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Executive Summary

The ALTERNATIVE project could be imagined as an exploratory venture. It pushes the established methods and practices of restorative justice out of their applicability comfort zone, towards social conflicts in intercultural settings where many of the discipline’s assumptions dither. Following an initial in-depth conceptual mapping study, detailed plans of operation were drafted and action research started rolling in four countries. Alas, as forewarned by some Prussian general, there is no plan that survives the impact with the battlefield and things got much more complicated. To start with, as it often turns out in overseas explorations, the new territories were far from being empty spaces. In fact a variety of social workers, alternative dispute resolution practitioners, community workers and related academic fields were already thriving there. This spurred some soul searching about whether the discipline had something relevant to say or novel practices to offer. But this was the easy part. The main structural difficulty faced by the project lay in the goal itself. Restorative justice – at least the enhanced form being explored here – resorts to open dialogue and non-violent communication in order to (re)build trust among those affected by a conflict – often bitterly harmed by it. Once mutual trust is restored, participants can address their oppositions, or at least manage the conflict in a non-destructive way, eventually cooperating toward achieving some common goal in the spheres of justice and security. Unfortunately, after Robert Putnam’s findings (2007), there are some reasons to think that communication, trust and cooperation are precisely what is not going to happen in intercultural settings, those with high ethnic or racial diversity at least, where people ‘hunker down’. How to get out of the impasse? Acknowledging it, dissecting it are but the beginning of an answer.

This report focuses on data collected from the research partners in four countries (social housing estates in Vienna, a small town in rural Hungary, three border towns in Serbia, Belfast and London/Derry in Northern Ireland) during the course of the project. The qualitative methodology adopted here (chapter 1) comparatively analysed the empirical data along two main dimensions. A ‘horizontal’ one compares the findings in the different research sites between themselves, describing them in detail and evaluating the main outcomes of the action research. After identifying a certain number of conflictual situations as ‘cases’ to be studied in depth, the researchers formalised them according to a number of conditions or variables. Analysing the cases so formalised with
Ragin’s set-theoretical combinatorial methods (QCA), we can highlight the following main descriptive findings (chapter 2):

— High intervention intensity practices happen only in cases with explicit and serious harm claims.

— A ‘standard’ RJ participation model where the roles of victims, offenders and community are well identified applies only in cases with explicit and serious harm claims and where there are public institutions’ representatives among the participants.

— When security, regardless of the scope of its definition, is more of a concern (high security intensity) there is always a public stakeholder present.

— The cases that are morally framed as ‘wrongdoing’ (as opposed to misbehaviour or the morally neutral conflict of interest) are dealt with more formal practices following a standard victim-offender-community participation model (as seen before); besides, these cases are associated with a wider security scope, but not necessarily a high security intensity.

A second ‘vertical’ gaze, following the ethnographic method of continuous dialogue between the etic and emic understandings of a concept in each site, aims at honing and realigning the key concepts of justice, security, conflict, community, restorative processes, active participation, trust and cooperation (chapter 3). Here are some highlights from this section.

Conflicts in the four action research sites where initially classified at different levels of analysis, from the micro (interpersonal) in Vienna, to meso (community level) in the small town in Hungary to meso-macro in Serbia and Northern Ireland. However, a closer analysis of actual conflict dynamics during field work showed that the symbolic level of activation or narrative framing (from interpersonal to communal to ethno-national, and vice-versa) of each conflict varied greatly in time, regardless of its intensity.

Early in the project the researchers made a reasoned option for an understanding of security largely in terms of personal safety that somehow prevented more complex analysis of (de)securitisation dynamics and of how to engage security apparatuses once
they have formed. Participants often voiced concerns of economic and job security alongside their physical safety thus confirming, on the one hand, the implicit human security approach of the research and, on the other hand, the importance of socio-economic factors and distributive justice in the various case studies.

In order to achieve active participation that goes beyond a token of bodily presence, it is crucial to analyse in depth who are the stakeholders affected by the conflict and what are their interests. The key insight is to define participation itself in terms of the stakeholders’ actual decision making powers and the resources they can invest or claim in the process, thus owning it (participation with power and property). A promising line of inquiry, supported by research on cooperation in behavioural economics, hints at the importance of devolution of certain constituent powers to the participants, i.e. not only decision making powers within the rules of the practice, but a deliberative voice in setting the rules themselves.

Preliminary to the definition and assessment of outcomes (chapter 4), a discussion is in order about a new evaluation space – and relative metrics – better suited to alternative understandings of restorative justice and security. Should ALTERNATIVE still consider the reparation of victims’ harms, the offender taking responsibility, their reintegration in a reconciled community as the main restorative outcomes? Or do we need new evaluation criteria? Perhaps both. Ideally, the new approach experimented by ALTERNATIVE should encompass the original RJ domain while at the same time extending beyond it. The main finding within the restorative justice outcomes field more narrowly understood (section 4.3) is that the tried and tested practices of restorative justice like mediations, circles and conferences, can be effective also to address well defined conflicts arising in intercultural contexts. Or at least this has been observed, provided that the harms are claimed explicitly and are dealt with through formal practices facilitated by trained practitioners with the involvement of public institutions, including police officers. The latter may contribute to the practice’s formality and ‘seriousness,’ perhaps even adding some latent negative incentive to sustain cooperation in implementing the agreement reached by participants, provided that they are considered sufficiently ‘neutral’ relative to the parties involved. This could be a critical factor in certain social contexts where institutions tend to be weak.
Social class cleavages are the second most relevant dimension – after ethnic diversity – in the definition of the intercultural setting in all sites, just as issues of socio-economic inequality are substantially present in the definitions of the types of conflict studied in the cases. The combination of socio-economic and ethnic inequalities are the strongest social determinants of low generalised trust. Considering the central importance of trust building – at least localised trust among the participants – in restorative practices this poses a big question mark on the possibility of developing meaningful restorative methods in such contexts. At the same time, it is a contradiction that contains its own resolution. We can sketch a tripartite field of tensions between various behavioural outcomes in intercultural contexts. First, destructive open conflict, bad race relations, hostility. Second, isolation, ‘hunkering down’, withdrawal from collective life along with the securitisation of social conflict in general (from petty criminality to migrations). Third, cooperation, where higher levels of socio-economic equality, and hence of trust, allow addressing conflicts.

Therefore, especially when dealing with conflicts in intercultural settings, restorative justice should strengthen its unique approach to justice as disjoint from penal punishment, and focus especially on redistributive justice as the deep equalising factor, beyond ripples of cultural diversity, that in turn may increase the chances of people trusting and cooperating with each other. Put in another way, even if moving outside of its tested sphere of applicability, restorative justice should not stretch its supply lines too thin and keep a solid anchoring in its core business of doing justice, least it becomes irrelevant.

Seen from this perspective, the research in the four sites shows that strong leadership and steering by public institutions combined with effective socio-economic redistributive policies are associated with lower levels of active participation on the one hand, and higher perceptions of personal safety – or at least de-securitisation of issues – on the other (Vienna, Hungary in some circumstances). When public actors are effectively hegemonic, the restorative approach experimented in the project seems to act as a complementary corrective, contributing (through improved communication and dialogue) towards a more effective representation of interests and identities of stakeholders, including a partial re-appropriation of conflicts. Conversely, higher levels of active participation and mobilisation in the presence of weaker social public provision are potentially open to exclusionary practices, are associated with heightened
perceptions of insecurity and are more prone to securitising dynamics. In these more competitive constellations, the restorative methods experimented in the project – in particular peace-making circles or ‘community mediation’ – might contribute towards strengthening social solidarity between stakeholders, building inter-group ‘bridging’ trust, increasing the sense of fairness in the process and improving the perceptions of safety.

Based on these general findings, ALTERNATIVE proposes a new approach for research and practice of restorative justice to conflicts in intercultural settings, articulated in three phases or interlinked dimensions that are only logically distinct: restoration of communication, restoration of trust, restoration of cooperative action for justice.
1 | Methods and data

‘Anything goes’ is not a ‘principle’ I hold – I do not think that ‘principles’ can be used and fruitfully discussed outside the concrete research situation they are supposed to affect – but the terrified exclamation of a rationalist who takes a closer look at history (Feyerabend 1975a, vii).

After joining the ALTERNATIVE project in 2014 with the task of carrying on with the comparative analysis, when looking at its rather liberal methodological approach this author’s first reaction was like: ‘hum, here anything goes,’ in that precise meaning of an aesthetic reaction as in Feyerabend’s often abused line (perhaps recursively so here as well). Not only the four working groups carrying out field research were focusing on different levels of analysis in utterly distant social contexts, but their overall methodological approaches were rather variegated as well. But before embarking in an excessive methodological tightening, it is perhaps wise to hear another piece of advice:

Methodology has by now become so crowded with empty sophistication that it is extremely difficult to perceive the simple errors at the basis. It is like fighting the hydra – cut off one ugly head, and eight formalizations take its place. In this situation the only answer is superficiality: when sophistication loses content then the only way of keeping in touch with reality is to be crude and superficial. This is what I intend to be (Feyerabend 1975b, 5).

Ditto here, crude and superficial, although for less noble reasons.

1.1 | Collaborative data management infrastructure

During its first phase, the comparative exercise focused mainly on recasting and honing the project’s conceptual tools. The comparison happened on two dimensions. A ‘vertical’ one, following the ethnographic method of continuous dialogue between the etic and emic understandings of a concept in each site. The ‘horizontal’ gaze compared the findings in the different research sites between themselves. The researchers had been meeting regularly for intense and detailed face to face discussions during the previous three years. In order to unfold and feed this rather dense and articulated
communication process the researchers had to develop methodological communication protocols and a suitable infrastructure to support them.

The evaluation grids designed during task 8.3 in 2013 are the main methodological communication protocol. They are the first approximation of the emic towards the etic, a collection of empirically rich and thickly described conceptual reflections. The grid template went through a couple of design iterations between the end of 2013 and mid 2014. The final version adopted by the project is replicated in the annex. The grid design development was also informed by the discussion with the project about which key concepts should be analysed by which work packages using the grid as a common reporting tool. The partners in research use the common evaluation grids to keep track – and communicate to each other – of how their empirical work has been informing their understanding of the key concepts in the project.

In order to allow the partners to follow the developments of the comparative analysis and as a tool for qualitative analysis, this author designed and implemented in FileMaker Pro a database to store, code and analyse the grids, making it accessible to partners via website and a dedicated solution for the iPad. As part of the data processing protocol, the grids themselves are uploaded to the online database that allows for structured queries by keyword or properties across all the fields of the grid itself, e.g. key or secondary concept, work package, thick description, local language, societal ecology, etc. (for the methodology of the comparative analysis and the operational definitions of these concepts see D8.1, D8.2, D8.3).

The concept-centric evaluation grids had been designed aiming at the conceptual realignment within each working group and across the project as a whole. However, they were not well suited to analyse the outcomes of the action research. Therefore, a further methodological development consisted in trying to broaden the case-based methodology of one of the research partners and – with some inevitable stretching – make it adaptable to the other sites. Each evaluation grid analyses a concept starting from a thick description of a ‘situation’ during the action research and its societal ecology. These thickly described situations are suitable to be thematised and analysed as ‘cases’ (see section 1.5.1 at page 23). Switching to the ‘case’ as unit of analysis allows to focus on tracing processes within it, participatory ones in particular, and analyse the action research’s outcomes. The case formalisation, linked to the evaluation grids,
together with a charting and visual analysis tools were implemented in the shared database as well. The remotely accessible shared database at the centre of the collaborative data management infrastructure has the following main functions:

1. Data entry and validation
2. Linking the grids with formalised ‘cases’ or observed situations that they thickly describe and that can be considered units of analysis
3. Characterising each ‘case’ along a set of formally defined conditions (or variables, see section below)
4. Conceptual analysis and feedback to the work packages for conceptual realignment based on the grids.
5. Set-theoretical, visual analysis tools of the cases for synoptical overviews and quick hypothesis testing.
6. The database feeds the Qualitative Comparative Analysis system coded in R, a free software environment for statistical computing and graphics.¹

Illustration 1: Comparative analysis information management infrastructure

¹ Details about R on the project’s website http://www.r-project.org. For details about QCA please refer to section 1.5.5 at page 38. The R code developed by the author is reproduced in the annex A.3 at page 201.
1.2 | Key concepts

The discussion on the concepts had started early in the project with drafting a series of notes and it developed further during various phases until a final list of key concepts was decided upon in April 2014. Some concepts that are clearly central to the project have been included since the beginning, namely active participation, civil society and community, conflict and crime, identity, ‘interculturality’, justice, restoration and restorative principles, security (safety). Among the concepts that were considered at some point and eventually dropped there is trust: it appeared only once at the second steering committee meeting. However, it will return with full force during the last year of the project when researchers across all sites will discuss issues of trust building as a condition that is instrumental to carrying out action research.

Eventually the list of concepts settled on the following, specifying the areas of concentration for the different work packages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Concept areas to be operationalised</th>
<th>Concepts to be focused upon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>Justice, security</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
<td>‘Interculturality’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative principles</td>
<td>Restorative principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Civil society (as part of democracy</td>
<td>Crime/conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>society)/community</td>
<td>Security/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Minorities/migrants</td>
<td>Crime/conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society/community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social inclusion/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Package</td>
<td>Concept areas to be operationalised</td>
<td>Concepts to be focused upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Victim/victimisation</td>
<td>Crime/conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-conflict society</td>
<td>Security/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic society</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-conflict society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim/victimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Identity as multidimensional</td>
<td>Crime/conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic vs communicative action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Concepts to be focused upon (April 2014)

Subsequent theoretically oriented empirical findings will argue for the separation in the treatment of ‘civil society’ and ‘community’ (see the section on orienting and analysing empirical developments); as a consequence, they are dealt with separately in the database.

1.3 | Evaluation grids and concepts coverage

By the end of the field research phase, the researchers in the different work packages drafted the following grids covering the key concepts as indicated. The complete set of grids, including the comments and feedback to the researcher in the field by the Leuven team were collected in another project document (deliverable 8.4) that is not publicly available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Grids</th>
<th>Key concepts *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Total grids: 13</td>
<td>Active participation (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total key concepts: 13</td>
<td>Citizenship (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict (x 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitality (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity (x 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration (x 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security / Safety (x 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Evaluation grids overview

Conflict and crime were originally linked in the concept list. The reason behind this coupling is to leave the methodological field open without taking sides in the wider criminological debate about ‘what is crime’ – e.g. from the ‘social harm’ or critical criminology perspectives (Pemberton 2007; Dorling et al. 2008; Hulsman 1986) – or in the more specific debate within RJ, whether to take conflict rather than crime as the main unit of analysis. However, the main reason not do so is that the linking would obfuscate the theoretical choices of the researchers in the field and their corresponding findings. Keeping crime linked to conflict would have been impossible to check in which action research sites, or cases within them, the issue dealt with was presented as a ‘crime’ or as a ‘conflict’ and what the different *emic* understanding of the concepts were. Therefore, the concepts were treated separately in the grids and database that organises and collects them. As a consequence, it was possible to see that ‘crime’ itself was never thematised as a key concept by the researchers who preferred, actually in line with the
general methodological approach across the project, to focus on conflicts. Crime legally defined as a breach of the criminal code appears every now and then in the empirical evidence, as a sort of background diffuse worry in Kisváros (e.g. grid #3), or even in serious cases of ‘hate crime’ in Northern Ireland (grids #27, 28, 29, 30, 46), but the researchers focused on the (in)communication processes around these cases, intercultural relations and potential for restoration, rather than a treatment of the crime itself in classic criminological terms.

The following table shows also the details about which secondary concepts were analysed when relevant to the situation thickly described in the grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>Subt.</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>Subt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intercultural Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-conflict Society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-conflict Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration / processes / principles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration / processes / principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social inclusion / excl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion / excl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic vs Communicative action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic vs Communicative action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim / victimisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim / victimisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals by WP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Grids covering which concepts by work package

While the quantity of grids itself is of course of little overall relevance in such a qualitative methodology of conceptual analysis and re-alignment, a minimum methodological condition to be fulfilled in order to be able to compare the four research
sites is to have at least one grid from each to cover the same key concept, at least for those that are at the core of the project. This has been achieved almost across the board, especially when taking into consideration that some concepts were not relevant – i.e. blunt heuristic tools unable to analytically thematise the social realities on the ground – in some research sites. The following charts will show the intensity of coverage of a specific concept in the various research sites, taking into account both the ‘key concept’ at the centre of the analytical attention of each grid, and the ‘secondary concepts’ linked to the situation thickly described in the grid, although less deeply thematised.

Illustration 2: Key concepts coverage (by work package)

The core concepts of justice, security and restorativeness are sufficiently covered by all research teams and allow for fruitful comparison.

Conflict is broadly covered by almost all research groups, with a particular intensity in Hungary where a well defined case-based methodology took precisely local conflicts as the main unit of analysis.
Community, as expected, was not uniformly relevant and was mainly treated in Northern Ireland and Hungary, with an original angle on it as ‘togetherness’ from Vienna.

1.4 | Reports by partners

Apart from the comparative evaluation grids, partners in the four sites drafted detailed context reports that thickly describe the societal ecology of each site, followed by action research reports that – together with the proceedings of the regional seminars organised in Belgrade, Budapest, Belfast, London/Derry and Oslo at the end of 2014 (beginning of 2015) – are invaluable sources of information for this exercise.

