

Supporting Engagement in Restorative Justice: Towards an Understanding of “Ambivalent Proportionate Interest” (API) and the “Window of Tolerance” Through a Classification of Participants’ Motivations and Satisfactions ¹

Erwan Dieu
ARCA - Service of Criminology

Astrid Hirschelmann
University of Rennes 2

Catherine Blatier
University of Grenoble

Restorative Justice (RJ) is a comprehensive model for addressing the expressive needs of offenders and victims. One of the sine qua non conditions is the collection of the participants’ consent. However, with the possibility of participating in a Restorative Justice program, offenders and victims are subject to an “Ambivalent Proportionate Interest” (API). This is a tension between the cognitive interest related to the perceived seriousness of the crime and the various emotional stakes (reliving, repercussions, proposed encounter). “API” means that Restorative Justice coaches must consider a “window of tolerance” in individuals during the proposal and preparation of the program. To best help participants and coaches, we question voluntariness here, not from a philosophical or legal point of view, but from a psychological perspective: we interviewed participants in a Restorative Justice program in the form of non-structured interviews and then categorized and quantified their expectations by thematic dimensions. We believe that knowledge of the structuring of participants’ expectations and satisfactions could help the facilitator in the initial collection of subjects’ needs.

Keywords: commitment, window of tolerance, ambivalent proportionate interest (API), motivation, restorative justice, satisfaction

A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EXPECTATIONS SOUGHT IN RESTORATIVE JUSTICE: CONTEXT, OBJECTIVE, METHOD

Context of Restorative Justice: Understanding the “Ambivalent Proportionate Interest” (API) and the “Window of Tolerance”?

Restorative Justice is officially integrated into French judicial measures since the Law n°2014-896 dating from 15 / 08 / 2014. Its remedies are specified in the Code of Criminal Procedure (Articles 10-1, 10-2 and 707), allowing it to take place at all stages of the criminal procedure. More recently, the expected circular SG-17-007/13.03.2017 makes explicit the implementation of Restorative Justice measures,

immediately applicable. In the image of the penal philosophy initiated by Zehr (1990), Restorative Justice in France is a meeting process open to people concerned by an offence and wishing to exchange. Several meeting formats are possible (e.g. mediation, conference, circle -cf. Lefebvre, et al. 2018; Dieu, 2018b), all requiring preparation with an independent third party (the facilitator or mediator). Like the studies identified in Latimer et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis, analyses of Restorative Justice programs regularly focus their interest on variables such as achievement of process goals, perpetrator-victim satisfaction, recidivism or risk of recidivism (or sometimes dynamic criminogenic needs), compliance with the agreement, compliance with Restorative Justice principles and goals, and more rarely, mental and somatic health assessment. A special bond is created between the perpetrators and the victims. For each of them, a place is assigned to the other in their personal history. Unlike psychological disorders or everyday conflicts, the offence is the witness of the rupture of a principle of trust between human beings and of the feeling of Justice necessary to social life (Walgrave, et al., 2020). Thus, the Restorative Justice hypothesis is based on the need for perpetrators and victims (and the community) to express the impact of the offence and the social reaction - among other needs- (Zehr, 2002; Ward & Langlands, 2009). Since they may feel the need to do so, and since the perpetrator and the victim have an endogenous legitimacy for restorative sharing, Restorative Justice opens up a space for communication with the help of programs (in France, these are framed by judicial measures -cf. Circulaire ministériel 2017). However, only a minority of perpetrators and victims engage in the proposed programs, which makes it difficult to set up as well as to sustain the programs in question.

