter bestraft werden sollten, um die soziale Ordnung aufrechtzuerhalten.</p>
<p>Click on the arrow in the bottom right corner to continue with the study.</p> 	<p>Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um mit der Studie fortzufahren.</p>

<p>Nowadays many people seem interested in True Crime. I want to investigate the impact of consuming True Crime on people's opinion towards Restorative Justice.</p> <p>Therefore, I would like to ask you to indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.</p> <p><b>Answer options for the following statements (left to right):</b></p> <p><b>Completely Disagree   Disagree   Slightly Disagree   Neutral   Slightly Agree   Agree   Completely Agree</b></p>	<p>Heutzutage scheinen sich viele Leute für True Crime (wahre Verbrechen) zu interessieren. Ich möchte die Auswirkungen des Konsums von True Crime (wahre Verbrechen) auf die Meinung der Öffentlichkeit zu Restaurativer Gerechtigkeit untersuchen.</p> <p>Aus diesem Grund möchte Ich Sie bitten anzugeben, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen.</p> <p><b>Antwort Möglichkeiten für die folgenden Aussagen sind (links nach rechts):</b></p> <p><b>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu   Stimme nicht zu   Stimme eher nicht zu   Neutral   Stimme eher zu   Stimme zu   Stimme voll und ganz zu</b></p>
--	--



I consider myself highly interested in the True Crime genre.	Ich finde ich bin sehr interessiert am True Crime (Wahre Verbrechen) Genre.
I enjoy consuming True Crime content such as listening to podcasts or watching documentaries.	Ich konsumiere True Crime (Wahre Verbrechen) -Inhalte, so wie beispielsweise das Hören von Podcasts oder das Ansehen von Dokumentationen.
I find consuming True Crime Entertainment to be unsettling.	Ich finde es beunruhigend True Crime (wahre Verbrechen) -Inhalte zu konsumieren.
I often actively seek out information about True Crime cases.	Ich suche oft aktiv nach Informationen zu wahren Verbrechen.
I do not engage with True Crime content on social media or other platforms.	Ich beschäftige mich nicht mit True Crime (Wahre Verbrechen) -Inhalten in sozialen Medien oder anderen Plattformen.
I like consuming True Crime to stay informed about current and past events and listen to/watch/read about victim's experiences.	Ich konsumiere gerne True Crime (Wahre Verbrechen) -Inhalte, um über aktuelle und vergangene Ereignisse auf dem Laufenden zu bleiben und mir die Erfahrungen der Opfer anzuhören/anzuschauen/zu lesen.

<p>If you consume True crime podcasts, how often do you listen to podcasts?</p> <p>Answer options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Never</li> <li>• Almost Never</li> <li>• Sometimes (Maybe once per month)</li> <li>• Occasionally (Once every week)</li> <li>• Often</li> <li>• Almost Every Day</li> </ul>	<p>Falls Sie Podcasts über wahre Verbrechen hören, wie oft hören Sie diese?</p> <p>Antwort Möglichkeiten:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nie</li> <li>• Fast Nie</li> <li>• Manchmal (Vielleicht einmal im Monat)</li> <li>• Gelegentlich (einmal die Woche)</li> <li>• Oft</li> <li>• Fast Jeden Tag</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>If you consume True Crime through shows/documentaries, how often do you watch those shows/documentaries?</p> <p>Answer options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Never</li> <li>• Almost Never</li> <li>• Sometimes (Maybe once per month)</li> <li>• Occasionally (Once every week)</li> <li>• Often</li> <li>• Almost Every Day</li> </ul>	<p>Wenn Sie Inhalte über wahre Verbrechen durch Serien/Dokumentarfilme konsumieren, wie oft konsumieren Sie diese?</p> <p>Antwort Möglichkeiten:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nie</li> <li>• Fast Nie</li> <li>• Manchmal (Vielleicht ein mal im Monat)</li> <li>• Gelegentlich (ein mal die Woche)</li> <li>• Oft</li> <li>• Fast Jeden Tag</li> </ul>
---	---

<p>If you have any comments, feedback, or (true crime) recommendations, please write them down below.</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Sollten Sie Kommentare, Feedback oder (True Crime) Empfehlungen für mich haben notieren Sie diese bitte im unteren Textfeld.</p> <p><b>WENN SIE DIESE ÜBERSETZUNG BENUTZT HABEN BITTE SCHREIBEN SIE „ÜBERSETZUNG“ IN DAS TEXTFELD.</b></p>
--	---

<p>Click on the bottom right corner to complete the study.</p>	<p>Klicken Sie auf den Pfeil unten rechts, um die Studie zu beenden.</p>
--	--

**Die Nächste Seite bitte ignorieren, da sie nur SurveyCircle Teilnehmer betrifft. Bitte klicken Sie noch einmal auf den Pfeil unter rechts, um die Studie zu beenden. Vielen Dank!**