Context reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D4.2</th>
<th>2014-01</th>
<th>Kremmel, Katrin; Pelikan, Christa</th>
<th>Living together in the Gemeindebau in Vienna. On Tensions, Conflicts, Fears and Hopes</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Vienna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>2014-01</td>
<td>Hera, G.; Györfi, É.; Szegő, D.; Balla, L.; Kelemen, K.; Benedek, G. (ed.)</td>
<td>Community problem analysis: building the bridges of trust within and within the communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budapest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>2013-02</td>
<td>Nikolić-Ristanović, Vesna; Ćopić, Sanja</td>
<td>Dealing with interethnic conflicts in Serbia and the place of restorative justice and victims</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>2014-01</td>
<td>Nikolić-Ristanović, Vesna; Ćopić, Sanja; Petrović, Nikola; Saciri, Bejan</td>
<td>Conflicts, security and justice in intercultural context of Serbia</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>2013-07</td>
<td>Chapman, Tim; Campbell, Hugh; McCord, John; McCready, Philip</td>
<td>A baseline research report into issues and needs in three sites where the community is experiencing conflict</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action research reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D4.4</th>
<th>2015-07</th>
<th>Kremmel, Katrin; Pelikan, Christa</th>
<th>Towards restorative circles: Action research interventions in Vienna’s social housing estates</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vienna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.5 | Comparing empirical findings

During the course of the action research on the four sites, based on the communications between researchers, preliminary empirical data and comparison with the project’s overall theoretical framework, some methodological development were discussed and introduced. They concern the linking of the concept analysis grids with a case-based analytical approach and the introduction of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of the ‘cases’ so formalised (as opposed to considering each action research site, as a whole, as unit of analysis, which were briefly considered for QCA and discarded in mid 2014; see section below for a presentation of QCA and its applicability to the project). The conceptualisation and operationalisation of ‘active participation’ in new governance context was enriched with insights and methodological tools drawn from the literature on multi-stakeholder partnerships. These methodological developments will be briefly presented in the following sections.²

Before proceeding, a brief note on the meaning and use of ‘context’ in comparative analysis in general and QCA in particular is in order. How to treat context, as a ‘real’ thing, external to the units of analysis and treated as a black box, or a set of variables at a higher level of analysis? The first part of the answer, independent of the specific comparative technique chosen, depends also on the purpose of the comparison itself (Schench 1990, table 2.1). In our case we will treat the intercultural context as a set of variables in itself, a space where cases tend to cluster according to their societal geography, that should enable us to specify the coordinates of certain observed phenomena.

² This section is drawn from Deliverable 8.4 and reproduced here with updates because it is essential for the comprehension of the analytical method while the original document is not publicly accessible.
1.5.1 | Concepts, grids and cases

The evaluation grids emerge from a particular ‘situation’ that they thickly describe and look back at from a specific conceptual angle.

‘situation’ → grids → concepts emic | etic

These situations are themselves part of a broader social and methodological dynamic at the research site. In some sites, the researchers call these situations ‘cases’. In Hungary in particular, the researchers explicitly structured their methodology around a definition of case taken from RJ practice with many important details about the referral phase, signalling, the receiving party, clients definition etc. But given the project’s methodological capaciousness, this does not necessarily hold for all sites. For example, researchers in Northern Ireland prefer to work around broader issues rather than individual cases.

While retaining the comparative grids for the conceptual alignment within the project, taking the ‘case’ as unit of analysis would help the ‘action / process’ and ‘evaluation / outcome’ sections of the comparative analysis.

‘case’ / ‘situation’ → grids → concepts emic | etic

The main problem with this move is the lack of a unified definition of ‘case’ across the working packages. That is, assuming that a ‘case’-based approach, or something amenable to be treated as such, exists at all. Considering that this would not be the first heterogeneity issue faced during the comparative analysis we decided to go ahead anyway.

Of course it is extremely difficult to find a definition of ‘case’ that is wide enough to cover such a methodological and empirical latitude and retain some analytical edge. If a case is seen to be a conflict/harm situation which was handled by anyone it can offer us insights about cultural framing, modes of handling, participation, etc. but cannot offer insight on assumption of restorative justice, not about security, etc. Vice-versa, if the case definition includes discussion workshops, it can offer insights about
communication, understanding of justice and security, but not about harm, reparation and other restorative outcomes.

For the purposes of the comparative analysis the definition of case will be quite broad and include also situations where the ‘intervention intensity’ of the action research is in fact limited to interviews and participant observation.

Stylised model of ‘case’ development:

1. During a communication process with the ‘researchers’, some participants refer to a conflictual social dynamic on the site of the action research (signalling).

2. The researchers assess the ‘conflict’ based on certain criteria.

3. Some kind of ‘action’ is agreed upon, planned and carried out to address the conflict.

4. Evaluation.

Even if the action research does not reach stage three, for the purposes of the comparative analysis we will still consider the ‘case’ as valid, just assigning to it a lower level of ‘intervention intensity’.

In between there are situations where the case involved an action, but this was not organised and carried out by the ALTERNATIVE researchers directly. For example a mediation between neighbours in Vienna by wohnpartner (an agency of the Municipality of Vienna providing mediation services in the social housing estates) that was observed by the researchers, or an ad hoc restorative conference between locals and immigrants organised in Belfast by a restorative practitioner trained by the researchers that was later referred to them. Whatever the actual role of the researchers in these
cases, ranging from participant observers to conveners, considering that, first, the case happened during the research; second, those who handled it are working in partnership with the ALTERNATIVE researchers; and, three, the case forms part of the empirical material on the project (e.g. through the grids), we will consider it as a case where an intervention has taken place.

1.5.2 | Case-based comparative methodology steps

Starting from this admittedly non fully rigorous definition of a case that has to be broad enough to encompass the methodological diversity within the project and hopefully sufficiently formalised to be operational, the following methodological steps, have been carried out by the researchers in the four sites in close communication and coordination with the comparative team in Leuven.

a) For each WP the researchers identified and selected a certain number of cases, broadly defined as above. The criteria for selection varied across the working packages and will be discussed later.

b) The cases were linked with the existing evaluation grids:

   – it is possible to have a grid about a concept even if the case / situation that is thickly described in the grid is not considered for a full fledged case study;

   – but each case should be linked to at least one grid that thickly describes it and one of more of the key concepts that are relevant in the case.

c) The comparative team in Leuven assessed each case and – using the online tools of the shared database – assigned values to the various conditions, including the outcomes (as detailed in the following section), briefly commenting on them explaining the rationale of their choices. The initial formal assessment of the cases is done centrally in Leuven in order to ensure a more homogeneous interpretation of the meaning of the conditions and application of the assessment criteria.

d) The researchers in the four sites logged into the online database, reviewed the initial assessment of the cases, discussed them in depth with the comparative team in Leuven, amended wherever necessary and eventually validated the data.
e) The Leuven team carried out a fuzzy-set QCA on the validated data and reported the result in this report, together with the conceptual realignment and the results of other analytical methods.

For this methodological protocol to work, it is important to have as clear definitions as possible of the conditions (variables) that describe each case and of the underlying theoretical hypothesis that justify their inclusion in the characterisation. During the course of the project the researchers discussed in depth the key concepts among themselves during the periodic meetings of the project’s steering committee. The local meanings and understandings of concepts emerging from the field were shared through the online database and further discussed, thus creating a reasonably common knowledge base across the research sites, making the assessment of the various conditions less idiosyncratic. It goes without saying that the analysis will be as good as the initial data.

1.5.3 | Case conditions and outcomes

The term ‘variable’ is attuned to the jargon of statistical analysis, while causal ‘condition’ refers to the language of case-based Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). Since we are going to do a bit of both, we keep the dual nomenclature. However, this has operational consequences. A variables by definition can assume numeric values to express varying degrees of intensity of a certain property. With fuzzy-set QCA conditions are not restricted to a dichotomous semantic and can assume continuously varying numeric values. The calibration process (Rihoux and Ragin 2009, 93–94) takes care of transforming these values in set membership scores (see section 1.5.5 at page 38).

If the set membership relation is not defined in terms of the intermediate values of condition’s range (e.g. ‘middle-income countries’), the treatment of intermediate values is critical and it is a good practice to use a calibration function that filters them out in a non linear way. If the initial data do not contain values in the central range, the calibration is easier and more straightforward. In order to achieve this, the researchers in their assessment of the degree of intensity of a condition have to make two successive dichotomous choices: first between ‘high’ and ‘low’; then, respectively, between ‘very high’ (assigning the value 5) and ‘intermediate high’ (4) or between ‘very low’ (1) and
‘intermediate low’ (2). Following this procedure in the construction and assessment of the conditions makes them ready for a fuzzy-set analysis.

QCA-based methods should start from the desired outcome. This should be the criterion for the theoretically informed selection of the conditions that are likely to contribute to explain it. In ALTERNATIVE there is no easy or univocal choice of a single outcome that lends itself to a reasonably simple formalisation and assessment. This is because of the fundamental methodological and theoretical openness of the project. In order to address this difficulty, we opted to mirror this openness in the choice of possible outcomes and selection of relevant conditions, keeping as guiding principle of course the overarching questions that the project asks about justice and security and the organic relationship to and path dependence from restorative justice. This openness and interpretive latitude is implemented in a software that allows to choose one possible output at a time and its theoretically related, adjustable constellations of conditions and then carry out various rounds of fsQCA on them.

It is now time to describe in detail what the conditions and possible outcomes are.

**Intercultural context**

What are the prevailing dimensions that define the intercultural context in the case at hand? Not the conflict in itself but its context. Not the context of the action research on the site in general, but its more specific facets that emerge and are relevant in the case. Assessment: based on how the intercultural dimension is identified and analysed in the grids’ combination of *emic* and *etic* conceptual understandings.

Some dimensions, possibly overlapping: Age; Ethnicity; Gender; Historical memory; Migration (international); Migration (domestic); Profession; Race; Religion; Social class; etc.

**Conflict type**

What kind of conflict is it? Assessment: based on how the conflict is identified and analysed in the grids as combination of *emic* and *etic* conceptual understandings.

Some types taken from the empirical evidence from ALTERNATIVE, possibly overlapping: Anti-social behaviour; Armed; Communal; Criminal activity (pre-judice
How relevant is the intercultural context, characterised as above, in the conflict according to the participants?

Assessment: based on how the intercultural context of the conflict is identified and analysed in the grids as combination of *emic* and *etic* understandings: highly relevant (5); somehow relevant (4); barely relevant (2); not relevant (1).

**Moral framing of the conflict issue**

How participants, or at least some of them acting as initiators or referrers of the case, present the conflict issue on an ideal scale of moral framing, from highest (*crime* or criminal wrongdoing) to intermediate (*wrongdoing*) to low (*misbehaviour*) or even to the absence of a moral dimension at all (assuming that this is actually possible) in cases of ‘simple’ conflict of *interests* between two or more parties.

**Harm claims**

Even if the existence of some kind of harm could be considered a defining feature of the conflict, it is important to register whether and how the participants talk about harm, if at all. The underlying hypothesis here would be that if there isn’t an explicit ‘harm claim’, a restorative justice intervention aiming at the reparation of harm would found itself on a precarious ground.

Low: participants do not claim that any harm has been done to them – individually or as a self-identified group – by others in the context of the case at hand.

Intermediate low: participants claim that they – individually or as a self-identified group – have suffered a moderate level of harm in the context of the case at hand.
Intermediate high: participants claim that they – individually or as a self-identified group – have suffered a serious level of harm, although still non existentially threatening, in the context of the case at hand.

High: participants claim that they – individually or as a group – have suffered great harm (i.e. existential) in the context of the case at hand.

Justice claims

This is about the discursive framing of the conflict in terms of a ‘question of justice’ and is linked to the moral framing of the issue. It is also an operationalisation of the participants’ ideas and understanding of justice that emerge from the case through the grids.

The underlying hypothesis here would be to probe whether there is a ‘justice continuum’ (in both framing and formalisation, see below) and whether it is independent from the ‘practice formalisation’ à la McCold & Wachtel in order to assess if there can be such thing as a ‘restorative practice’ without a ‘justice’ dimension.

The assessment of this condition ranges from low, when participants do not talk about the issue in terms of justice / injustice and rather frame it in an interest-based, pragmatic way; to high, when participants strongly frame the issue in terms of justice / injustice: “It is a question of justice!” “It’s not fair!”, etc. And, as usual, the intermediate low and intermediate high values according to the double dichotomy assessment.

Practice type

In the case abstraction defined above for this methodology, we consider all research practices as action research, although at different levels of activity. Those practices that are more closely linked with standard – non explicitly active – social science research methodology, like interviews, focus groups etc. will cluster towards the lower half of the activity scale, while practices explicitly aimed at dealing with situations arising from the cases will score higher. The type of practice is implicitly, the level of activity or ‘intervention intensity’ in action research.
### Practice’s Intensity of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice’s Intensity of intervention</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>“Intervention intensity”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Restorative conferences, circles. Public assembly, especially when invested with deliberative powers.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate high</td>
<td>Mediation sessions.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate low</td>
<td>Workshops, focus groups, dialogues, interviews.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Surveys.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Intervention intensity assessment*

### Refusal

With this dichotomous conditions we map those cases where there is a substantial mismatch between planning and implementation of an action. In particular, there is a ‘refusal’ condition in a case when as a consequence of an explicit or implicit denial by some key stakeholders to participate, the organisers of the practice have to change its type, namely from a higher intensity of intervention (e.g. a circle or assembly) to a lower one.

### Practice formalisation

According to the restorative practices approach there is a continuum of practices from informal to formal. We look at the practice in itself, regardless to its specific content in terms of ‘justice’ or ‘moral claims’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly formalised practice</td>
<td>When the case involves a formal institutional setting like a Municipal council or Court of Justice. But also a tightly scripted conference or circle.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate formal practice</td>
<td>(less tightly-scripted) Conference, circle, mediation involving a trained practitioner in institutional setting. Circle, mediation involving a trained practitioner in non-institutional settings.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Practice formalisation assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate informal practice</td>
<td>Ad hoc mediation by a neighbour or untrained practitioner.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less structured or free flowing interviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard ‘scientific’ interviews, focus groups in non institutional settings but more or less structured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very informal practice</td>
<td>Occasional encounters, chats, face-to-face interactions in non institutional setting.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Practice formalisation assessment*

Note that according to this definition the practice’s type and its level of formalisation are not fully independent variables. Some types of practice have a more restricted range of formalisation: conferences will vary between intermediate to highly formal; interviews will swing in the lower half of formalisation values.

### Researchers’ involvement in the action

The role of the researchers in the practices reported in the grids varies a great deal and with this condition we try to capture it. In a way it is the assessment of the level of *participation* of the researchers themselves in the case and related practice looking at decision making and resources invested. In fact, with this single condition we are trying to map three distinct levels of involvement: initiative (who makes the first move towards the action), planning and actual implementation. In order to limit the space of combinations to those that arguably are more empirically relevant, these conditions are amalgamated in the following levels of participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>The researchers or partners, associates roles</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full participation</td>
<td>Initiative: yes Planning: yes Acting: yes The researchers or their partners / associates have access to the highest decision making level regarding the initiative, planning of the action and they act in key roles in its implementation.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6: Researchers’ role in the action**

**Security scope**

The researchers in ALTERNATIVE have discussed the concept of security to some length and have eventually settled on considering mainly security as personal safety. But how do participants understand security first and foremost? Three possible options:

- **Personal safety:** physical safety of self and close family and related property.

- **Socio-economic:** an understanding of security that starts from the personal level but includes also the economic / financial dimensions (e.g. job security) and the safety net of public assistance and social security.

- **Collective identity:** the main referent object of security are collective identities (e.g. ‘our culture’, ‘our religion’, ‘our nation’, ‘our welfare state’, etc.) that are perceived as threatened.
**Security intensity**

Regardless of the prevailing understanding of security in the case (security scope, see above), how relevant is the ‘security’ dimension for the case, how important is the ‘security’ signifier for the participants?

- **Low**: there is almost no language of security.
- **Medium-low**: somehow important.
- **Medium-high**: important.
- **High**: very important.

**Participation**

Does the Victim-Offender-Community model – and related discursive framing identifying clear roles for those affected by a conflict as victims, offenders and community members – of participating stakeholders apply to the case? In case it does, which of the main stakeholders’ groups (V | O | C) did actually participate?

Regardless of the V-O-C stakeholders model, what type of stakeholders did participate in the case, viz.:

- **Civic**: E.g.: civic association, community reps., NGO, political parties
- **Public**: E.g.: any governmental / statutory agency at any level of government
- **Private**: E.g.: business, private sector
- **International / non-local**: E.g.: INGO, EU institutions and their proxies, and non-local actors for highly localised cases.

Participation *completeness*: all relevant stakeholders were included or, vice-versa, no important stakeholder was left out of the process. Who are the *relevant* stakeholders? This is precisely the result of a stakeholder analysis (interests, power distribution, etc.) and depends of many factors, including the objectives or the action itself.

Admittedly, this operationalisation and formalisation of participation is still anchored to the standard restorativeness criterion of stakeholders groups presence (V-O-C). It does not reflect key ownership variables whose importance have been outlined during the last year of the project. We will take into account this limitation when analysing the data about participation.
Public stakeholders

The participation of public stakeholders – public institutions at all levels of government, elected or appointed – is considered relevant to test various hypothesis on the relationship between RJ processes and governance models and is therefore included as a dichotomous condition on its own. In particular, because of its influence on the formalisation of justice and relevance to the kind of ‘lifeworld’ approach to justice that is specific to RJ, it is important to map whether representative of the police or other law enforcement agencies have been involved in the process.

Outcomes

Based on the project’s objectives and the theoretical results of the earlier phases (see deliverables from D1.1 through D3.3) we identify here some outcomes at the case level that alone or in combination with each other are relevant in operationalising the overall project outcomes. Some aspects of the action research process can be considered as outcomes in themselves and will be presented first.

Intervention as outcome

The action research intervention as an outcome in itself (considering that not all cases saw a significant intervention for various reasons), assessed according to its intensity.

Justice formalisation

Main criterion: the action research’s distance from, or degree of interpenetration with the Law & Court system (criminal and civil justice system: State Law System: SLS, including police and public order agencies) and thus ultimately a measure of the legally enforceable coercive potential underlying the action research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A practice where there is a direct and explicit involvement of the</td>
<td>The case goes to Court or A Court-<strong>mandated</strong> RJ practice like VOM and</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal Justice system</td>
<td>other RJ practices where referral and oversight are strongly controlled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by SLS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A practice where there is an indirect but still palpable involvement of</td>
<td>A Court-<strong>influenced</strong> RJ practice VOM and other RJ practices where</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the formal Justice system.</td>
<td>referral and oversight are influenced by SLS but with more degrees of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom for the other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A RJ practice where the ‘shadow of coercion’ is relatively remote</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A RJ practice freely agreed upon by the participants without any</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coercive potential.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: *Justice formalisation assessment*

Considering that the desired outcome for RJ process is whether the ‘system’ of formal justice has not played a relevant role, the ‘lifeworld’ condition semantic is the opposite of justice formalisation.