In previous work on studying the difficulties of engaging perpetrators and victims in Restorative Justice (Dieu, 2018a), we named “Ambivalent Proportionate Interest” (API) the paradoxical process that drives individuals during an initial exchange(s) for participation in Restorative Justice. API” defines the tension of the subject (perpetrator or victim) when his or her need is dependent on both (i) the cognitive interest in participating in the program and (ii) the emotions at stake in the program. The cognitive interest (i) is linked to the perceived seriousness of the offence, while the emotions (ii) are linked to the stakes of the (future) encounter directly subjected to the reliving of the (past) facts and its (present) repercussions. “IPA” is then the (cognitive) “Interest” of the person “Proportionate” to the (perceived) seriousness of the offence, but “Ambivalent” to the (emotional) stakes of what is conditioned to it. The “IPA” is a first explanation for the difficulties of engagement of the perpetrators and victims. If the perpetrators and victims feel that the emotional stakes are low, it will be easier to adhere to a restorative process, but if they feel that there is little seriousness, there will be less cognitive interest, and therefore the possibility of refusing to participate. Conversely, if the cognitive interest is high, the emotional stakes are likely to be high, and the possibility of refusal remains. Through the “IPA”, we see that engagement in the Restorative Justice process depends on a “window of tolerance” that must be handled with care. The IPA is also seen through the influence of the social circle on the window of tolerance in question as a brake or lever on it.

Voluntariness, an essential condition for starting the restorative process, raises questions for us here. How can IPA be better grasped to enable Restorative Justice practitioners to maintain the window of tolerance for perpetrators and victims? If the participants commit themselves on the basis of dialogue, acknowledgement of the facts and possible reparation of the other, we analyze the process from the point of view of the specific expectations raised during the interviews (motivations or expected satisfactions) and in fact the satisfactions obtained at the end of the process. Indeed, behind the IPA, what do the subjects concretely expect from a restorative measure? We hypothesize here that there is an identifiable taxonomy of expectations and satisfactions about a restorative measure. To this end, we are conducting non-directive interviews to collect the subjective experiences of the referred perpetrators and victims who have agreed to participate in a restorative justice measure (n=88 subjects). The speeches will be analyzed qualitatively and grouped by theme. The themes will then be quantified and analyzed in the form of a multifactorial taxonomy. The analyses will be conducted in a temporal manner (before and after the program, motivations and satisfactions).

Clarification of the Qualitative Discursive and Quantitative Methodology of the Motivations and Satisfactions Related to the Restorative Process Experienced by Offenders and Victims of Crime

It is an analysis of the subjects' discourse at the entrance and exit of the process. At the beginning of restorative programs, the analysis of the motivation and expectations of the subjects is often carried out, while at the end of the program, the resolution of their expectations and motivations, i.e., their satisfaction with the program, is logically presented. Like various data collection procedures following a Restorative Justice program (McCold, & Wachtel, 2003), the methodology for collecting and analyzing the subjects' satisfaction is oriented towards semi-structured interviews concerning expectations of oneself, of the other, of the process in a temporal sense (e.g. expectations before, during and after the process). With regard to the collection and analysis of data at the beginning of the process, we have to answer research questions that are not explicitly stated in the recommendations of the UN Manual on Restorative Justice (2008: 67): are we assessing the expectations of an undifferentiated subject or according to an established judicial status (perpetrator/victim)? are we assessing expectations with regard to the process itself or are we assessing specific motivations involved in a particular alliance relationship?