Idealised cases on the Justice formalisation / Practice formalisation continuum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice formalisation</th>
<th>Justice formalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>(low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted conference on</td>
<td>'Sewing circle' with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teenager misbehaviour</td>
<td>participants discussing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>held at a community</td>
<td>about neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre on a volunteer</td>
<td>issues of misbehaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court-mandated VOM</td>
<td>Researcher ‘chatting’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who eventually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sues his neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about a dispute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: *Justice vs practice formalisation double continuum*
Participation as outcome

The researchers assess participation as outcome based on the completeness of stakeholders representation in either the three-stakeholders VOC model or a broader model where stakeholders are not assigned to predefined roles. Reference hypothesis: participation vs delegation in RJ.

For the VOC participation model the database assigns the following participation scores:

– full participation (100%) if all three main stakeholder groups (V, O, C) are present.
– very good participation (80%) if Victim and Offender are both present.
– good participation (60%) for these configurations: V and C, O and C.
– low participation (30%) if only one stakeholder group (V or O) is present.

For the non-VOC participation model (i.e. where none of the participant groups identify themselves as either ‘victim’ or ‘offender’), provided that the participation is complete, i.e. all relevant stakeholders are present, the presence of various types of stakeholders (civic, public, private) is deemed to increase the quality of participation in general, taking into account that some of these stakeholders types may not be relevant in certain cases.

Restorative outcomes

The researchers assess the following outcomes as dichotomous conditions (i.e. absence or presence, yes or no) based on the established evaluation criteria of restorative outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restored Communication</td>
<td>Assessment of the quality of communication among participants during and after the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility</td>
<td>The participants accept responsibility for their actions in the conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 RJ manuals often include also the apology as a desirable outcome, however a preliminary study of the project documents drafted by the different work packages showed that the notion of apology figured significantly only in the conceptual framework and field work conducted in Serbia, while it was hardly mentioned elsewhere. Considering that the action research in Serbia itself did not deploy actual restorative practices on actual cases, this specific outcome has been omitted from the case formalisation.
### Table 9: Restorative outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing positions</td>
<td>The participants change their initial positions towards a more open and co-operating attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement reached</td>
<td>The parties in the conflict reach and agreement about how to manage it and move ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in security / safety perceptions</td>
<td>When the intervention led to observed changes in the security / safety perceptions of the participants. Important condition, but not systematically monitored and difficult to operationalise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaired Harm</td>
<td>When the practice facilitated by the intervention led to some kind of reparation of the harm claimed by some of the participants. Considering the RJ specificities, this is particularly relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Conflict</td>
<td>When the conflict is premised on structural conditions and have a continuous character, although with varying intensity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Treatment</td>
<td>The intervention is still ongoing at the moment of the final assessment, normally because it is carried out by partner agencies with a degree of independence from the research project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comprehensive RJ outcome**

The identification and definition of a comprehensive restorative justice outcome is a problem in itself and will be discussed below in section 4.1 (page 148). As a very rough and preliminary approximation, the database combines the main dimensions that characterise RJ processes in general (Pelikan 2003; Pelikan 2007):

- Communication: the intervention somehow facilitated the restoration of open, engaged, respectful communication among participants.
- Participation: there was a wide and meaningful participation of various stakeholders in the process (*participation vs delegation*).
- ‘Lifeworld’: the formal justice system and its institutions were only moderately involved, if at all (*lifeworld* vs *system*)
- Reparation: there was some reparation of the harm claimed by participants (*reparation vs retribution*).

Without restoration of communication it is unlikely that any of the other dimensions can yield significant results, thus it will be considered as a preliminary requirement. If communication has been somehow restored, the comprehensive restorative justice
outcome is assessed taking into account that participation, ‘lifeworld’ and reparation are *integrated* components of a meaningful restorative process as defined here, so that a fully restorative outcome will need all of them to be high and significant. At the same time, they are valuable also in themselves separately or, put in another way, it would be unreasonable to almost completely discard the restorative value of a process where one of the three components is missing or weak (as implied by the tight integration assumption). As an example, it would hard to rule out the restorative value of a successful mediation that involves plural participation and substantial reparation of harm only because it involved some degree of latent coercion.

1.5.4 | **Visual analysis of subset inclusion relationships**

The data corresponding to the various conditions can be plotted using bubble diagrams where three variables can be represented at the same time: horizontal axis, vertical axis and bubble radius. Each chart shows a fourth colour-coded variable representing the research site: light blue for Vienna (WP4), light yellow for Hungary (WP5), light green for Serbia (WP6), light orange for Northern Ireland (WP7). The chart space is normalised for the values assumed by the variables on the scale from one to five. Binary variables are mapped to 1.5 (No, zero) and 4.5 (Yes, one). To take into account that there are both a margin of ambiguity in the definition of the variables and a subjective element in the researcher assessment, at the time of charting a white noise random error in the interval from -0.5 to +0.5 is added to each data point. Apart from acknowledging the qualitative and constructed origin of the data, the random noise has the added benefit of scattering data points around within the limits of their semantic portion of space, thus allowing for a more readable chart. While each chart rendering is different from the other in the minutes details, its qualitative properties – it goes without saying – do not change and it can be employed as a useful descriptive tool.

1.5.5 | **QCA**

The database interface allows the researcher to select which cases, conditions and outcomes are to be made available for the fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis implemented with code written by this author for the R environment and using the QCA libraries (Duşa and Thiem 2014; Thiem and Duşa 2013).
Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) was introduced and developed by Charles Ragin (1987). A more recent overview of the state of the methodology taking stock of past experience, criticism and new development can be found in book-length form in Rihoux & Ragin (2009) and Schneider & Wagemann (2012) or, in a shorter format, in Marx, Rihoux & Ragin (2014).

Like other case-oriented comparative methods, QCA’s goals are in the field of historical interpretation, where it is important to develop a coherent narrative taking into account the time sequence of events and its context, and causal analysis.

The main uses of the method are, first, to summarise data describing cases in a synthetic way. Second, to check the analytical coherence of a given set of cases vs relevant causal conditions (detecting ‘contradictions’, i.e. logically problematic configurations). Third, to evaluate existing theories. Fourth, to assess new ideas, propositions, conjectures (data exploration). Fifth, the elaboration of new theories. In the current exercise we will deploy QCA towards the bottom range of its application range, namely a synthetic descriptive analysis of the empirical evidence from the action research sites, checking the analytical coherence of the data and a limited testing of certain conceptual interpretations.

The main strength of comparative methods is in their combinatorial character (Ragin 1987, 13). First, construct useful empirical typologies of cases and identify causal conditions that concur to explain a phenomenon (outcome). Second, infer an explanation of how a combination of these conditions is linked to an outcome. Third, test all logically possible combinations of the same conditions with empirical data from other cases in order to assess multiple conjunctural causation of the INUS type. INUS conditions are Insufficient (not sufficient by itself) but Necessary components of causal combinations that, in turn, are each Unnecessary (because of the existence of multiple causal paths) but Sufficient for the outcome (Mackie 1974).

Compared with classic comparative methods (e.g. J.S. Mill’s method of argument and indirect method of difference), Ragin built on exemplary comparative works like Barrington-Moore’s Social Origins of Democracy and Dictatorship seeking more rigour and formalisation. The use of boolean algebra introduces a modicum of formal techniques, although QCA is clearly not a statistical method. Its quantitative side looks for
logical regularities, inclusions relationships between subsets, not frequentist/statistical ones.

The main features of the original QCA method of 1987 and following years as summarised by Marx, Rihoux and Ragin himself (2014) are that it is:

1. **Case-based**: the case is treated as a whole, keeping its integrity, while different parts within it relate to each other. Operationalisation: represent the case as a configuration of variables, called in QCA causally relevant conditions linked to an outcome.

2. **Comparative**: find similarities and differences between configurations of causal conditions. Analytical tool: truth table. It is the matrix of all logically possible configurations of causal conditions.

3. **Iterative** way of developing an explanatory model: when an identical configuration of causal conditions is linked to both presence and absence of an outcome we are in presence of a ‘contradiction’. The researcher checks for omitted causal conditions and reiterates the analysis.

4. **Assessment of multiple conjunctural causation**: context-specific notion of causation.

5. Researchers can **reduce the empirical complexity** of the cases applying boolean algebra. The result is a ‘parsimonious configuration’. There are various software tools that help with this.

In the so-called crisp-set QCA all conditions are codified with dichotomous (boolean) variables, i.e. they can assume only two values like yes/no, true/false, 0/1, thus making straightforward the application of well established boolean algebra theorems and techniques (De-Morgan, Karnaugh, etc.) for simplifying boolean expressions.

Following Ragin’s seminal publication, the debate focused on the following critical issues:

a) **Case sensitivity**: the inclusion or exclusion of a single case can radically alter the analysis.

b) The use of dichotomous variables often implies too rough simplifications (see multi-values and fuzzy-set version of QCA developed as a response).
c) Limited diversity problem: if the analysis has identified \( k \) different causal conditions, the logically possible combinations of these conditions are \( 2^k \). With the exponential explosion of the number of possible configurations the empirical data occupy only a small fraction of the logical combinatorial space and there is the risk, relative to the actual number of cases, of making each case so unique, distant from the others, as to become idiosyncratic. If each case is represented in the space of causal conditions by an utterly different vector of variables, it is not possible to carry out any meaningful comparison and only descriptions are possible.

d) Omitted variable bias: on the other end of the spectrum, if the number of causal conditions is too little relative to the number of cases, there is the risk of observing too many regularities and inferring causal relations that have no empirical basis.

e) Lack of longitudinal perspective. The method is static, there is no time dimension or sequence of variables.

f) QCA assumes case independence (like all variable-oriented methods).

Taking into account especially (c) and (d), the authors recommend as a rule-of-thumb to keep a 3 to 1 ratio between cases and conditions in order to have sufficient diversity of cases but at the same time avoiding to saturate the conditions space in such a way that each case becomes unique (relative to the chosen set of conditions) and therefore not comparable in a meaningful way.

The application of QCA in ALTERNATIVE is methodologically problematic. Even if the original research design foresaw a qualitative comparative analysis of the four action research sites, it did not contemplate QCA. QCA as developed by Ragin and others in the last 25 years is a particular way of doing comparative, case-oriented analysis based on qualitative methods meant to address the shortcomings or limitations of previous comparative methods. Interesting as it is it would not be applicable to ALTERNATIVE if the ‘cases’ definition would be limited to the four action research programmes, each considered as a whole.

However, switching the unit of analysis to the expanded ‘case’ definition as presented above, with a multiplicity of them in each action research site, it is possible to apply
QCA on a sufficient number of cases and this has been implemented in particular as fuzzy-set QCA in R. The code is reproduced in annex (page 201).

The last methodological node to untie is the problem of how to treat the context within QCA, taking into account that as discussed earlier we are modelling the ‘intercultural context’ as a set of conditions and that cases from the same research sites are non independent from each other relatively to cases in other research sites where the context changes significantly. The debate among QCA researchers is interesting. Some propose using a multilevel approach, in our case subdividing cases by working package (Denk 2010; Denk and Lehtinen 2013). Others argue for just adding the context conditions to the others and run a single analysis (Thiem 2014). Interesting but moot for us because of the limited diversity problem: we do not simply have enough cases in each work package for a first level QCA run and adding the context conditions to the whole dataset would likewise expand too much the combinatorial space. Taking into account these limitations we will apply QCA cautiously to all the cases available without over-stretching its explanatory remit.
2 | Cases descriptive analysis

Descartes himself studied the way balls move and collide, how they gather speed as they go down ramps, et cetera, and tried to explain all of his data in terms of a theory that was purely geometrical in nature. The result of his lucubrations was classically French in that it did not square with reality but it was very beautiful and logically coherent.

(a fictional letter from Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz to the secretary of the Royal Society in Neal Stephenson’s *Quicksilver*, 2003, 802)

The 28 cases analysed here have been selected by the researchers in each site because they are particularly informative of the kind of processes and dilemmas involved in researching new understandings of justice and security in situations of conflicts in intercultural contexts. They do not exhaust the range of research activities carried out by the ALTERNATIVE partners. For example, in Hungary the researchers chose only six cases for in depth study and the comparative analysis out of more than 40 that they collected during the years of the project. Failures – vis a vis some kind of baseline restorative justice metric that itself will need re-assessment – are as important as successes in this kind of qualitative analysis and they have been included regardless of their statistic prevalence. The cases analysed here are therefore representative of the action research activities carried out in each site, although not in a statistical way.

2.1 | Dataset

A brief description of each case / situation, whose details can be found in the project documents for each work package and in the comparative grids.
**WP4-c01 Mediation G-M** – Observation of the mediation session between two neighbours living one upstairs of the other in one of the housing estates, about issues of noise.

**WP4-c02 Graffiti** – An ‘Anti-Islamic’ graffiti is found on the wall of one of the social housing estates and it triggers some anxiety and uneasiness. A circle is organised to reflect on it.

**WP4-c03 Frauencafé workshop** – Communication capacity building workshop at the Women’s café, a meeting place for women in one of the housing estates.

**WP4-c04 Frauencafé circle** – Attempted circle at the Women’s cafe trying to address the issue of a group of ‘Turkish’ women who left the room during a lecture on Christmas traditions organised by other community workers.

**WP4-c05 Bassena workshop** – Communication workshop at one of the social housing estates focusing on Anna’s story and the difficulties of an elderly woman dealing with groups of lively children playing loudly on her doorstep.

**WP4-c06 Film-making** – Participatory film-making with the teenagers of one of the housing estates. The adolescents referred to themselves as foreigners, although they had been born in Austria. They talked of the stigmatisation of their housing estate due to class and ethnic issues. The adult they interview speaks of the problems dealing with youth in the estate.

**WP4-c07 Bassena circle** – A restorative circle about issues of noise and misbehaviour in the housing estate. One of the participants referred of a ‘real’ situation of noise in the neighbourhood that affected her and ‘played’ herself, while the others roles (children and their parents) were played by other participants and not by the actual parties involved in the case.

**WP4-c08 Mediation S-O** – Observation of the mediation session between two neighbours living one upstairs of the other in one of the housing estates, about issues of noise.
WP4-c09 Mediation K-G – Observation of the mediation session between two neighbours living one upstairs of the other in one of the housing estates, about issues of noise.

* * *

WP5-c01 Butcher’s festival – Several sessions of the Municipal council discussing the organisation of and participation in the traditional Butcher’s festival, trying to address the complaints of the Roma inhabitants who maintained that in the previous edition they could not afford the entrance ticket and felt excluded.

WP5-c02 Charity provision – Conflict around the distribution of aid packages by the Red Cross where a Roma woman questions the eligibility criteria of potential recipients.

WP5-c03 Civic guard – Discussions around the ‘Civic guard’ (volunteer night watch patrols) and failed attempt to establish a new one open to the Roma minority.

WP5-c04 Roma conflicts – Conflicts within the Roma community where an unemployed woman (who once held some governmental position though) accuses the incumbent leader of the Roma minority self-government of favouring only certain families (related to him) in the distribution of the resources he has access to through his public office.

WP5-c05 The school – In the local school some Roma children are accused of theft by teachers and principal. Their parents complain that they have been singled out unfairly and mistreated and in turn accuse the teachers of racism. An attempted circle trying to address this conflict does not take off despite preparatory interviews.

WP5-c06 Healing circle – Psychological support, post-electoral debriefing and restoring morale with the former mayor after his defeat in the local elections.

* * *
WP6-c01 Workshop BP 1 communication – Seminar in Bačka Palanka, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on the empirical research findings on victimisation, gender and ethnicity.

WP6-c02 Workshop BP 1 security – Seminar in Bačka Palanka, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on survey findings about feeling of safety – Feeling of safety: similarities and differences.

WP6-c03 Workshop BP 3 RJ – Seminar in Bačka Palanka, Workshop 3 on restorative justice and conflict resolution: testing restorative circle model.

WP6-c04 Workshop M 1 communication – Seminar in Medvedja, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on the empirical research findings on victimisation, gender and ethnicity.

WP6-c05 Workshop M 1 security – Seminar in Medvedja, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on survey findings about feeling of safety – Feeling of safety: similarities and differences.

WP6-c06 Workshop M 3 RJ – Seminar in Medvedja, Workshop 3 on restorative justice and conflict resolution: testing restorative circle model.

WP6-c07 Workshop P 1 communication – Seminar in Prijepolje, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on the empirical research findings on victimisation, gender and ethnicity.

WP6-c08 Workshop P 1 security – Seminar in Prijepolje, Workshop 1 on communication about conflicts, victimisation and security: small groups discussion on survey findings about feeling of safety – Feeling of safety: similarities and differences.

WP6-c09 Workshop P 3 RJ – Seminar in Prijepolje, Workshop 3 on restorative justice and conflict resolution: testing restorative circle model.

* * *
**WP7-c01 Polish family** – Two neighbours in dispute in South Belfast in July (parade season); one is a local resident and the other is a Polish family. The Polish family complained about rubbish falling into their garden and some flags falling over the fence. The local woman complained that they were not respecting her flag and her culture. The house and car of the Polish family had been damaged maliciously and another house in the street occupied by a foreign family had been attacked. Having listened to both sides of the story a RJ practitioner organised a conference inviting a wide set of stakeholders.

**WP7-c02 SH housing** – Tensions and procedures around the announced construction of 100 new apartments of social housing in Seymour Hill (South Belfast). The conflict has several dimensions: local working class protestant-unionist-loyalist (PUL) residents feel entitled to the new social housing after many years of neglect but fear that they might be assigned to families from other neighbourhoods thus altering the composition of the community. The Housing agency, developers and local politicians do a poor job of informing the residents.

**WP7-c03 Dunmurry** – Anti-social behaviour and generational conflict in Dunmurry (South Belfast). Committee meeting of the Greater Dunmurry Positive Relations Partnership (GDPRP) to discuss issues affecting the local Dunmurry village which is considered a frontier as it lies equidistant between loyalist and nationalist areas.

**WP7-c04 Musgrave Park** – Conflict between young people and the local residents in South Belfast resulting from anti-social behaviour of young people who are gathering in local parks on weekends.

Based on the case formalisation outlined earlier in section 1.5.1 and the data validated by the researchers, the dataset looks like the following.

Conditions key:

- MF  Moral framing
- HC  Harm claims
- JC  Justice claims
- PF  Practice formalisation
- II  Intervention intensity
- RI  Researchers involvement
- SS  Security scope
- SI  Security intensity
- PUB Public stakeholders participating
- P  Police officers participating
- VOC Victims, Offenders, Community participation model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c01 Mediation G-M</td>
<td>2 4 4 1 4 5 1 2 1 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c02 Graffiti</td>
<td>2 4 4 2 5 1 4 4 5 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c03 Frauencafe ws</td>
<td>1 5 2 2 2 5 5 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c04 Frauencafe circle</td>
<td>1 4 4 1 5 5 4 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c05 Bassena ws</td>
<td>1 4 1 1 2 1 5 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c06 Film-making</td>
<td>2 1 1 2 1 1 5 2 3 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c07 Bassena circle</td>
<td>1 4 4 1 5 1 5 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c08 Mediation S-O</td>
<td>2 4 4 1 4 5 1 2 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c09 Mediation K-G</td>
<td>2 4 4 1 4 5 1 2 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c01 Butcher's festival</td>
<td>5 4 4 2 5 5 2 4 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c02 Charity provision</td>
<td>4 5 4 2 5 5 5 4 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c03 Civic guard</td>
<td>1 1 1 5 1 5 5 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c04 Roma conflicts</td>
<td>4 2 2 1 1 1 5 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c05 The school</td>
<td>2 4 4 1 1 5 4 4 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c06 Healing circle</td>
<td>5 1 4 4 5 5 4 1 3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c01 Wshop BP 1 comm</td>
<td>1 5 4 1 2 5 5 4 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c02 Wshop BP 1 sec</td>
<td>1 5 4 5 2 5 5 4 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c03 Wshop BP 3 RJ</td>
<td>5 5 5 4 2 5 5 4 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c04 Wshop M 1 comm</td>
<td>1 5 5 2 2 5 5 4 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c05 Wshop M 1 sec</td>
<td>5 5 1 5 2 5 5 4 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c06 Wshop M 3 RJ</td>
<td>5 5 4 4 2 5 5 4 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c07 Wshop P 1 comm</td>
<td>1 5 4 2 2 5 5 4 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c08 Wshop P 1 sec</td>
<td>5 5 4 5 2 5 5 4 3 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c09 Wshop P 3 RJ</td>
<td>5 5 5 4 2 5 5 4 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c01 Polish family</td>
<td>4 4 5 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c02 SH housing</td>
<td>4 5 5 4 5 5 2 4 5 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c03 Dunmurry</td>
<td>2 4 4 4 5 5 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c04 Musgrave Park</td>
<td>2 2 4 4 1 5 5 2 1 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For dichotomous conditions, the No value (absence) is mapped to 1 and the Yes value (presence) is mapped to 5 in the [1,2;4,5] scale used for the other conditions.

Some cases are (almost) ‘identical’ in the current formalisation, but we have to consider also the outcomes before making a final decision about the cases that could be omitted from the more formal Qualitative Comparative Analysis that will follow in another section. For the time being the dataset will be considered as it is.

The database system where these data are stored can easily generate charts representing two or three variables (conditions or outcomes) at a time. Considering that all conditions assume either dichotomous (binary) values or are the result of a double dichotomy (e.g. first between low and high and later between very high or intermediate high), representing the cases as a scatter plot in the space of two (double) dichotomous conditions allows for quick inspection of logical relationships between them. For example if the cases scatter points are plotted according to a similar pattern (in grey the
quadrants where there are cases, in white where there are not), this is the visual depiction of a logic implication whereby A would be a 'sufficient condition' for B. This is QCA set-theoretical language where an inclusion relationship between a set and sub-set is given a 'causal' meaning, therefore A => B is the same as saying that in the space of the cases considered, the set of cases that verify condition A is a subset of the set of cases that verify condition B.

A condition’s capitalised letter stands for its Yes / presence / intermediate-high to very-high values; while the non capitalised letter stands for the negated value, i.e. No / absence / very-low to intermediate-low.

### 2.2 Implications (subset inclusions) between conditions

Considering the relatively high number of combinations of conditions, tentative bilateral logical implication relationships between conditions can be more conveniently explored automatically with a simple routine written in R. The results are summarised in the following relationships and will be analysed in depth below:

| II => HC | The high intervention intensity practices happen only in cases with explicit and serious harm claims. | 49 |
| VOC => HC | A ‘standard’ RJ participation model where the roles of victims, offenders and community are well identified applies only in cases with explicit and serious harm claims and where there are public institutions’ representatives among the participants. |
| VOC => PUB | When security – regardless of the scope of the definition – is more of a concern (high security intensity) there is always a public stakeholder present. |
| SI => PUB | The cases that are morally framed as ‘wrongdoing’ (as opposed to misbehaviour or the morally ‘neutral’ conflict of interest) are dealt with through more formal practices. |
| MF => PF | All the cases that the researchers observed without having a more prominent role in them involved are high intensity interventions with more formalised practices, explicit harm claims and the participation of public stakeholders. |
| P => PUB | (by definition, police officers are a subset of public stakeholders) |

### 2.3 | Intercultural contexts

One of ALTERNATIVE’s main conceptual clarifications and methodological hypothesis is that its object of research are conflicts in intercultural settings (as opposed to conflating them, and in fact already assuming a conflict model, in opaque ‘intercultural conflicts’). Bearing this in mind, the cases formalisation keeps intercultural context separate from the type of conflict.

From the context analysis of each site and the additional synthetic characterisations added by the researchers in the case formalisation – crude dichotomous schematisations that pale in comparison to the nuanced analysis but can be useful if supported by it – we will present here only the essential dimensions of the intercultural context of the action research.

WP4: The main dimensions of the intercultural context in Vienna are ethnic diversity originating in relatively recent (last few decades) international migration. Additional dimensions, often but not necessarily in combination with the former, are subtle but relevant differences in social class and increasingly visible religious diversity, as well as age differences between residents of the Gemeindebau. In some cases also gender diversity contributes to defining the context.
WP5: The intercultural context in Kisváros is characterised first and foremost by ethnic diversity and socio-economic inequalities (social class). The latter is not restricted to the generally poor and marginalised Roma minority, but it encompasses cleavages of social status, influence, wealth and profession among the non-Roma population, especially connected with the condition of newcomers that moved to the town in the recent past. The ethnic diversity between Roma and non-Roma inhabitants sometimes acquires open racists overtones.

WP6 : Ethnic diversity is by far the dominant feature of the intercultural landscape in the three towns in Serbia. However, it is not the only one and it is combined with additional components of religious diversity, social class cleavages and diverging historical memories. Domestic migrations, different timescapes for the generations defined by the armed conflicts of the 90s and a heightened sensitivity to gender issues add texture to the picture.

WP7: The different historical memories, not limited to the ‘Troubles’ of the last decades, intersected with deep seated working class community identities define the main outlines of the intercultural context in South Belfast and London/Derry. These are complemented by the traditional religious cleavages, inter-generational timescapes and ethnic diversity brought by recent international migrations to Northern Ireland’s main urban centres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage (percent of cases) in each site</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>All WPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical memory</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration – international</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration – national</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Intercultural context dimensions
This initial characterisation can be complemented with the addition of some of the main institutional and societal ecology conditions in the four action research sites, based on the context reports by the researchers in each site and some additional research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WP4 (Austria / Vienna)</th>
<th>WP5 (Hungary)</th>
<th>WP6 (Serbia)</th>
<th>WP7 (UK/NI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-war</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from socialist regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strength</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low (captured by political parties, interest groups, especially at the local level)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive new governance model</td>
<td>Less pronounced, mitigated by paternalist / corporatist legacy</td>
<td>Mixed with weaker institutions</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
<td>More pronounced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare-state</td>
<td>Strong, transition to selective means-testing mitigated by paternalist / corporatist legacy</td>
<td>Weakened by transition, legacy universalism?</td>
<td>Weakened by transition, legacy universalism?</td>
<td>Strong, transition to selective means-testing more advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality(^4)</td>
<td>Low (0.27)</td>
<td>Low (0.27)</td>
<td>Low (0.29)</td>
<td>Medium-high (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalised trust(^5)</td>
<td>Medium (5.1) embedded in welfare institutions</td>
<td>Medium-low (4.8), low ‘bridging’ social capital</td>
<td>Medium-low (?)</td>
<td>Medium-high nationally (5.4). High within community, low ‘bridging’ social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in institutions: the national government (EU28 avg. 31%)</td>
<td>Medium-low (42%)</td>
<td>Low (34%)</td>
<td>Medium-Low (39%)</td>
<td>Medium-Low (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^5\) Data source: European Social Survey 2012 (data for Austria 2014), average score to the question ‘Most people can be trusted or you can’t be too careful’ from 0 to 10. No data for Serbia from the same survey, using estimate from similar surveys.

\(^6\) Data source: EU Eurobarometer, 2015; question: ‘I would like to ask you a question about how much trust you have in certain institutions. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it? Percentage answering ‘Tend to trust’ (European Commission 2015).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WP4 (Austria / Vienna)</th>
<th>WP5 (Hungary)</th>
<th>WP6 (Serbia)</th>
<th>WP7 (UK/NI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in regional or local public authorities (EU28 avg. 47%)</td>
<td>Medium-high (62%)</td>
<td>Medium (52%)</td>
<td>Very low (19%)</td>
<td>Medium (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in national legal / justice system (EU28 avg. 52%)</td>
<td>High (72%)</td>
<td>Medium (45%)</td>
<td>Low (38%), but increasing from previous year (24%)</td>
<td>High (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the police (EU28 avg. 69%)</td>
<td>High (77%)</td>
<td>Medium (55%)</td>
<td>Medium (47%)</td>
<td>High (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption⁷</td>
<td>Low (.72)</td>
<td>Medium (.54)</td>
<td>Medium-high (.41)</td>
<td>Low (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in civic organisations</td>
<td>Medium-low (corporatist legacy)</td>
<td>High (but little 'bridging' across groups)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High (but little 'bridging' across communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ status</td>
<td>Well established in research, legislation and practice</td>
<td>Well established in research, legislation and practice in Budapest but not in the small town where the research took place</td>
<td>Established in research, not known in particular in the research sites</td>
<td>Well established in legislation and practice, strong community bases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Synopsis of societal ecology and institutional conditions in the research sites

These variables are essentially defined at the national level and we assume that there are no significant differences between the different research locations within these two working packages, namely South Belfast and London/Derry in Northern Ireland; Bačka Palanka, Medvedja and Prijepolje in Serbia.

It is worth underlying that only in Serbia those interviewed tend to trust more the national government than the regional or local authorities, while the general trend at the European Union level seems the opposite (with a notable exception in Greece). If people tend to trust less the public institutions that are closer to them rather than the more remote national government it could be related to direct experiences of incompetence, venality or outright predatory behaviour by local officers that have captured the institutions at the local level, circumstances that emerge with sufficient

---

⁷ Transparency International, perceptions of corruption in the public sector, 1= least corrupt, 0=most corrupt) (Transparency International 2014).
clarity from the field research conducted by ALTERNATIVE partners in Serbia (see deliverables D6.1 and D6.3).

2.3.1 | The form and importance of civil society organisations

The corporatist social arrangements in Austria left a legacy on active participation and civic organisation, whereby ‘urban residents’ sense of security is based on their trust in “the system” (i.e. local welfare state and the urban infrastructure) rather than on regular involvement in activities and patterns of association and participation operating on a local level (Sessar 2004, 105, quoted in WP4 context report). One of the partners in the research project is the NGO Bassena, but the residents of the social estates are not organised and they relate to the mediation services or social workers as individuals. Old institutions like the tenants’ representative do not seem to be meaningful in the changing societal ecology of the Gemeindebau.

There is a vibrant and articulated civil society in Kisváros, but civic organisations hardly straddle social borders between the various local groups of interests, such as the ‘native villagers’ and the ‘newcomers’, the active and non-active members of the Catholic church, the Roma and the non-Roma, the supporters of the previous and of the present regime, the poor and rich residents and the representatives of the different ideologies. New cleavages between Roma and non-Roma and ‘native villagers’ vs ‘newcomers’ are the less porous. Researchers observed how leaders or officials, from the Roma minority elected leader to the school principal (vis-à-vis the teachers) exercise a gatekeeping role towards their constituencies.

All research sites in Serbia are multi-ethnic towns in the border regions of the country. Bač and Bačka Palanka are in the region of Vojvodina, bordering with Croatia; Prijepolje in the region of south-west Serbia near the border with Bosnia; Medvedja is in the region of south Serbia bordering with Kosovo (although unrecognised by Serbia). The divisions along ethnic lines often prevent establishment of normal relationships within the ethnically mixed communities and the researches “explored the relations and existing conflicts between Serbs and Croats (in Bač and Bačka Palanka), Serbs and Bosniaks/Muslims (in Prijepolje), and Serbs and Albanians (in Medvedja), and the way people solve them, including how victims are treated, security perceptions and the place
of restorative justice” (WP6 context report). Despite the focus on ethnic divisions, in each location there are multiple cleavages:

There are conflicts and divisions among Serbs and other ethnic groups themselves which are connected with their belonging to different political and other social groups, differences in their war victimisation and other factors (for example, between communists and anti-communists, between supporters of nationalist leaders and their opponents, between Serbs from Serbia and Serbs from other parts of the former Yugoslavia, between refugees and local population, war participants and those who did not participate in war etc.). The entire population of Serbia (Serbs but also other ethnic groups such as Roma, Albanians, Bosniaks, Hungarians, Croats etc.) were victims of both immediate and long-term consequences of NATO air strikes (Nikolić-Ristanović 2003, quoted in WP6 context report).

In Northern Ireland there is a vibrant civil society\(^8\) where communities play a strong role. However, it is still mostly divided along the old conflict line between the two main groups (Republican-Nationalist-Catholic vs Unionist-Loyalist-Protestant), with the addition of immigrants from other European or developing countries as third minority. More recent trends towards the weakening of the community roots of the most successful civic organisations that are being co-opted as service providers by the statutory agencies (see next section), as well as intra-community conflicts – e.g. Loyalists vs Unionists or feuds between former unionist paramilitary organisations\(^9\) – that are sometimes reflected in civil organisation membership, including in the RJ field, where there is a strong constitutive link between ‘communities’ and restorative justice.\(^10\)

---

8 “Derry has a strong tradition of self-help initiatives meeting community development outcomes. The Northern Ireland Civil Rights movement origins in the late 1960s are strongly associated with Derry, indeed to the Bogside itself. The neighbourhoods which Divert work in have strong links to the Sinn Fein and SDLP political parties, including the senior leadership of these parties” (WP7 context report).

9 “Loyalism is a subset of Unionism and like the latter its adherents are in favour of the preservation of Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom. Loyalists are characterised for their mainly working class background and strong associations with para-militarism. They are ‘loyal’ primarily to Ulster and the Protestant monarchy rather than to the UK government” (WP7 #25).

10 “Restorative principles became more explicit through the work of reconciliation organisations such as the Quaker Peace Education project based in the University of Ulster (Tyrell 2002). The Quakers were
2.3.2 | The relationship between state and civil society

In Vienna there is a historical legacy of the corporatist social model with paternalistic overtones and distrust of ‘autonomous’ social initiatives.\(^{11}\)

With the accession of Austria to the European Union in 1995 and the corresponding conferral of sovereignty to the community level the interplay between state and society becomes more complex and it brings with it the transformation of the post WWII welfare state centred on social protection, introducing a new citizenship model\(^ {12}\) “from a universalistic policy of securing access to affordable housing for the working population to counteracting the exclusion of ‘new’ disadvantaged strata of the population, not least those with a migration background” (WP4 context report).

Despite the transition towards new governance models, in the Gemeindebau the role of the public hand embodied in the agency of the Municipality of Vienna for public housing, Wiener Wohnen, is still strong.

leaders in the field of restorative justice in the 1990s and supported the development of the Restorative Justice Forum which pressed government to introduce restorative justice in Northern Ireland. This Forum continues to be influential. [...] Introduction of the Youth Conference, which established restorative justice as the primary approach for the youth justice system. [...] Community schemes had up to that point taken referrals directly from members of the community. In 2006 the Community Restorative Justice Ireland (CRJI) scheme in west Belfast dealt with just over 1,000 cases. The schemes could take direct referrals and respond quickly, flexibly and informally. The new arrangements required all crimes to be reported directly to the PSNI. [...] The Greater Dunmurry Positive Relations Partnership (GDPRP) is made up of community groups from across the sectarian frontier including Dunmurry, Seymour Hill, Conway, Colin, Milltown and Lagmore. It meets to discuss any contentious issues such as parades.”

11 “Bottom-up ‘autonomous’ initiatives like the settlers’ movement that were surfacing immediately after WWI did not survive and came to a halt. In fact, after a phase of ‘wild settlements’ that can be characterised as an emergency measure and a short phase when these activities were supported by the administration of the City of Vienna, the movement became co-opted and suffocated by large scale efforts that became manifest in the Gemeindebau” (WP4 context report).