After a review of the scientific literature concerning alliance analyses specific to subjects in therapy (Bordin, 1979, 1994; Martin, et al., 2000; Despars, et al., 2001; Horvath & Symond, 1991; Horvath, et al., 2011), to offenders (Serin & Kennedy, 1997; Ward, et al, 2004; Taxman & Love, 2010), the Motivation Scale (Boisvert, 2006) allows for the development of undifferentiated possible expectations of the perpetrator/victim, expectations that are graded in intensity and classified, against a program that carries with it desired returns (at least with the facilitator). Although we do not conduct an interview with a closed questionnaire concerning the motivation of the subjects (it is primarily an open exchange on the guidance of an institutional partner), we thus become familiar with motivational reasoning in a setting that necessarily creates (potentially therapeutic) effects, i.e., produces, among other things, a release of the emotions following an offence committed and suffered. "*Honestly, I really don't understand what I can get out of it...*" (i2), "*Because I would feel guilty if I didn't do anything about my problems.*" (i6), "*Because I would like to make changes to my current situation.*" (i7), "*Because I believe it will eventually make me feel better.*" (i8), "*Because I would feel bad about myself for not pursuing...*" (i11), "*Because I should have a better understanding of myself.*" (i12), "*Because [it] [...] will help me cope better with events.*" (i17), "*Because through [...] I feel that I can now take responsibility for making changes in my life.*" (i20)... The subjects' questioning about their expectations and motivations, and even about the resolution of expectations about their suffering and ruminations, are conducive to therapeutic work that is initiated here without having the appropriate framework, as Restorative Justice is not a psychotherapy in itself. Without betraying the subjects' words, the qualitative analysis attempts to group the subjects' *verbatim*s into major discourses in order to quantify their occurrences. This analysis leads us to propose a taxonomy of expectations in connection with the work on motivation previously cited, the direction of these expectations in terms of spatiality and temporality.

DISCURSIVE OUTCOMES AT ENTRY TO THE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROCESS

Restorative Motivation at the Beginning of the Process?

At the entrance to the program, the *verbatim*s of both perpetrator and victim subjects are particularly similar. We have grouped the major speeches and presented them according to their order of occurrence, undifferentiated perpetrator and victim on the left-hand column, and then prioritized them again in a differentiated manner between perpetrators and victims. These major discourses highlight similar expectations between perpetrators and victims, although certain priorities can be qualified, such as a desire for *empowerment* on the part of perpetrators - a desire often attributed to victims - and a need for intellectualization of the offence and its motivations on the part of victims. All of them share different kinds of expectations, such as the release of emotions and consequences, the understanding of the problem-situation, and interrelational contact.

TABLE 1
SUBJECTS' EXPECTATIONS AT PROGRAM ENTRY

	Expectations of offenders and victims (n88)	<i>Expectations of offenders (n57)</i>	<i>Expectations of victims of crime (n31)</i>
1	To understand the event and its causes... (84% ²)	<i>To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (86%)</i>	<i>To understand the event and its causes... (97%)</i>
2	To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (82%)	<i>To understand the event and its causes... (77%)</i>	<i>To express the consequences on me (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (87%)</i>
3	To express the consequences on me (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (76%)	<i>To express the consequences on me (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (72%)</i>	<i>To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (74%)</i>
4	To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (69%)	<i>To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (68%)</i>	<i>To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (71%)</i>
5	To have peace, and put an end to inner suffering... (58%)	<i>To have peace, and put an end to inner suffering... (56%)</i>	<i>To have peace, and put an end to inner suffering... (61%)</i>
6	To be back in front of a person who has done / suffered... (53%)	<i>To be back in front of a person who has done / suffered... (53%)</i>	<i>To be back in front of a person who has done / suffered... (55%)</i>
7	To facilitate my social integration / social relations... (18%)	<i>Because other people think it's a good idea for me... (18%)</i>	<i>To facilitate my social integration / social relations... (19%)</i>
8	Because other people think it's a good idea for me... (12%)	<i>To facilitate my social integration / social relations... (12%)</i>	<i>Nothing in particular... (13%)</i>
9	Nothing special... (9%)	<i>Nothing special... (9%)</i>	<i>Because other people think it's a good idea for me... (10%)</i>

However, the expectations seem to have different dimensions. Indeed, not all expectations are aimed at the same satisfaction mechanisms or the same people who would derive satisfaction from them. Expectations do not always concern the same temporal direction either; some refer to objectively past elements while others look to the future. Finally, the process of motivational self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002) that underlies these expectations does not seem to be uniform, particularly between internal and external expectations.