12 “While the welfare state itself has gone through a transformation, increasingly moving away from a system of ‘passive benefits’ to ‘social investment’ in human capital these developments are coupled with an emphasis on education in ‘active citizenship’, which envisions participatory individuals who are adaptable in an increasingly globalised society, and ready to contribute at local, national and transnational levels. This project, while expanding the boundaries and forms of participation in society, at the same time burdens the individual, rather than the state, with the obligation of ensuring social cohesion and solidarity” (WP4 context report).
The same kind of transition towards a new governance model and welfare reform happened in the United Kingdom earlier and perhaps deeper than in Vienna. The statutory agencies co-opt civic organisations and NGOs as partners into a decentralised system of service delivery slowly eroding their community roots. For example in London/Derry researchers report that

There was a sense that as a result of the agencies track record of being effective the state funders require forms of accountability that are bureaucratic. [The civil society partners’] relationship with the state system is characterised by: 1. Funding and funding contracts. 2. Referring people to health services. 3. Providing education programmes to schools. 4. Advocating on behalf of young people and families. (WP7 #25)

This applies to the University of Ulster research partners in Derry as well, where Divert are a community-based group that rely on state funding and “the researchers wonder if what was once seen as radical and innovative is now co-opted into general provision. The project workers recognise this tension experiencing at first hand how families are having to deal with the harm caused by the misuse of drugs yet often inhibited to seek support due to mistrust of the state’s services and the police.”

As Northern Ireland is democratised and modernised governmental agencies are keen to engage with the community or lifeworld but they do so with a strategic and professional mindset. As a consequence they consult local people to gain information which they believe will make their services more effective rather than mobilising the resources and energy of local people through communicative action. (WP7 #26)

While “there are sophisticated strategic partnerships between community organisations and statutory agencies’ in West Belfast and Derry, ‘these relationships have not developed as effectively in loyalist South Belfast,” where a significative amount of the action research has taken place (D7.4).

An important aspect of the relationship between state and civil society is the political manipulation or re-production of ethnic or communal identities. This does not have to
reach gruesome intensities as in the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s, but can manifest itself in more subtle ways. For example in Northern Ireland:

In an effort to ensure that the two main identities are represented in government, the settlement [following the peace agreements] has institutionalised a politics in which power is derived from maintaining balanced but separate identities rather than transforming relationships. This form of identity politics prioritises contentious cultural issues over economic or social problems. This sustains inter-communal conflict at community level. (WP7 context report)

The trajectory of restorative justice itself in Northern Ireland “can be understood as an example of what Habermas (1987) defines as the colonisation of the 'lifeworld' by the system” or ‘juridification’.13

In Kisváros there are a variety of civil society initiatives in many fields like charitable initiatives to culture. A peculiar state – civil society relationship is the one regarding the Roma minority:

Romany had never been considered as people constituting the nation until as late as 1993. Then, among the 13 national minorities, distinguished as the only ethnic minority, the Romany got the right to form local minority governments (WP5 context report)

Nevertheless, despite some high profile judicial cases that saw the public trial of perpetrators of hate crimes against some Roma citizens, the members of this minority are often victims of institutional discrimination.

A peculiar relationship between state and civil society that is still relevant in Serbia is the phenomenon of capture of state institutions by social groups, often expression of some politically organised interest, and the consequent weakening of the institutions and their capacity to provide public goods.

13 “McEvoy and Eriksson (2008) argue that the state saw community based restorative justice as a threat to its need to control and own justice and as a result sought to regulate community justice initiatives. Habermas (1987) refers to this as juridification.” (WP7 context report)
A Serb male NGO activist from Bačka Palanka (71 years old) said: “We started to expect bad things from state institutions instead of good regulations. We have inadequate laws that are useless.” He also said: “The awareness of people has to be raised, now they are easily manipulated by politicians.” (WP6 #08 and #20)

The capture of state institutions by one group was also one of the realities of the Troubles in Northern Ireland that strongly undermined trust in the criminal justice system and police forces:

Although the criminal justice system also pursued loyalist paramilitaries, it was perceived by republicans as part of the state apparatus directed against their struggle (Ruane and Todd 1996). This was compounded by the fact that police officers (Independent Commission on Policing in Northern Ireland 1999) were predominantly from the Protestant community. (WP7 context report)

2.4 | Types of conflict

This section will try to analytically address the problem of representation and description of the multi-layered complexity of the conflicts emerged during the field research and their non linear relationship with the intercultural background. A first approximation consists of identifying some components of the main conflict in each case, even if we are still at a rather high level of abstraction and each of these components is by construction essentially contentious (‘ethnic’, ‘religious’, ‘communal’ etc.). Looking at which components are prevailing in each site it will be possible to sketch initial typologies.

In the Vienna Gemeindebau the researchers found interpersonal conflicts between neighbours that are often, but not necessarily, overlapping with issues of misrecognition where different ethnic, religious and generational motives add complexity to the picture. Conflicts in the Gemeindebau are not directly politicised,14 although from

14 "Faced with a sharp increase in ethnic and cultural diversity in the Gemeindebau and the its politicisation by right wing identitarian parties, the statutory agencies of the Municipality responsible
the context analysis we know that the opening of the eligibility lists to residents without citizenship was, and indeed still is, a hotly contested political issue.

The ethno-cultural dimension of conflict – with the occasional ugly racist overtones and counter accusations of institutional discrimination – stands out in Kisváros. While this stands by and large for Roma vs non-Roma it would be a mistake to fold everything down to this easy monochromatism. In fact the researchers have shown how interpersonal and inter-generational issues are clearly relevant within each of the group bipolarities they identified (apart from Roma vs non Roma; Old residents vs Newcomers; Conservative catholics vs Secular / liberal sorts; Richer established city notables vs Poorer precarious upstarts). Conflicts in the small Hungarian town often find they representation in the political sphere whose field is deeply marked by the (former) mayor, his allies and adversaries.

The ethnic dimension prevails also in the conflicts reported to the researchers in the three locations in Serbia, but it is clearly associated with their politicisation and issues of socio-economic inequalities and redistribution. The manipulation of ethnic identities by rent-seeking and often predatory local political power holders are perhaps the crucial de-naturalising, defining feature of the ‘ethnic’ in these conflicts. The picture is completed by issues of institutional discrimination based on gender or ethnic minority status.

The conflict profile in cases reported from South Belfast is extremely composite, but issues of socio-economic redistribution are deeply felt in these working class communities. The consequences of a combination of welfare reform towards more competitive new-governance models, fiscal crisis, budget cuts, under-investment in educational services do figure prominently and directly in conflicts that manifest themselves at first as anti-social behaviour or hate crime cases against recent immigrants.

for the management of the Gemeindebau – like wohnpartner – have resorted to ‘strategies that aim at a de-politicisation of conflicts and [...] de-politicisation of belonging [...]. Both strategies address ‘all people’ regardless of their social and ethnic affiliation. Moreover, wohnpartner claims diversity and the support and cultivation of diversity as its pivotal aim’”(WP4 context report).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of conflict</th>
<th>Coverage (percent of cases) in each site</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Cultural’</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (institutional)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (mis-distribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity (mis-recognition)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHL violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old residents vs newcomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political (politicised)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public vs private space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Types of conflict

The ALTERNATIVE project deals with conflicts in intercultural settings (as opposed to conflating them, and in fact already assuming a conflict model, in opaque ‘intercultural conflicts’) and as a consequence the case formalisation analyses intercultural context separately from the types of conflict. One additional variable tries to gauge how relevant the intercultural context of the case is for the particular conflict that it deals with. Perhaps unsurprisingly, in a great majority of cases (20) this link is quite strong or somewhat strong (5), but it was important nevertheless to treat them separately and register some nuances in this link (for example when the interpersonal dimension of the conflict cannot be reduced to ethnic and cultural distance only, as in the mediations in Vienna) and allow for a few cases to be decoupled from their intercultural context (in particular the case of conflicts within the Roma community, for example).
2.4.1 | Ethnic diversity, social class and redistribution

Social class cleavages are the second most relevant dimension – after ethnic diversity – in the definition of the context in all sites, just as issues of socio-economic inequality and misdistribution are significative present in the definitions of the types of conflict studied in the cases. As we will see in section 3.7 (page 107) the combination of socio-economic and ethnic inequalities are the strongest social determinants of low generalised trust. Considering the importance of trust building – at least localised trust among participants – in restorative practices, this warrants some further analysis. In Vienna, for example,

The residents of social housing estates suffer from a general lack of resources. Compared to inhabitants living in other types of housing the residents of social housing estates have lower educational attainment, lower per capita income and higher unemployment rates. [Together with an] increased precariousness of their social and economic situation. A general loss of social standing has been diagnosed. Overall the social composition of the tenants changed from the 1970s onwards; the proportion of socio-economically disadvantaged households increased. [According to Christoph Reinprecht] we face an intersection of the social homogeneity of comparative economic deprivation and being dependent on social assistance on the one hand and ethnic heterogeneity on the other hand. (WP4 Context report)

In Kisváros “the typical issues connected to Romany people are twofold: part of it are directly connected to structural and economic issues as long-term unemployment, and poor living conditions and segregated education” (WP5 Context report).

Across the three sites in Serbia socio-economic concerns like joblessness or lack of economic opportunities emerge strongly in many interviews expressing how the lack of employment and perspectives makes young people leave: “People do not see a perspective here, they have no jobs, no society. And that is why we must raise awareness of young people, that they can live here, that they can live together” (WP6 #08, an Albanian NGO activist from Medvedja).

All research sites in Northern Ireland are working class neighbourhoods.
West Belfast is a large urban district in Belfast, which is largely working class, Catholic (92.5) and republican. It includes some of the most deprived areas in Northern Ireland. West Belfast includes the top two most deprived wards (Whiterock and the Falls) in Northern Ireland, out of a possible 582 ranked wards. Out of the eleven wards which constitute the west Belfast study area eight (73%) fall within the top 10% and five within the top two per cent of deprived wards in Northern Ireland illustrating that west Belfast is severely disadvantaged. [...] South Belfast is a densely populated urban district of Belfast city. It contains some of the most affluent residential areas as well relatively deprived working class communities. (WP7 context report)

The cases of hate crime in South Belfast are dramatic examples of the intersection of the ethnic and class issues:

I asked what they thought of the recent reports of hate crime in loyalist areas. They accepted that recent incidents involved local people protesting when immigrants moved into houses in the neighbourhood and in some cases intimidating them till they moved. They acknowledged that there was a racist dimension to the hate crimes but went on to say that racism did not fully explain it. They claimed that these incidents only occurred in relation to social housing rather than private rentals. There appeared to be a sense of entitlement among residents in relation to public housing that did not apply to the private sector.

They claimed that white Protestants from another area would be resented if they were allocated a Housing Executive or Housing Association house or apartment in the neighbourhood. This had happened recently when someone from Rathcoole (another loyalist area) moved in. However, they agreed that while the reaction to a Protestant outsider would be negative it would not be as aggressive as towards another nationality or race.

Houses are being bought by private landlords and rented to migrant workers and students. This restricts the availability of housing to the local working class families who have lived in the area for generations. Loyalism being a defensive identity politics against the threat of republicanism has been and
continues to be open to influence by right wing, racist politics. However, it also has a sense of class identity which contains the seed of a more progressive politics (WP7 #27).

2.5 | Types of practices and researchers’ involvement

To the different types of practices correspond varying, and decreasing in the order they are presented here, intensity of ‘activity’ of the research intervention, assessed looking at its potential social change. This is not therefore a measure of the level of how much the facilitators or mediators in each practice intervene or interfere with the process itself and the other participants. The latter is important in itself but has not been formalised in the case-based method. It will be addressed however in the section of participation as ownership of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice type</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Interventions where researchers where more substantially involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WP7: Polish family (observed by researchers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assembly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WP5: Butcher’s festival (observed) WP7: SH housing, Dunmurry (observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WP4: Graffiti, Bassena circle, Frauencafé circle WP5: Charity provision, Healing circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WP4: Mediations (G-M, S-O, K-G),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WP4: Frauencafé workshop, Bassena workshop WP7: Communication workshop (three locations BP, P, M), Security workshops (x3) in three locations, RJ workshop (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WP4: Film-making (video story-telling) WP5: Civic guard, Roma conflicts, The school WP7: Musgrave park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: Types of practices*

The practice of choice where the researchers have sought to test novel approaches to restorative justice for conflicts in intercultural settings is the circle. There are five cases of circles that were co-initiated and designed by the researchers. In ‘The school’ case in Hungary a circle was attempted based on a good amount of preparatory work in the form of interviews, but the intervention could not be carried out as planned for a variety
of reasons, chiefly the implicit refusal (withdrawal from cooperation) of one of the key stakeholders to participate.

Another practice that is strongly represented in the empirical base are the communication workshops as safe environments where to practice the principles of non-violent communication and do preparatory work for further restorative practices where actual conflicts are addressed by the affected persons. Apart from the 11 workshops listed and formalised here, of which nine held in three locations in Serbia, during the course of the project the researchers organised similar activities also in other locations.

_Illustration 4: Intervention intensity, researchers’ involvement, practice formalisation_
The chart above represents pictorially the three dimensional space of practice type (i.e. its intervention intensity), researchers’ involvement and practice formalisation. In the top-left quadrant we can find the cloud of rather formalised workshops, plus the informal video story-telling in Vienna, the ‘failed’ circle in Hungary (The school) and two other explorations at the difficulty at engaging in open communication about conflicts, still from Kisváros.

In the top-right quadrant are five cases where the researchers had a substantial role in restorative circles, almost all rather formalised. In the bottom-right quadrant there are a variety of practices that addressed conflict situations in a rather formal and intense way (mediations, public assemblies, conferences) that were observed by researchers during the project even if they had little say before and during these practices. We can also note how the action research practices carried out in Serbia and Northern Ireland and reported here cluster on two different vertexes of the space: formalised workshops organised by the researchers in Serbia; observation of public assemblies (part of long term conflicts followed up by the researchers) or other restorative practices in Northern Ireland. The cases from Kisváros and Vienna are more evenly distributed across a variety of typologies.

The last chart presented in this section illustrate the relationship between harm claims and intervention intensity. At first sight, there is a significant association between the intensity of the intervention – i.e. the kind of practice – and the kind of harms that are explicitly claimed by some of the participants. Conversely, if there are no explicit harm claims, the intensity of intervention is always low. There are cases where explicit harm claims are not addressed through a more intense restorative intervention and are worth clarifying. In the workshops organised in Serbia this happens by design: participants discussed issues of even severe harm that happened to themselves or to relatives, acquaintances or in the community, but they were not meant to be addressed in that occasion or through that kind of practice where the focus was more on communication.
In the case of Musgrave Park in South Belfast, an intervention might have occurred in the months following the research but it falls beyond its scope and the interviews that are recorded here. In the School case in Kisváros, more tellingly, the researchers faced an implicit refusal – in the form of withdrawal of cooperation and continuously postponed meetings – by some key participants that prevented them from carrying on with the restorative intervention (a circle) that they had proposed after the case had been referred to them and was accepted in principle by those affected by it.

Illustration 5: Harm claims, intervention intensity
3 | Conceptual realignment

In this section we will present the conceptual realignment for those key concepts where there is sufficient material from the four sites, while those concepts that are particularly relevant in only one or two sites will not be analysed here. By conceptual realignment we mean the procedure of reconstruction of conceptual linguistic symbols that reflect the ‘internal’ vision of the studied reality in the four sites, in order to hone each concept into a more useful ‘tool’, justified not because of its “existence outside the human mind, but in its value as an analytic, heuristic device” (Popísil 1971, 19, quoted in Ferrari 1990).

Apart from this subset of key concepts, we have added the theoretical and post-field research empirical treatment of two additional concepts that emerged as highly relevant across the board during the last year of the project, namely trust and its active correlative, cooperation.

Before proceeding, the following table summarises and briefly comments some standard definitions and concepts as they are understood in the established restorative justice literature (The United Nations Economic and Social Council 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of RJ as ‘approach’</th>
<th>ECOSOC 2002/12</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restorative justice is an evolving response to crime that respects the dignity and equality of each person, builds understanding, and promotes social harmony through the healing of victims, offenders and communities.</td>
<td>Social harmony, healing, understanding: no space for conflict as ‘normal’ process in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stakeholders’ and their needs to be addressed by RJ (although they are called with the more neutral ‘parties’ throughout the Resolution) | Victims:  
- obtain reparation  
- feel safer  
- seek closure | Compartments:  
- understand the underlying causes of crime  
- promote community wellbeing  
- prevent crime |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Offenders:  
- gain insight into the causes and effects of their behaviour  
- take responsibility in a meaningful way | | <— Security-as-safety already built into the core definition of RJ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restorative justice programme</th>
<th>“Restorative justice programme” means any programme that uses restorative processes and seeks to achieve restorative outcomes.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restorative process</td>
<td>“Restorative process” means any process in which the victim and the offender, and, where appropriate, any other individuals or community members affected by a crime, participate together actively in the resolution of matters arising from the crime, generally with the help of a facilitator. Restorative processes may include mediation, conciliation, conferencing and sentencing circles.</td>
<td>&lt;— active participation built into def.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative outcome</td>
<td>“Restorative outcome” means an agreement reached as a result of a restorative process. Restorative outcomes include responses and programmes such as reparation, restitution and community service, aimed at meeting the individual and collective needs and responsibilities of the parties and achieving the reintegration of the victim and the offender.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>“Parties” means the victim, the offender and any other individuals or community members affected by a crime who may be involved in a restorative process.</td>
<td>‘parties’, not ‘stakeholders’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>“Facilitator” means a person whose role is to facilitate, in a fair and impartial manner, the participation of the parties in a restorative process.</td>
<td>Stress again on participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercultural context</td>
<td>Restorative justice gives rise to a range of measures that are flexible in their adaptation to established criminal justice systems and that complement those systems, taking into account legal, social and cultural circumstances, [Annex, Preamble, 3]</td>
<td>Measures (not practices) to be adapted to the cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Disparities leading to power imbalances, as well as cultural differences among the parties, should be taken into consideration in referring a case to, and in conducting, a restorative process. [II. Use of RJ programmes]</td>
<td>Relevance of cultural setting along with and linked to power imbalances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Facilitators shall possess a good understanding of local cultures and communities and, where appropriate, receive initial training before taking up facilitation duties.</td>
<td>Recommendation not fully implemented (see D3.1 and D1.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
<td>10. The safety of the parties shall be considered in referring any case to, and in conducting, a restorative process. [II. Use of RJ programmes]</td>
<td>Safety within the process, linked to societal security outside, but affected by it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: ECOSOC restorative justice definitions
3.1 | Conflict

The methodological move toward choosing the ‘cases’ as units of analysis cannot be complete without its epistemological counterpoint about a constructivist understanding of the conflicts themselves. This section will only ferment the rich material developed in deliverables D2.1 and D2.2 with some field observations. Constructivist because the referral system for the identification of cases is based on participants – including the researchers – signalling that some situations are affecting them and that indeed should be considered as conflicts. But it is clearly not so straightforward.

To start with, there are many situations of ‘denial of conflict’ or, put more reflexively, there is no conflict that participants – again, including researchers – can agree on. In Vienna a group of teenagers refuses to let outsiders define and frame the inhabitants of the housing estates as marginal and disadvantaged. They constitute and defend the pride of place as identity instead of acknowledging a higher level social conflict (WP4 #38). In the Graffiti case as well the researchers noted that the residents and participants to the circle were in denial about considering the ‘anti-islamic’ graffiti as a particularly serious slur, or perhaps it was a conscious refusal to let the existential threat framing going out of hand. In Kisváros the ‘culture of silence’ is precisely about the denial of acknowledging conflicts or at least to talk about them openly and publicly once they have indeed signalled by some resident: “conflicts came up in different waves reflecting on the dynamic of their relationships” (WP5 #59). Sometimes more than denial it seems a matter of suspension. There are few open conflicts in the post-conflict societies of the three towns researched in Serbia, but also little contact and communication between people. People live next to each other while keeping some social distance (e.g. in disapproving of mixed marriages, where the religious and ethnic dimensions overlap, WP6 #8).

A second general observation is that contrary to certain conflict life-cycle models, there are many conflicts that just refuse to peter out or burst, they look more like steady states, with varying and generally not cyclical levels of intensity, because the underlying structural conditions (e.g. the way the housing estates were built, the thickness of the walls, the lack of sound barriers etc.WP4 #41) do not change.
The conflicts in the different research sites are situated at various levels on the micro-meso-macro scale. In fact, some of the incidents thickly described in the evaluation grids are rather similar: disputes between neighbours (alas, after Nader and Todd (1978) the idea of a unified notion of ‘dispute’ posited as common empirical unit of analysis lost forever its innocence).

Disputes between neighbours figure prominently in Vienna, by construction. But they appear also in Kisváros and South Belfast (the keyword ‘neighbour’ or ‘neighbourhood’ appears in the same context as ‘conflict’ or ‘dispute’ in a subset of grids from all research sites, in particular grids #17 and #41 from WP4; grids #11 and #14 from WP5; grids #9, #16, #18 and #23 from WP6; grids #29 and #52 from WP7).

However, apparently similar conflicts (issues about unpleasant noises, smells etc.) are framed at different levels not only in various places, but the same dispute can have a history with various phases, switching level and with it the narrative frame of symbolic activation, moving ‘up’ from interpersonal to communal or ethnic or religious framing, and possibly vice-versa.

At the basic level, sort of ground zero of the disputes between neighbours, there are visual, olfactory, auditive or pressure signals traveling from one private (e.g. apartment) or public space (e.g. street, yard) to another private or public space. The intensity, nature, duration and pattern of these signals is perceived as highly unpleasant and disturbing by the receiver. So much so that “life becomes impossible.” The receiver is not passive but engages with the source at various levels in what could be analysed as a semiotic of reception. A warped instance of aggressive, reversed ‘semiotic of reception’ happens when the actual source of the disturbing sensorial signals blames the receiver for bothering him/her (as epitomised in the old fable about the wolf upstream and lamb downstream). In one case from Belfast (WP7 #29) there is a similar situation: a Polish family complains first about rubbish falling in their garden and some flags falling over their fence during the traditional July celebrations of Loyalist / Protestant identity. Reacting to this complaint, the source of the rubbish herself, a local resident, rallies the neighbours against the ‘foreigners’ for not respecting the local traditions and flags.

In almost all instances of such conflicts the source of the signals belong to a ‘minority’ group (immigrant background, ethnic, religious etc) while the receiver party belongs to
the majority in the local societal ecology. In all cases described there is a third party engaging in practices that range from mediation (institutionalised or ad hoc) or good offices to simple communication link / enabler (e.g. translator).

The symbolic level of framing of the disputes depends on what the participants, researchers included, make of it. At the interpersonal level the dispute is inter-subjectively framed by those involved, including the researchers, as between two families / persons that happen to live door to door. Ascriptions of race, ethnicity, religion etc. however potentially present in the subjective representations of the ‘other’, are not part of the common narrative of the parties about the issue. At the meso–communal level the issue is inter-subjectively framed in terms of e.g. newcomers vs locals, different social classes, immigration background vs old resident, ethnic-cultural minority vs majority (e.g. Roma) but without a national dimension. A third level would be the macro or ethnic-national framing.

A difference in level is independent from the intensity of the dispute, this is rather crucial. An interpersonal quarrel can reach a very high intensity – perhaps including violence and aggression – while a higher level framing could simmer for a long time at a relatively low level of animosity.

A sketchy ideal-typic representation of the patterns of dispute dynamics in the various locations would be something like the following. In Vienna the overall institutional framework, system of mediation and shared norms keep the disputes within the interpersonal level. The partners not only try to find pragmatic solutions, but also – deliberately or simply by normative default – to prevent the dispute from escalating to a communal-ethnic level. What seem to be an underlying unspoken framing in ethnic-cultural terms of the disputes occasionally manifests itself, but is immediately withdrawn through either normative pressure or mediator’s intervention. Occasionally a latent framing at a higher level (e.g. social class prejudice) by one of the parties, although not fully acted out, makes it more difficult to find a pragmatic solution that can work for both.

In Kisváros the framing seems relatively stable at the ethnic-cultural level even if the intensity of the disputes themselves appear to be relatively low. Rather, the cases emerging from the grids have more to do with the porous boundary between private and
public space. The disturbing sensory signals originating from the private space (e.g. burned plastic smell, unkept garden views) are construed more as a confirmation of a difference, a hiatus in civilised behaviour, rather than a personally and directly felt discomfort.

In one case from South Belfast, as already hinted to above, there is an apparently sudden ‘escalation’ towards a higher level framing of the complaints on the part of the native, old residents that almost as quickly de-escalates after the intervention of a restorative practitioner with a prompt extension of recognition to the minority party (direct, personal invitation to a street party).

In the four locations in Serbia there are no reported cases so far of this kind of conflict between neighbours that bend themselves to such a simplified model. Nevertheless, there are references to different levels of symbolic activation of conflicts between the ‘political-personal’ and ‘ethno-national’ levels. An NGO activist in Bačka tells of intimidations and occasional attacks to his property that happened to him in the post-war period. When asked (“do you think that such behaviour was motivated by the differences in ethnicity?”), he specifies that in this case he probably targeted not because of his ethnicity but because of his activity with the NGO, thus for ‘personal’ or ‘political’ reasons.

The different levels of activation or narrative framing of a conflict are interconnected and in fact a ‘political’ actor can be instrumental in escalating an interpersonal dispute, framing it at a higher level in order to leverage the associated reverberation of the case to further his political project. It is therefore an important aspect to analyse in order to design restorative practices that are able to change the frame and preventing a personal or neighbourhood conflict to escalate being framed as ethnically motivated and increasing its potential for politicisation.

Both respondents in Bačka seem to agree that the cases of conflict (harassment, tensions) experienced after 2000 were not ethnically motivated but rather linked to local politics or other reasons. Assuming that the main motivation is ‘political’ does this mean that none of the parties involved tried to frame the issue in ethnic terms, not linking it to the past conflicts? If this is the case, why?
Assuming a very simplified model where the framing of the conflict is a product of the interaction of a political actor and the public (i.e. his constituency) attitude, we can have four dynamics leading to different results:

a) The political actor tries to frame the contentious issue in ethnic terms and finds a receptive public. End result: the ‘ethnicisation’ of the conflict.

b) The political actor tries to frame the contentious issue in ethnic terms but the public is not receptive, its attitude have changed (for various reasons including the recent experience of recent war, a more open society where a plurality of voices can be heard, bridge-building grassroots activities etc). End result: no ‘ethnicisation’ of conflict, although it could be un unstable equilibrium.

c) The political actor does not try to frame the conflict in ethnic terms (and this for various reasons, e.g. external pressures, national political strategy, change in political actors motivations, etc.) even if the public is still receptive (e.g. for a sense of disenfranchisement from the past war, influence of certain media, etc.) End result: no ‘ethnicisation’ of conflict, but it is an unstable situation because if there is still a constituency for ethnicisation another political entrepreneur might try to exploit it.

d) The political actor does not try to frame the conflict in ethnic terms and the public is not receptive. End result: no ‘ethnicisation’ of conflict, stable equilibrium.

Admittedly, it is simplistic, but if we try to play along for a second, based on field observations and respondents’ opinion it seems that the public attitude in Bačka at the moment are averse to frame conflicts in ethnic terms for many reasons (as mentioned, the experience of recent war, a more open society where a plurality of voices can be heard, bridge-building grassroots activities etc) so we would be either in (b) or (d).

The dynamic variability of the level of symbolic framing of conflicts is perhaps one of the variables to take into account when attempting a comparative reflection on what kind of institutionalisation, if any, and what kind of public participation to restorative practices would be more effective for enhancing people safety and demands for justice, taking into account the political environment, public attitudes and expectations, etc.
3.2 | Justice

For to accuse, requires less eloquence, such is man’s nature, than to excuse, and condemnation, than absolution more resembles justice.

(Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*)

The discussion group between alleged ‘social-democrats’ in the Vienna’s *gemeindebau* (WP4 #10) and other observations from the small town in Hungary (although residents speak only very rarely about justice) brought up a wide array of ideas about justice, almost covering the whole theoretical spectrum and indirectly confirming the merits of Amartya Sen’s approach (2008).

(Social) justice as:

- **Impossibility, justice à venir** (but less optimistic than Derrida): “something communism tried to reach, but it went wrong about trying to realise it”; “justice does not exist. For everyone has an opinion” (WP4 #10).

- An **impartial** political arrangement, a regulating system where some authority (the EU, a mother figure) has the power to keep conflicting interests and excessive competition in check, as well as the human tendency to exclude and oppress the weak and the diverse (“when children are in a group the many turn against one – the weakest one, or the only one with red hair”) (WP4 #10).

- As **legitimisation** of the dominant group’s interests: “Only one ‘justice’ exists – the justice of the majority.” All the groups that are involved have their own idea of ‘justice’ that can legitimate processes and decisions. The native villagers do not want to have a common wreath and memorial ceremony with other organisations and they overrule the informal decision of a group of people that had approved the joint celebration (WP5 #01).

- Mutual **recognition** among adults “capable of seeing for ourselves what is right in a given moment”, without the need of third supra-entity (WP4 #10). In grid WP5 #13 reciprocity is an important factor in building relationships with the
neighbours, especially if they are Roma as seen from an influential member of the majority: “He offered me... if here are any duties I should just call him and he will come. In fact, I will call him. This is what we call ‘fair’. There and back.”

- **Equality**, equal shares: “it was easy for me to share with my brother, when there was a chocolate, each one would get half of it” or “When we’d all earn the same, that would be just” (WP4 #10).

- **Distribution according to needs and capabilities** (e.g. a bigger flat for a disabled on a wheelchair) (WP4 #10).

- A normative framework to **handle differences**. “Mines” would not like to cooperate with “yours” and in case of conflict the priority is not to find agreement and solution (WP5 #01);

- Fuelled by **envy** and **resentment**: “people who saw my flat envied me, because they thought it was so big what they found unjust. They’d ask ‘why do you have such a big flat, I also want one’ – They would not recognise my initial disadvantage, my disability to walk, my wheelchair” (WP4 #10).

- **Injustice as capitalist system**: “capitalism, which builds on inequality, implies that some have more and others less. Is that just, that one has millions and I don’t? Or is that given by nature? Should we change this? Is that just, when I drink wine and you only get water?” (WP4 #10).

- **Self-determination**: “Well, but what if I want to drink water and not wine?” (WP4 #10).

- The quintessential **social ‘feeling’**: “the feeling of being treated unjustly or justly, only comes when I compare myself with somebody else, when I am alone, that doesn’t matter, only when a second person joins, this becomes important. When I

---

15 The element of ‘resentment’ and ‘envy’ in justice, as the dark side of the emotion of ‘anger’ or ‘moral indignation’ (T. Parsons), triggers mobilisation. Zizek makes this sweeping statement: “Lacan shares with Nietzsche and Freud the idea that justice as equality is founded on envy: our envy of the other who has what we do not have, and who enjoys it” (How to read Lacan, p. 37). According to Sloterdijk one has to distinguish ‘anger’ from ‘resentment’, “gamme d’émotions qui appartiennent au régime du thymos, c’est-à-dire au régime de la fierté. […] la fierté de soi” (Truong, Sloterdijk, and Žižek 2011). Hence, with self-pride, self-esteem and self-respect as inter-subjectively constructed and developed we go back to ‘recognition’ more or less as in Honneth (1995).
am alone in the wood, I am fine and I am free, justice does not play a role” (WP4 #10).

Last but not least, justice emerges also as the place where the longing for justice and the institutionalised legal system of criminal justice awkwardly try to meet (Crónica de un desencuentro anunciado?). The shortcomings of formal, procedural justice (slow, does not repair the damage that is caused by crime etc.) are no secret: “I asked a villager why he did not denounce [a theft]: ‘Will I get back my ham and bacon? I will not’” (WP5 #15). But the formal, procedural, impartial criminal justice system is also seen as the place where to seek justice in case of serious crimes. Referring to a heinous war crime occurred in the 1990 (WP6 #21), the interviewees spoke about justice in terms of prosecution and punishment. The recourse to criminal justice as a system of legal norms protected by the state (pravo) is seen as the correct (just, fair) ways to achieve justice as pravda, the feeling of justice, justice of the people (WP6 #23).

Therefore, justice in this case is linked to the legal justice – the need to establish the responsibility of those involved in this crime, to punish the perpetrators, but also organisers of the crime, while non-punishment of perpetrators is seen not just as unjust but also as a way of maintaining tensions and conflicts. In addition, some of them spoke about the need to find out what has happened, where the bodies are buried, for the family members of those killed to be recognised as civilian victims of war and to get reparation. This speaks in favour that justice in the post-conflict societies, i.e. transitional justice is linked to the judicial (criminal) justice, but it also requires some other mechanisms of dealing with crimes from the 1990s, including truth seeking processes and reparation (WP6 #21).

Emphatic rhetorical reference to ‘justice’ as both ‘fairness’ and avoidance of suspected racist exclusion during the discussion at Kisváros’s City council on the issue of the Butcher’s festival. As the mayor put it: “It is unfair that Roma residents of [our town] mustn’t visit the festival,” something total contrary to everything he had been fighting for during the last ten years, and he was determined to prevent it (WP5 #36).

However, according to the researcher who observed the meeting, the emotional elements are so prominent that they may obscure other dimensions of ‘justice’:
The representatives of the city council do not speak about justice. They are “only” outraged, angry and sad because of the suspected anti-Roma sentiments of [the organiser of the Festival]. What do these emotions mean? Do they feel lack of justice? Is the city council fighting for something? What is it? Is it equality? Is it the local residents? Is it justice? Is it moral justice? Is it an agreement which was done previously?

Justice as dialogical process (but there are limits to consensus building in matters of justice) vs Justice as spoil of political struggle, justice of the majority as a general feature of the societal ecology in Kisváros:

Dialogue, agreement and reconciliation are not typical in Hungary. This is the characteristic of the whole society but the government that one has been in power since 2010 made this ‘habitus’ stronger. Consensus building is not the basic idea of the ruling party. Opposition parties found themselves in the position of the “enemy”. Not wide consensus but the idea of “decision made by us” is the ruling one. Only one ‘justice’ exists – the justice of the majority. (WP5 #36, #01)

Justice is thus understood in the research sites as an essentially and literally contested concept, rather a ground. All groups involved in the various issues emerged during the action research in Kisváros “have their own idea of ‘justice’ that can legitimate processes and decisions.” These diverging understandings are analysed in depth in the Charity provision case (grids WP5 #3, 4, 33). Even if direct open dialogue and cooperation between ‘us’ and ‘them’ is normally eschewed, groups do have norms to handle their differences and conflicts (WP5 #01) and prevent them from escalating in a destructive way, but without open communication of the kind the researchers intended to champion. As a terrain characteristically open to epistemological struggle even at the micro level, understandings of justice are themselves part of the conflict and as such subject to possible inter-subjective construction through restorative processes of open communication.
Cases analysis: moral framing, harm and justice claims

The majority of the cases were reported by the researchers as to be morally framed at a sufficient high level as ‘wrongdoing’, though short of outright ‘crime’. In some cases though some kind of ‘criminal activity’ forms part of the conflict background even if not as the main issue that the action research tried to address. Another major group is morally framed in a more neutral way as ‘misbehaviour’ and only one as a conflict of interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of moral framing</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Cases with high intervention intensity only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongdoing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 WP4: Graffiti WP5: Butcher’s festival, Charity provision WP7: Polish family, SH housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misbehaviour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 WP4: Mediations (G-M, S-O, K-G), Bassena circle, Frauencafé circle WP7: Dunmurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Healing circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Moral framing

Trying to map the moral and justice framing of the conflict addressed during the action research in the various sites shows that when participants claim that they have been harmed in a conflictual situation they do not necessarily activate the ‘justice’ signifier at the same time (bottom right sector of the chart).