With regard to *the spatiality of expectations*, reserving self-centeredness (Nothing in particular...: 9%), we differentiate four types of expectation that emerge from needs turned towards the self to those turned partly towards others: cognitive, emotional, psychosocial and social needs:

- *Cognitive Needs*: To understand the event and its causes... (84%); To be back in front of someone who has done / suffered... (53%);
- *Emotional needs*: To express the consequences on me (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (76%); To have peace, and to put an end to the inner suffering... (58%);
- *Psychosocial needs*: To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (82%); To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (69%);
- *Social needs (connection to others)*: To facilitate my social integration/social relationships... (18%); Because other people think it is a good idea for me... (12%).

As far as *temporality is concerned*, once again putting aside the absence of expectations (Nothing in particular...: 9%), we differentiate three types of expectations that emerge from needs turned towards the past, the present and the future (we specify here that the classification is made from the exchanges and the expectations of the subjects that allowed the categorization of the great discourses):

- *Related to the past*: To understand the event and its causes... (84%); To be back in front of a person who has done / suffered... (53%);

- *Related to the present*: To express the consequences on me (e.g., shame, guilt) in the long run (76%); To have peace, and end inner suffering... (58%); To facilitate my social insertion/social relationships... (18%); Because other people think it is a good idea for me... (12%);
- *Linked to the future*: To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (82%); To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (69%).

With regard to *the motivational process of expectations*, reserving amotivation (Nothing in particular...: 9%), we differentiate two types of expectations that emerge from extrinsic motivation, resulting from an external movement towards the internal, and from more intrinsic motivation:

- *Extrinsic motivation*: Because other people think it's a good idea for me... (12%); To facilitate my social integration/social relationships... (18%);
- *Intrinsic motivation*: To understand the event and its causes... (84%); To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (82%); To express the consequences on myself (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (76%); To regain self-confidence and esteem... (69%); To have peace, and put an end to inner suffering... (58%); To be back in front of a person who has done/suffered... (53%).

Taxonomy and Opening Towards a Restorative Motivation Scale (RMS) at the Entrance of the Restorative Justice Process?

By crossing the major discourses of expectations according to the vectors of “spatiality”, “temporality” and “motivational process”, we obtain a taxonomy of the expectations of the subjects at the entrance of the Restorative Justice program. This taxonomy raises the different possible motivations of the subjects according to cognitive, emotional or psychosocial needs, turned more towards the past, the present or the future, and according to intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. This taxonomy would make it possible to test a Restorative Motivation Scale (RMS). To arrive at a RMS - which is not the objective here - a scale of restorative motivation, it would be necessary to proceed to a distribution of the speeches put in the form of explicit sentences with a Likert scale going from 1 to 5, then a weighted analysis with regard to the average answers of the subjects of the preceding programs as here³.

TABLE 2
TAXONOMY OF SUBJECTS' EXPECTATIONS AT PROGRAM ENTRY (RESTORATIVE MOTIVATION SCALE “RMS” PRIMER)

Typical Verbatim	Nothing special... (9%)	To facilitate my social integration / social relations... (18%) Because other people think it's a good idea for me... (12%)	To understand the event and its causes... (84%) To be back in front of a person who has done / suffered... (53%)	To express the consequences on me (e.g. shame, guilt) in the long term (76%) To have peace, and put an end to inner suffering... (58%)	To regain control of my life, to feel respected by others (82%) To regain self-confidence and self-esteem... (69%)
Spatiality	Self-centered	Link to others	Cognitive needs	Emotional needs	Psychosocial needs
Temporality	Present	Related to the present	Linked to the past	Related to the present	Related to the future
Process	<i>Amotivation</i>	<i>Extrinsic motivation</i>	<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>	<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>	<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>

DISCURSIVE OUTCOMES AT THE END OF THE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROCESS

Restorative Satisfaction at the End of the Process?