16 In the case of the ‘Civic guard’ in Kiszváros a background of burglaries in town is the main reason for the existence of a voluntary night watch, but the issue that sparked the case was not crime itself, but the de-facto exclusion of Roma inhabitants from the Civic guard (on suspicions that they would be associated with the burglars) and the ultimately failed attempt of the leader of the Roma minority self-government to establish a new civic guard. In the cases of anti-social behaviour by youth in South Belfast (‘Dunmurry’ and ‘Musgrave Park’) this involved also some minor criminal offences (damages to public property).
This disjunction still holds if we restrict the set of cases to those where the conflict was explicitly addressed through a more intensive intervention (conference, public assembly, circle, mediation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice formalisation(^\text{17})</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>All situations and cases in the research sites do not get even close to court, in fact none of them is morally framed as ‘crime’ and criminal activities figure in the background of three cases only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) The cases from WP6 being workshops that did not deal with actual conflict situations did not report an assessment of the ‘justice formalisation’ condition.
Having defined the level of formalisation of justice largely as the relative distance from the coercive shadow of the justice system and its related institutions, the cases where the level of justice is intermediate high all see the participation among the stakeholders of police officers. This is not to say that there cannot be ‘restorative justice’ in the presence of police officers, as it is widely practiced around the world. The contention here is much more circumscribed to mapping the relative presence and influence, if any, of legal coercion.

As soon as one zooms in to the individual cases the role of police officers in these practices acquire interesting nuances. For example in one of the Serbian locations a programme titled Development of the police in the community, initiated by the Serbian Ministry of Interior, benefited from the ideas and knowledge that two police officers acquired participating in one of the seminars organised by ALTERNATIVE in 2014 and is now being implemented by the local police in partnership with a variety of statutory agencies, local NGOs and schools. Likewise, in Bačka Palanka a police officer who attended the ALTERNATIVE seminars initiated meetings of the local restorative team to discuss further cooperation (D6.3).
If enhancing communication with crime victims, in particular the vulnerable ones, may “contribute to regain and enhance trust in the police” (D6.3), the relationship between community and police forces are often non linear, as in Northern Ireland where the establishment of a reformed force, the new Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI), was central to the Good Friday agreements. Despite the undertaking of a radical organisational change programme, a peculiar form of devolution of duties that was common before the reforms seems to continue.

Some loyalists are critical of the police: “we are trying to establish a new culture of going to police and they (the police) are letting us down by not

Illustration 7: Justice formalisation, police forces, participation
punishing people who commit crimes, they are too reliant on us to deal with it... there is no fear of punishment in young people nowadays, back in my day you’d have been dealt with... police are scared of community reaction... the whole process takes too long, there will be people in court this month (June 2013) for trouble that happened in Ardoyne last July (2012), they should arrest them and put them through due process to send a message” (WP7 context report).

Illustration 8: Moral framing, practice formalisation, security scope

There is a significant association between moral framing and practice formalisation. Or, conversely, there are no cases where an informal practice is used in the presence of
‘high’ moral framing (crime or wrongdoing). Incidentally, we can also observe how the cases with high moral framing and formal practices tend to be also those where the security scope is wider, i.e. involving also the socio-economic dimensions and possibly threatened collective identities beyond personal safety concerns.

### 3.3 | Security (safety)

Security has been conceptualised throughout the project as personal safety, therefore most observations refer to this field and in particular to (the absence of) crimes against property (theft, burglary etc.) or serious violations of physical personal integrity (assault, murder, rape, kidnapping, etc.). There is a strong conceptual overlap with the narrower meaning of ‘human security’ as *freedom from fear*.

While personal safety perceptions are good in the small town in Hungary (the statement ‘I feel safe in Kisváros’ scored 4.2 out of 5 on a Likert scale), crime is still a concern for many. There are already some security solutions in place that involve the Civic Guard – a voluntary organisation expression of civil society – as security provider: “I remember when the alert started to work in my neighbourhood and I called the Civic Guard. And within a few minutes they were there. You can feel that our members are attentive. It makes me stronger to know that they are taking care of us” (WP5 #15).

The importance of the neighbourhood solidarity (‘We should not be selfish. If I hear that the dog at my neighbour is barking all night... I also switch on the light, go out and ask if everything is all right. We, neighbours support each other. The whole street...’) complements and strengthens this participatory, civil-society-based approach to security/safety (*biztonság*). Solidarity and trust (*bíz-ik*, from which *biztonság*) can be alternatives to the techno-institutionalisation of security, but are also potentially open to exclusionary practices (Roma may have quite a hard time to be accepted in the Civic Guard).

Societal securitisation processes of existential threats to collective identities are at work in the background in Kisváros and Belfast and are part of the societal ecology of the action research. For example in Northern Ireland

From the loyalist point view the biggest threat to their security is the perceived strategy of republicans to deprive them of their British identity. […]

84
“Our culture is being attacked. There is no fear of a Sinn Fein bombing campaign now we fear a loss of identity.” (D7.4, 164)

However, the ‘securitisation’ analytical framework, in particular the sector of societal security concerned with threats to collective identities (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998), was discussed but not adopted by the project and therefore it is not possible to apply it here ex post for a full fledged analysis. The conceptual identification of security and safety, and the operationalisation of safety as – by and large – the absence of crime against property and personal integrity has the advantage of bringing the concept closer to the ‘human’ dimension, as already mentioned. At the same time, this methodological approach is analytically blunt if one were interested in analysing the political consequences (“what security does”) of the securitisation of crime and – by extension – of conflict. In one occasion there is an incipient threat construction where the referent object for security is... security itself, although there is no consensus about it:

Here, the participants turned back to the ‘Roma crime’ issue. According to Laci and Anna, the Roma are the ones – besides strangers – who endanger security. Peter did not agree with them: “it is not an issue that has to be linked solely to the Roma. I know non-Romas who are burglars. There is a disadvantaged group and they have to commit crime” (WP5 #15).

Although in this case it is clear from the thick description that security/safety means absence of crime, there is no identification of a threat to a collective identity (as in the discursive activity of right-wing political groups) and therefore it is not part of a societal securitisation process.

The reification of security, or even its personification as a source of normative behaviour18 is in itself interesting but cannot be analysed here. More concretely, in Medvedja members of the Albanian minority identify the ‘police’ as a security threat itself. Participants are keen not to generalise and specify that only ‘some’ individual officers did mistreat or disrespected them. At the same time they make clear that these are not just random offenders or lunatics, but the legacy of a policy of institutionalised harassment against the Albanian minority during the 1990s. Officers that were trained

18 “Security does not allow it” – personal observation from fieldwork in Afghanistan.
and ‘socialised’ at the time were never vetted afterwards and continue to constitute a threat to the minority.

The Albanian male student explained this best: “We feel safe with regard to our neighbours, but many policemen did bad things and they are still policemen. Now, when someone sees the policeman that did such things to him or his family, of course he will not feel safe.” The Albanian male NGO activist also said that he cannot feel 100% secure because: “There are still policemen, that were active during the times of conflict in the Presevo valley in the 1990s and that were harassing Albanian citizens. Some of these men committed crimes and they were not punished. And they continue to act badly like the war is still going on.” [...] He added: “Many who were harassed during the war feel badly because of it... The policemen can recognise those who are not from around here and when you are an Albanian they tend to question you... It all reminds me of the 1990s.” (WP6 #18).

The Roma inhabitants of the Hungarian small town – or at least the former leader of their minority self-government – have identified in the de facto exclusion of Roma inhabitants from the local Civic Guard a conflictual issue. The attempt to establish a new Civic Guard, open to Roma volunteers as well, however failed, but not because of direct exclusion or discrimination (as described in grid WP5 #34 and D5.3).

A departure from the ‘security as personal physical safety’ frame occurs in a couple of occasions when the understanding of personal safety is expanded to economic security, employment. For example, respondents in Bačka link the economic insecurity and lack of jobs to the poor performance of the government (WP6 #20). In Kisváros the members of a focus group agree that more jobs would contribute to personal economic safety and, crucially, to stem criminality (reminding how the collective farms kept many people busy and away from crime). Interestingly they place job creation within provision of ‘social security’ connecting the contribution of “local entrepreneurs [who] should hire local employees and thus support the village” to that of charities (WP5 #15).

There is hardly any use of language of security in Vienna at the time of the research, although there had been attempts at securitising the conflicts in the Gemeindebau by the right-wing Freedom Party (FPÖ) during a previous political contest. It seems that
the enveloping institutional embrace of the Municipality based of a mix of corporatist welfare paternalism, pragmatic approach to conflict mediation and community service provision through NGOs have created conditions for the apparently stable de- or non-securitisation of neighbourhood disputes.

There is not so much evidence of the respondents’ participation in local networks and associations. Anyway we would suggest, and have argued elsewhere, that according to the empirical evidence from some Viennese residential quarters urban residents’ sense of security is based on their trust in “the system” (= local welfare state and the urban infrastructure) rather than on regular involvement in activities and patterns of association and participation operating on a local level (Sessar 2004, 105, quoted in WP4 context report).

**Cases analysis: security scope and intensity**

The case formalisation tries to capture the security dimension of the case using two conditions, one for the security scope (narrowly conceptualised as personal safety, or widened as to construe some kind of threat to a collective identity, or mainly focused on socio-economic concerns) and the other for the security ‘intensity’ or how important is security – however locally defined – for the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security scope</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Cases where security issues are more important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety only</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 WP5: Civic guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP6: Workshops on RJ in three locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP7: Dunmurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic (jobs, social sec. etc)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 WP5: Healing circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP6: Workshops on security in three locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective identities threatened</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 WP7: Polish family, SH housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17: Security scope and intensity*

The overall picture is mixed as shown in the following chart. There is of course a relative prevalence of the narrow scope – inevitably confirming a research design since it was a deliberate choice by the researchers to focus on security as personal safety. The
deviations from this general direction are highly informative, especially the emergence of a rather strong signal about the socio-economic dimension of security, in particular from the discussions in the workshops held in Serbia where the worries for lack of jobs and opportunities are sharper.

There are no obvious inclusion relationships between security scope and its intensity across all the cases, but there are some simple regularities within each research site, confirming that there is no language of security – i.e. low intensity – in Vienna even if the scope varies. The fact that the normally more ‘combustible’ threat to a collective identity is not construed as a security emergency hints at a socio-institutional ecology where pragmatism and ‘normality’ tend to prevail. The top-left corner could be seen as

Illustration 9: Security scope, security intensity
the space for those cases where putative de-securitisation or better, the prevention of securitisation is effective. The cases from the small town in Hungary cover almost all the available spectrum, testament to their careful choice in order to add detail and various facets to the analysis. There are only three cases where the security scope widens to include threats to a collective identity and only two of them – both in Northern Ireland – this is combined with a higher intensity of the security concerns.

Illustration 10: Security intensity, public stakeholders, security scope
The last chart in this section shows the subset inclusion relation (or ‘causal’ implication) between security intensity and the presence of public stakeholders. When security – regardless of the scope of the definition – is more of a concern, there is always a public stakeholder present.

### 3.4 | Community

Community is a very difficult terrain for a comparative exercise since some case studies rely heavily on this concept, even making community as a goal, an object for restoration; while it is much less relevant for others.

Still, community matters a great deal, especially in certain contexts and societal ecologies, and it would be unwise to wipe it out only because a single, neat, non redundant and non overlapping conceptual definition cannot be found by researchers. Just to give an example among many about the relevance of community, in behavioural economics and experimental psychology,

> minor changes in the (experimental) context can affect behaviour. For example, there is evidence that subjects [in the United States] contribute more in a one-shot PD [Prisoner's Dilemma game] if it is called ‘community game’ than if it is called ‘Wall Street game’. Under the plausible assumption that the community frame triggers more optimistic beliefs about other subjects inequity aversion our model is consistent with this observation. (Fehr and Schmidt 1999, 852)

The following sparse observations resulted from re-aligning the material emerging from the comparative grids with the theoretical output of other work packages.

The semantic reversal of ‘civil society’ from its Hegelian roots where it stood for a society *civilised* by laws and universal rights, to the current liberal mainstream meaning of a collection of civic, non-governmental groups, associations, organisations. The civic groups or NGOs, the liberal elective social locus of solidarity, are in fact, many small and 'organised' – as opposed to organic – communities.
Vice-versa, in Hegelian understanding, the state was the institutional locus of solidarity, the model of all communities. Ironically, this broader idea of community is still very much present in the American liberal tradition, as summarised by this obituary of a great liberal politician:

His alternative prescription was heartfelt Democratic liberalism, calling on Americans to become one community, exercise compassion, embrace government as good and recognise that “at the heart of the matter we are bound one to another” (The Economist 2015)

In general, one can make a rather good case of separating conceptually ‘community’ from ‘civil society’ (e.g. grid WP5 #32), even if they have been treated as almost synonyms – or at least two sides of the same coin – during some of the preliminary discussions within the project.

Within ALTERNATIVE, the concept of community is particularly relevant – by design – in the Northern Ireland site (WP7) and, to a lesser degree, in the small town in Hungary (WP5). The working definition adopted by the researchers in Northern Ireland of community as a communication process, both object and means of a widened restorative approach to justice, is original and fecund of further developments. For example along the lines of the admittedly more abstracts suggestions sketched by George Pavlich in a series of seminal contributions (1996; 2004). However, the way ‘community’ is still treated conceptually in most of the comparative grids is still a rather static, personified entity, more a noun than a verb to use Pavlich’s language in a recent seminar (2014).

Community as communitas. Adopting the insights of Esposito (1998; 2002), Sloterdijk (2014) and others on the inextricable link between community and immunity one can start a fruitful work on the workings and implications of security and securitisation in context where ‘community’ is an important conceptual reference (see D1.3).

Co-obligations, internal policing of mores and customs, informal enforcement, historical link between customs and laws. Sometimes these functions are legally sanctioned in new governance agreements between ‘community’ and state agencies. Community-based
Policing is of interest in Northern Ireland (regional workshop, Fall 2014), while a grassroots, self-help ‘Civic guard’ is important in Kisváros (grids WP5 #15 & #34).

While in Vienna the concept of community seems much less relevant, the researchers have reflected on ‘togetherness’ (grid WP4 #54) as a substitute or proximate concept and asked “what is the relationship between ‘othering’ and boundary making”, such as the expressions of paternalism / maternalism from the ‘Austrian’ majority women towards women of immigrant background, speculating that “it could be interpreted as a manifestation of dominance of the Austrian majority taking a condescending, protecting and controlling attitude towards the members of the minority.” But it could also be interpreted as “concealing helplessness and the longing for contact. It reminds us once again that the analysis of power-relations must not proceed too hastily.”

3.5 | Active participation

Looking at the mechanisms of participation, dialogue and facilitation, against the baseline European attitude of ‘justice from above’, did the project promote the involvement of citizens and intermediate social agencies in solving their conflicts – and enabled them to do so?

This report will not analyse restorative justice discourse’s polysemic embeddedness in new governance processes and its resulting governmentalities *per se*. This rich critical seam prospected twenty years ago by George Pavlich’s seminal book on *Justice fragmented* (1996) has been further mined, within ALTERNATIVE, in D1.2 and D1.3. Here we will rather take it as an established ‘fact’, trying to gauge its implications for the essential ambivalence of participation in restorative justice practices under new governance models. This section will therefore look at the new governance discourse on participation from the outside, leveraging its own key features – an analytic of ownership and decision-making powers – for a critical appraisal.

Linguistically, there is a fecund semantic ambivalence built into the idea of participation. To participate evokes the idea of taking (a) part: it may refer to the part that is assigned or given to somebody, *separating* it from the whole, or the part that is *joined* with the others in order to *reconstitute* a whole (especially in communication, sharing some news with members of the community, e.g. regarding a proposed marriage). The very divisive action of cutting something into parts creates an implicit
bond inasmuch as the parts are still perceived and constructed as belonging to a unity. It means divide and share at the same time.

With the neoliberal turn from government to governance, from passive social protection to active citizenship, the citizens of contemporary European polities have never enjoyed such a latitude of venues of participation to have their voices heard, their views taken into account (Bovaird 2005; Martens 2007; Offe 2009; Rhodes 1996; Shearing and Wood 2003; Sloan and Oliver 2013). However there is a fundamental ambivalence in ‘participation’ that was not lost to observers even during its 1960s heyday as famously engraved in this Paris May 1968 poster.

![Poster](image)

After the great reforms of the 1980s and 1990s towards a new governance model, the new ‘light’, regulating-not-owning, service-coordinating-not-providing, governance-open government is still rather expensive and extracts a fair amount of resources from households and companies. The tax burden in continental Europe is still the highest in the world, even if it may have been marginally reduced in Scandinavian countries from the ‘socialist’ rates of 60 plus percent it hovers around or just below 50 percent in France, Italy or Belgium (Offe 2013).

Part of the state revenues are spent to recruit an army of new social engineering specialists whose job is to ‘activate’ the citizenship, creating the spaces and institutional venues where they can participate. After creatively and passionately labouring in start-
up factories and offices, the new model citizen will answer to a higher call and moonlight as a city planner when called upon to join participatory urbanism designing new developments. The following month she will don the whig as member of a jury or as part of a community of care in a restorative justice circle. A few days later, he will turn into a specialist of public health when scrutinising the local hospital practices in ensuring that patients’s rights are properly upheld. All this, it goes without saying, as voluntary work happily contributed out of civic duty for the common good, while facilitated by well remunerated professional ‘activators’.

Under the new European social project compact, citizens more or less keep paying as many taxes as before, receive less social protection (welfare) services, but are now suavely prodded to be entrepreneurial, to be the masters of their own social destiny, to participate more. In sum the new model active citizen has to work more, and do it in an environment that is both more competitive and highly regulated so as to prevent anti-systemic alternatives to gain momentum, surrounded by facilitating specialists who are ultimately answerable to statutory agencies, and for free (Fung 2001).