At the exit of the program, the *verbatim*s of both perpetrator and victim subjects are again tenuous. As with the expectations at the beginning of the program, we have grouped the major speeches together and presented them in order of occurrence as undifferentiated perpetrators and victims in the left-hand column, and we have again prioritized them in a differentiated manner between perpetrators and victims. In general, almost all subjects were keen to specify the fulfillment of their expectations, and although there were nuances in prioritization between perpetrators and victims, these were small variations depending on only a few subjects. Thus, five out of seven of the major satisfaction statements (except for “nothing in particular...” at 4%) came from more than 90% of the subjects.

TABLE 3
SUBJECTS’ SATISFACTION AT THE END OF THE PROGRAM

	Satisfaction of offenders and victims (n88)	<i>Perpetrator satisfaction (n57)</i>	<i>Satisfaction of crime victims (n31)</i>
1	Expectations met... (96%)	<i>To have heard and expressed oneself to the other... (100%)</i>	<i>Expectations met... (94%)</i>
2	To have “exchanged”, to have heard and expressed oneself to the other... (96%)	<i>Expectations met... (96%)</i>	<i>“Easing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (94%)</i>
3	“Easing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%)	<i>Recommend the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (95%)</i>	<i>To “restore” oneself, to free oneself, to get rid of a weight... (90%)</i>
4	To “restore” oneself, to free oneself, to get rid of a weight... (91%)	<i>“Easing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%)</i>	<i>To have “exchanged”, to have heard and expressed oneself to the other... (87%)</i>
5	Recommend the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (91%)	<i>“Helping” others, having “empathized” with the repercussions of one’s actions... (93%)</i>	<i>Recommend the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (84%)</i>
6	To have “helped” others, to have “empathized” with the repercussions of one’s actions... (87%)	<i>To “restore” oneself, to free oneself, to get rid of a weight... (91%)</i>	<i>“Helping” others, having “empathized” with the repercussions of one’s actions... (77%)</i>
7	“Understanding” the past event in my journey... (79%)	<i>To “understand” the past event in my journey... (86%)</i>	<i>To “understand” the past event in my journey... (68%)</i>
8	Nothing special... (4%)	<i>Nothing special... (4%)</i>	<i>Nothing special... (n2)</i>

We can also disaggregate the same dimensions of expectations at program entry, namely expectations, “temporality” and “process” from subject satisfaction discourses at program exit.

With *regard to satisfaction*, we distinguish between general satisfaction and specific satisfaction. The general (in)satisfaction concerns an overall view of the program, the big speeches such as: Expectations fulfilled... (96%); Recommend the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (91%); Nothing

special... (4%). The specific satisfactions specify the general satisfaction. We differentiate four types of specific satisfaction that emerge from the resolution of expectations turned towards segments of the self: cognitive, emotional, psychosocial and social:

- *Cognitive satisfaction*: ‘Understanding’ the past event in my journey... (79%);
- *Emotional satisfaction*: To “restore” oneself, to free oneself, to get rid of a weight... (91%);
- *Psychosocial satisfaction*: “Soothing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%);
- *Relational satisfaction*: “To exchange”, to have heard and expressed oneself to the other... (96%); “To help” others, to have had “empathy”, with regard to the repercussions of the acts... (87%).

With regard to **the temporality of expectations**, we differentiate three types of satisfaction that emerge from the initial expectations turned towards the past, the present and the future:

- *Related to the past*: Expectations met... (96%); “Understanding” the past event in my journey... (79%);
- *Related to the present*: “Exchanging”, having heard and spoken to the other... (96%); Advising the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (91%); “Restoring”, freeing oneself, getting rid of a burden... (91%); “Helped” others, had “empathy” with the impact of the actions... (87%);
- *Related to the future*: “Soothing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%).

With regard to **the motivational process and the possible resolution of initial expectations**, reserving amotivation (Nothing in particular...: 9%), we must make explicit a distinction between generality and specificity. A generality is strongly evidenced in the form of “shareable contributions” towards people other than the subjects directly concerned by the program, with grand speeches such as: “Expectations fulfilled...” (96%) directed towards the facilitator in the exchange, or “Advise other people/friends in a similar situation about the program...” (91%). The specificity is aimed at the more intimate contributions of the program to the subjects, specificity that is split between extrinsic and intrinsic contributions:

- *Extrinsic contributions*: “Helping” others, having “empathized” with the repercussions of one’s actions... (87%); “Exchanging”, having heard and expressed oneself to the other... (96%);
- *Intrinsic benefits*: “Understanding” the past event in my journey... (79%); “Restoring” myself, freeing myself, getting rid of a weight... (91%); “Soothing” a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of my life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%).

Taxonomy and Opening Towards a Restorative Satisfaction Scale (RSS) at the End of the Restorative Justice Process?

TABLE 4
TAXONOMY OF SUBJECTS’ SATISFACTION AT THE END OF THE PROGRAM
(BEGINNING OF A RESTORATIVE SATISFACTION SCALE “RSS”)

Typical Verbatim	Expectations met... (96%) Recommend the program to other people/friends in a similar situation... (91%)	To have “exchanged”, to have heard and expressed oneself to the other... (96%) To have “helped” others, to have “empathized”	“Understanding” the past event in my journey... (79%)	To “restore” oneself, to free oneself, to get rid of a weight... (91%)	“Easing” of a feeling of insecurity, regaining control of one’s life, better self-esteem, self-confidence... (93%)
-------------------------	--	---	---	--	--

	Nothing special... (4%)	with the repercussions of one's actions... (87%)			
Spatiality	General (In)Satisfaction	Relational satisfaction	Cognitive satisfaction	Emotional satisfaction	Psychosocial satisfaction
Temporality	><	Related to the present	Linked to the past	Related to the present	Linked to the future
Process	<i>Shareable contributions</i>	<i>Extrinsic contributions</i>	<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>	<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>	<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>

By cross-referencing the major discourses of satisfactions according to the vectors of “spatiality”, “temporality” and “motivational process”, a taxonomy of the satisfactions of the subjects at the end of the Restorative Justice program is drawn up. This taxonomy specifies once again the different possible satisfactions of the subjects according to cognitive, emotional or psychosocial needs, turned more towards the past, the present or the future, and according to an intrinsic or extrinsic motivation, shareable or not. This taxonomy would also allow for the development of a scale, as yet non-existent, a Restorative Satisfaction Scale (RSS) that would be useful for comparing programs according to objectivable criteria. As we had specified for the expectations, in order to create a RSS -which is not the objective of the study here either- a restorative satisfaction scale, it would also be necessary to proceed to a distribution of the speeches put in the form of explicit sentences with a Likert scale going from 1 to 5, and then a weighted analysis with regard to the average answers of the subjects of the previous programs as here⁴.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION AROUND THE EXPECTATIONS AND SATISFACTIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS: A POSSIBLE STRUCTURING FOR THE FACILITATOR CONCERNED WITH THE NEEDS OF THE SUBJECTS?

Since Braithwaite’s (2011) proposals on Restorative Justice and Motivational Interviewing and Walgrave’s about a Positive Criminology linking “Trust Criminology” and “Restorative Justice” (2016), our work has focused on the bridges and complementarities between different criminological models (Dieu, 2019; Dieu & Hirschelmann, 2018; Dieu, et al., 2016, 2020b). This article is a continuation of that. Upon entering and exiting the Restorative Justice program, it remains essential to share with subjects about their expectations, needs, motivations, (non)resolutions, and (in)satisfactions. According to our results, the *a priori* and *a posteriori* motivation (entry and exit) is most often ordered around particular axes (God, 2020). Based on a taxonomy that crosses spatial, temporal, and motivational orientation, drawn from the organization of subjects’ expectations of Restorative Justice (Dieu, 2018a), we hypothesize that a Restorative Motivation -Entry Phase- (RMT) and Restorative Satisfaction -Exit Phase- (RSE) scale would help both facilitators and subjects. The purpose of these scales would be to support the subject in his or her need for restorative justice (in an interview or self-reflection questionnaire with a possible Likert rating of 1 to 5) and to guide the subject in his or her expectations of the person he or she is going to meet and in preparing for these meetings. Five dimensions are at stake in these motivation and satisfaction scales in accordance with the results of the article, organized and presented in the following table.

TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF THE EMR AND ESR DIMENSIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF EXPECTATIONS
AND SATISFACTION OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PARTICIPANTS

Dimensions	A priori motivation / EMR	Ex post facto motivation / ESR
Dimension 1	Nothing special (<i>Amotivation</i>)	Overall satisfaction (<i>Shareable contributions</i>)
Dimension 2	Link to others - linked to the present (<i>Extrinsic motivation</i>)	Relational satisfaction - Related to the present (<i>Extrinsic inputs</i>)
Dimension 3	Cognitive needs - related to the past (<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>)	Cognitive satisfaction - related to the past (<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>)
Dimension 4	Emotional needs - related to the present (<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>)	Emotional satisfaction - related to the present (<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>)
Dimension 5	Psychosocial needs - future related (<i>Intrinsic motivation</i>)	Psychosocial satisfaction - related to the future (<i>Intrinsic contributions</i>)

While voluntariness is an intrinsic condition of Restorative Justice, it is necessary to ensure that all means have been put in place to ensure that the decision and maintenance of commitment are free (similar to the assumptions of Motivational Interviewing and the links to Restorative Justice, see God, 2020). As the “IPA” principle of Ambivalent Proportionate Interest indicates, there are several elements that can inhibit a person’s engagement in Restorative Justice. We believe that consideration of the proposed taxonomy by Restorative Justice coaches would allow participants to maintain their window of tolerance (response to the “IPA”) and thus increase the likelihood of their engagement in programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Translated & Edited by American Publishing Services (<https://americanpublishingservices.com/>).

ENDNOTES

1. The following article is an update and translation of the article: Dieu E, Hirschelmann A, and Blatier C. (2020a). “Motivated? Satisfied? Yes, but about what exactly?” Restorative justice: an attempt at a taxonomy of participants’ expectations and satisfactions. *International Journal of Criminology and Technical and Scientific Police*. 83(1): 65-75.
2. Total of percentages exceeding 100% since the subjects position themselves on several fields at the same time.
3. The “Restorative Motivation Evaluation” scale (EMR) was created following the proposed indications. It is currently being tested within the National Platform of Restorative Justice Practices in France, supported by the SADJAV of the Ministry of Justice.
4. In connection with the “Evaluation of Restorative Motivations” (EMR) scale, the “Evaluation of Restorative Satisfactions” (ESR) scale has been created following the proposed indications. It is linked to the EMR and also tested within the National Platform of Restorative Justice Practices in France, supported by the SADJAV of the Ministry of Justice.

REFERENCES

- Boisvert, N. (2006). *Validation of the Échelle de Motivation du Client face à la Thérapie (EMCT), French version of the Client Motivation for Therapy Scale (CMOTS)*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières.
- Bordin, E.S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy Theory Research & Practice*, 976(16), 252–259.
- Bordin, E.S. (1994). Theory and research on the therapeutic working alliance: New directions. In A.O. Horvath & L.S. Greenberg (Eds.), *The working alliance: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Braithwaite, J. (2011). The essence of responsive regulation. *UBC Law Review*, 44(3), 475–520. Reported as “Motivational Interviewing is effective and restorative” in 2016. Retrieved from <http://restorativeworks.net/2016/05/motivational-interviewing-effective-restorative/>
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Despars, J., Kiely, M.C., & Perry, J.C. (2001). The development of the therapeutic alliance: Influence of therapist interventions and patient defenses. *Psychotherapies*, 21(3), 141–152.
- Dieu, E. (2018b). Desistance Sponsorship Program (DSP) and Circle of Support and Accountability (CSR): Synthesis of similarities and dissimilarities for an adapted Restorative Justice in France. *International Journal of Criminology and Technical and Scientific Police*, LXXI(3), 351–362.
- Dieu, E., & Hirschelmann, A. (2018). Three reflections to situate French psycho-criminological analysis. *Annales Médico-Psychologiques Revue Psychiatrique*, 176(6), 586–590.
- Dieu, E., Hirschelmann, A., & Blatier, C. (2020a). “Motivated? Satisfied? Yes, but about what specifically?” “Restorative justice: an attempt at a taxonomy of participants’ expectations and satisfactions. *International Journal of Criminology and Technical and Scientific Police*, 83(1), 65–75.
- Dieu, E., Palaric, R., & Maillot, R. (2020b). Restorative practice and identity-based desistance process: The Desistance Sponsorship Program (DSP). *Revue Internationale de Criminologie et de Police Technique et Scientifique*, 73, 220–235.
- Dieu, E., Vandevoorde, J., & Hirschelmann, A. (2016). Restorative Justice: Neither treating nor repressing? The case of Louis, a multi-recidivist neither “dangerous” nor “sick”. *L'Encéphale*, 43(3), 283–291.
- God, E. (2018a). *Restorative Justice: Psycho-criminological reflections from a Forensic Clinic*. Doctoral dissertation in Psychology, Université Rennes 2 - Haute-Bretagne under the direction of A. Hirschelmann. Defended January 25, 2018.
- God, E. (2019). What to make of desistance models in the support of offenders? *International Journal of Criminology and Technical and Scientific Police*, LXXII, 170–190.
- God, E. (2020). “Yet it might answer your questions and do you some good”. The question of the link between motivational interviewing and Restorative Justice. *Medical Psychological Annals*, 178(2), 117–122.
- Horvath, A.O., & Symond, B.D. (1991). Relation Between Working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(2), 139–149.
- Horvath, A.O., Del Re, A.C., Flückiger, C., & Symonds, D. (2011). Alliance in individual psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 48(1), 9–16.
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2001). *The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices, Meta-Analysis*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Lefebvre, H., Dieu, E., & Issen, E. (2018). Circles of Support and Accountability as a possible link between Risk-Need-Responsivity principles and Restorative Justice? *International Journal of Criminology and Technical and Scientific Police*, LXXI(3), 334–350.

- Martin, D.J., Garske, J.P., & Davis, K.M. (2000). Relation of the therapeutic alliance with outcome and other variables: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(3), 438–450.
- McCold, P., & Wachtel, T. (2003). Restorative justice theory validation. In E.G.M. Weitekamp & H-J. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative Justice: Theoretical Foundations* (pp. 110–142). Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Serin, R., & Kennedy, S. (1997). *Treatment readiness and responsiveness and their contribution to effective correctional programs*. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Taxman, A.W., & Love, K.M. (2010). An Offender Version of the Working Alliance Inventory-Short Revised. *Journal Offender Rehabilitation, 49*(3), 165–179.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2008). *Handbook on restorative justice programs*. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Programme_justice_reparatrice.pdf
- Walgrave, L. (2016). Positive criminology, criminology of trust and restorative justice. *Restorative Justice: An International, 4*(3), 424–434.
- Walgrave, L., Ward, T., & Zinsstag, E. (2020). When Restorative Justice meets the Good Lives Model. In E. God, *Good Lives Model*. Harmattan.
- Ward, T., & Langlands, R. (2009). Repairing the rupture: Restorative justice and the rehabilitation of offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*(3), 205–214.
- Ward, T., Day, A., Howells, K., Birgden, A. (2004, October 31). The multifactor offender readiness model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(6), 645–73.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse: Good books.