* * *

In order to add some analytic edge to the concept of participation, we will focus on an in depth stakeholders analysis – who is in the circle, how did they get there, what are their interests, etc. – while focusing on two essential variables that emerge from a variety of sources ranging from historical research in medieval partecipanze agrarie in northern Italy\textsuperscript{19} to Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of active participation ending with more recent interest in multi-stakeholder partnerships (Pishchikova et al. 2010), namely power and property. The analysis of how decision-making powers are distributed among

\textsuperscript{19} An ancient form of collective property of agricultural land originating in the Middle ages and still in use in Northern Italy (Emilia, Veneto). In many cases the lands had already undergone major drainage works and were given as emphyteusis by powerful abbeys in Northern Italy to the families of farmers living in the nearby village. In this case participation refers to the undivided property of land (the part cannot be separated from the whole). In the case of the lands given in emphyteusis by the Abbey of Nonantola, near Modena, the institution is also remarkably open to foreigners, with the only condition being that of residing on the land, without alienating it. Even if the nominal property of the land remained with the Abbey, with the exception of the small emphyteutic fee and the commitment to take care of the land improving it, the participants enjoyed full ‘possession’, i.e. access to and control of the land and its produce. The participants retained full, collective decision making powers regarding cultivations, organisation of works, sharing of produce etc. (Bassanelli 1979).
stakeholders and how decisions are taken within the participation process, plus the resources that each stakeholder has to claim or invest in the process are key to understand what participation actually means.

Arnstein defines participation as “a categorical term for citizen power. [...] It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parcelled out” (Arnstein 1969, 220 emphasis added) and proposes his ladder of citizen participation divided in three rungs, in decreasing order of actual participation:

- **Citizen power:** Citizen control
  - Delegated power
  - Partnership

- **Tokenism:** Placation
  - Consultation
  - Informing

- **Non-participation:** Therapy
  - Manipulation

This amounts to a sort of checklist for determining the level of participation looking at the actual decision-making power of the partners on the key passages of public policy making and implementation, the how and by whom.

The experience of the 1960s was mainly concerned with issues of material production and redistribution. When public housing programmes on the contrary focused on tenants’ values instead of ‘important matters’ – as it would be the case today when ‘values’ and ‘identities’ have taken the forefront as opposed to merely ‘material’ concerns, a shift analysed in depth for example by Inglehart (1997) – Arnstein saw examples of ‘therapy-level’ participation:

  Less dramatic, but more common examples of therapy, masquerading as citizen participation, may be seen in public housing programs where tenant
groups are used as vehicles for promoting control-your-child or cleanup campaigns. The tenants are brought together to help them “adjust their values and attitudes to those of the larger society.” Under these ground rules, they are diverted from dealing with such important matters as: arbitrary evictions; segregation of the housing project.

A similar potential pitfall for restorative practices has been pointed out for example by (Richards 2011, 99–100) who sees an unwarranted link between ‘empowerment’ and ‘responsibilisation’, the moral pressure that an offender (or stakeholder in general) takes responsibility for her actions or those of her children, relatives, neighbours etc. When the housing agency in Vienna sets policies – and deploys the means to enforce them – that focus on the good behaviour of tenants (cleanliness etc.) in the private and public spaces is it a ‘pragmatic’ solution that avoids entering into potentially slippery questions of culture and ethnicity, or ‘therapy’ as Arnstein would have it? The Vienna municipality approach is effective to keep tensions down and prevents conflicts from escalating – one colour-blind rule for all – even at the cost of less active participation, putting clear limits to the residents’ actual ownership of the restorative processes as shown in the attempted circle at the Frauencafé (described in D4.4).

After the ‘disagreement’ between the restorative practitioner, and the wohnpartner team-leader about the former’s approach a reflective meeting between researchers and practitioners highlights two main features for restorative circles as emerged from their action research:

[First,] a radical understanding of active participation and community ownership as a core requirement of restorative circles had become prevalent and was at odds with wohnpartner’s perceptions of the scope of active participation.

[Second,] the question of transparency: does it suffice for the facilitator to have a map in her mind and to carefully steer the process of the conflict ‘enfolding’, intervening only when this process appears blocked? [The facilitator’s] master plan ‘behind’ [...] remained opaque to Esra and Anna, the two community workers of wohnpartner and therefore also to the head of wohnpartner (D4.4, 53).
If we look at (multi-stakeholder) partnerships as the signature format of new governance implementation, they are higher up in Arnstein’s ladder because in a partnership “power is in fact redistributed through negotiation between citizens and powerholders.” Partnership can work most effectively when “there is an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable; [...] when the citizens group has the financial resources to pay its leaders reasonable honoraria for their time-consuming efforts; [...] and when the group has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers, and community organizers” (emphasis added). These conditions are hardly met in the average development project run by a foreign-funded NGO and they should be taken into account when designing restorative practices that aim at participation and empowerment.

The overall ambivalence of participation within the new governance discourse was already highlighted in deliverable D4.1 of this project, suggesting to analyse participation through Soysal’s lenses (2012). This author would go further, adding an in-depth stakeholders and partnership analysis to operationalise ‘participation’ in each action research site to clarify issues of ownership.

Social psychology has developed a Participatory Action Research (PAR) focus as a way to promote justice with an eye at the differences between the power structure that the advocates and the local community power structures. Among others, Dworski-Riggs and Langhout (2010) conclude that “power differences should not be seen as roadblocks to participation, but rather as moments of opportunity for the researchers to refine their methods and for the community and the community psychologist to challenge existing power structures.”

If the new liberal social project for Europe ultimately seems to envisage a kind of participation, that we will call little p, participation without power and property we will normatively posit that active participation in restorative justice approaches to conflicts in intercultural settings will have to be of the big P type, a more substantive participation with power and property:

\[ P + PP \]
Christa Pelikan summarises the findings about the paradoxes of participation from the ALTERNATIVE research sites as such:

In **Northern Ireland** the paradox we see enacted is the one inherent in the facilitation of a restorative circle. The essence of the ‘professional’ quality of the facilitator is his making him/herself invisible, in other words, retreating as much as possible in order to bring maximum feasible participation of the participants to the fore. This was achieved in the concrete case where it was possible to dig deeply into the parties’ concrete experiences and of doer and done-to. And this increased the conditions of possibility of ownership of ‘their’ conflict.

At the surface, the paradox of participation in **Serbia** consists of the high willingness of the participants of the seminars provided by ALTERNATIVE despite a history of war and of the deep wounds it has left. But we know that in Serbia the majority of seminar participants belonged to groups that had already been engaged in activities working towards overcoming the new and old boundaries and the injuries and traumas of the past. There the ideas of restorative justice fell on fertile ground. Will active participation become realised once the instrument of a restorative circle is tested in social and political reality?

The **Austrian** type of participation paradox lies with the heritage of the maternalistic policies of the City of Vienna and its sub-organisations. The Bassena has attempted to break free from this heritage and to develop its position as an intermediary agency. As with strategies of empowerment it has to tread a fine line though. And we have to accept the residents’ refusal or at least lack of interest in becoming ‘active’. Active participation must not be imposed, not even by well-meaning restorative justice advocates. The cautious approach [the restorative justice facilitator] has chosen has to be understood against the backdrop of the difficulties encountered in the **Frauencafé**.

In **Hungary** – despite a stunning multitude of civil society activities going on – researchers had emphasised the existence of a culture of silence which,
we would contend, is just a traditional way of reacting to everyday nuisances and life catastrophes – especially where such traditions are still vivid. Therefore, this culture of silence is not necessarily a specific feature of a Hungarian small town. In this particular location, it combined with the protagonists of the conflict ‘using’ the restorative approaches offered to them for strategic action – as opposed to communicative action; the ALTERNATIVE team had therefore to struggle with various antagonistic forces and more often than not did find a way to make people acquainted with restorative thinking and practices.

Whereas in Austria it is the deeply entrenched policy line of the researchers’ main partner organisation that put limits to the efforts of stretching active participation, the world of Kisváros erected high hurdles for the efforts of the ALTERNATIVE team to more widely convey the path of conflict transformation through active participation of all involved (C. Pelikan and M. Ragazzi, Critical reflections on active participation under new governance models, forthcoming).

### Cases analysis: participation models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation model</th>
<th>All cases</th>
<th>Subsets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOC: standard RJ with ‘Victims’, ‘Offenders’ and ‘Community’ stakeholder groups</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 V + O + C all present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5: Butcher’s festival, Charity provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 V + C (no offender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5: School, Healing circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 V + O (no comm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP4: Mediations (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 O + C (no victim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP7: Polish family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None (the participation model applies theoretically but the roles were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not played by the persons actually affected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP6: Workshops on RJ (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder groups are not characterised in terms of victims and offenders</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Participation ‘complete’ (all relevant stakeholders were present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WP4: Frauencafé workshop, Bassena circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP6: Workshops on comm. and security (x 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP7: SH housing, Dunmurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation model</td>
<td>All cases</td>
<td>Subsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP4: Graffiti, Frauencafé circle, Bassena ws, Film-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5: Civic guard, Roma conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP7: Musgrave park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Participation models

The VOC participation model and higher intensity of intervention are both closely associated with explicit harm claims.

Illustration 11: Harm claims, VOC participation model, intervention intensity
The few interventions that result in significant reparation of harm all unfold under standard RJ approaches (formal mediations, but also an ad hoc informal restorative conference) where the roles of ‘victim’ and ‘offender’, with the addition of ‘community’ are well delineated and identified, as shown in the following chart.

Illustration 12: Harm claims, VOC participation model, reparation of harm

The ideal justice formalisation and practice formalisation continuum is well represented in the ALTERNATIVE field research, although there’s only one case where an informal practice is combined with a relatively formal approach to justice.
A more complete participation seems to be facilitated by more formal practices, while it seems not affected by the degree for justice formalisation.

3.6 | Restorative justice principles and methods

To what extent the activities carried out under ALTERNATIVE can still be considered part of restorative justice?

The ALTERNATIVE actions have different topologies and footprints on a hypothetical ‘restorativeness’ map. Or, the map itself is variable and plural. Some of ALTERNATIVE actions may score higher and other lower on a hypothetical ‘restorativeness’ scale.
defined in the established way, following for example McCold and Wachtel (2002) and checking if all three stakeholders group are participating (victims, offenders, community), whether victims’s harms have been repaired, offenders have taken responsibility and the community been reconciled. However, this metric is far from unique as will be discussed further in the outcomes section. Overall, there is this ‘already’ and ‘not yet’ element to it, especially according to the variable amount of ‘faith’ in restoration that is clearly unevenly distributed throughout the project. But the general understanding is that this is preparatory work for a harvest that is yet to come.

Reflecting on their own interventions and comparing them to textbook restorative practices (“what does the ‘Fallbearbeitung’ [case resolution/handling of a case] in our workshops have to do with RJ or with restorative practices?”), researchers in Vienna reckon that the answer is not clear cut. Some elements of restorative processes are present: a ‘lifeworld’ experience that relies on the active participation of one of the parties (but not all) directly affected by the conflict and of a ‘community’ that can also actively participate and can identify with the present stake-holder and also the absent ones as they live in the same shared social space. Those present witness and actively participate in the reinterpretation of the conflict situation. There is a ‘discovery’ of the living conditions of the adolescent neighbours and, crucially

Through this shared concern, a certain notion of ‘we’ emerges. This notion of a ‘we’ is NOT based on the exclusion of any third party, but on a shared concern/shared feeling of care FOR a third party. [...] Then, there even is reconciliation of some sort, as Anna finds peace with her own role in the whole play. (WP4 #50)

Further, there is also a budding coordination for collective action as the participants afterwards joined a group of local adolescents to launch a local petition as a first step to act against the city’s plans of removing the local football court.

However, there are other aspects of the intervention that are more difficult to recognise as ‘restorative’, from the lack of participation of one key stake-holder and therefore the lack of direct dialogue, although this did not prevent to have a meaningful communication among those actually present and, as mentioned, some kind of reconciliation or satisfaction with the process by the other participants. Beyond this,
there is perhaps a more fundamental difference in purpose, whereby the communication workshops organised by the researchers are more about “training and capacity building, instead of actual conflict resolution through the active participation of the ‘victim’ and ‘offender’.” (WP4 #50)

Even if “it might even be possible to argue, that some sort of conflict resolution processes are taking place during the workshops,” the researchers prefer to guard some conceptual clarity and “refrain from calling these conflict resolution processes ‘restorative’, mainly due to the absence of the antagonistic, opposing party” (WP4 #50), thus using a common participatory criterion to co-define restorativeness.

***

In Kisváros the ALTERNATIVE researchers experimented, after painstaking preparations, with ‘community mediation’ as a natural extension of restorative principles and practices adapted to the new setting. One of the mediators found that, comparing victim-offender mediation with community conflicts – it was difficult to pin down the issue as “the opposing sides are constantly in interaction, they always have confrontation (...)” (WP5 #59). A fluidity that requires long periods of engagement with the community by the mediators, hence the difficulty of keeping true to their deontological commitment to impartiality:

The mediator also highlighted a contradiction between the method and the principle of impartiality. A community mediation needs that enormous presence in the field, because the people are not used to [rely on it]. Building trust and offering new methods to solve a conflict is necessary in that case. On the other hand, that process and the close relation to the involved persons make it a challenge to maintain impartiality in the conflict. Giving examples for it it was hard for the mediator to not try to convince Tibor to join the conflict resolution process. On the other side, once Éva added a remark ‘Why do you push me against Tibor?’ (WP5 #59)

It is not only a matter of impartiality between participants, but also it seems among intervention and non-intervention, and in the case of the former, among different
degrees of intensity that echoes the dilemmas posed by the researchers in Vienna as well about “who are we to interfere in these matters?”

With all its fluidity, need for continuous engagement, difficulty to remain impartial, community mediation seems to be yielding very little in terms of outcomes:

Another specificity of this community mediation is the limited outcomes of the restorative action: not like in any other case it is not expectable to solve the whole conflict or provide a common narrative of the conflict, nor an agreement for the future. The mediator evaluated this opportunity as the first step to use restorative techniques, as these kinds of events are only good enough to get to know new techniques of conflict resolution unknown to the communities (WP5 #59).

***

An extended understanding of restorative justice might even consider a greater flexibility or complementarity with the criminal justice system. During the three seminars held in Serbia participants agreed that in a hypothetical case of victimisation both retributive and restorative measures may be applied. However, they came to different conclusions about the order of their application. While in Bačka Palanka, retributive approach was given priority, in Medvedja restorative approaches were suggested as the first reaction. In Prijepolje, the conclusion was that both restorative and retributive measures should be applied simultaneously (WP6 #56).

This is a context where restorative justice is not known yet and where memories of serious – and unaccounted for – crimes from the wars of the 1990s still loom, casting an ominous shadow to more recent cases of institutional ethnically-motivated discrimination, especially by some elements of the police forces as chief sources of insecurity (WP6 #18). It is therefore interesting that here emerges a clear view of the complementary between retributive and restorative justice that is in fact the norm in most jurisdictions where the latter has already been introduced in legislation and practice. At the same time, there are interesting proposals for the introduction of
‘restorative sanctions’, or the retributive use of some restorative measures such as apology, dialogue and community work. There is also an in depth discussion on prevention where education of the perpetrators, communication, dialogue are all considered important measures. The chief preventive tools however would consist in the application of restorative approaches themselves, decoupled from their formal justice system dual referent, “applied at solving different problematic situations and preventing conflicts, and increasing overall security of citizens” (WP6 #56).

* * *

In Northern Ireland the researchers found themselves in quite the opposite situation. Rather than having to introduce the concept of restorative justice, they had to deal with competition among different community-based RJ projects all working in Protestant-Unionist-Loyalist areas of Belfast, in a context where restorative justice practices are already well established and enjoy a strong legitimacy before both communities and statutory agencies. ALTERNATIVE’s local partners are an upstart community based project that has been receiving support and training from the University of Ulster. They are faced with an incumbent organisation that they tend to believe is somehow favoured by statutory agencies, who automatically assume that it already covers loyalist areas. Behind this competition there are layers of former affiliations with rival paramilitary organisations within the Protestant-Unionist-Loyalist side during the time of the armed conflict that are now mapped in the restorative practitioners organisations. This makes researchers’ access to certain loyalist communities more difficult if they are perceived to be associated with the other organisation, despite the fact that the researchers see a need for RJ practices because of a combination of conditions that gives an idea of the complexities of restorative work in these contexts:

there remains a large portion of loyalist areas that are unaccustomed to restorative practices. This absence of restorative practices when considered in conjunction with prevailing negative perceptions of policing, the decreasing role of paramilitaries as justice arbitrators within the community and the stated dissatisfaction with the anti-social behaviour of young people engenders an ever increasing feeling of insecurity and isolation amongst some loyalist communities (WP7 #48).
3.7 | Trust

Ogni struttura vivente alberga una selvaggia diffidenza verso ogni apporto di altro materiale di origine vivente.

[“Every living structure harbours a savage distrust toward every contribution of any material of living origin”].

(Primo Levi, Il sistema periodico, Carbonio, 237-238)

During the project there are intermittent references to the concept of trust in all four sites, with a stronger profile in Hungary (D5.2: “Building the bridges of trust with and within the communities”) and Serbia when dealing with victims support in inter-ethnic conflicts (D6.2), and not least as an instrumental intermediate step for implementation of the action research methodology. In Vienna they use the language of ‘trust’ more sparingly, although it could be argued that trust and solidarity are already embedded in an impersonal institutionalised form in welfare institutions. In all these cases, the references to trust are by and large circumscribed to localised trust to be built among the participants.

Trust is based on the ‘esteem’ kind of recognition, to use the Hegelian semantic, and as such (unlike respect) it is not mandatory, it cannot be object of legal sanction and thus it is not universal. Economists are extremely interested in how this kind of social capital is re-produced, depleted etc. because there are good reasons to think that it is a very important ingredient of economic success and growth in market economies. Should RJ and ALTERNATIVE set ‘trust’ and ‘social capital’ as goals too?

A promising line of inquiry in the restorative justice dilemma would be focusing on restoring trust. When community is relevant, one of the possible answers to the research questions of ‘what do we mean by restorative practices’ and ‘what to restore?’ could head in the direction of trust in particular and social capital in general (to take Putnam’s classic definition that sees the former as a component of the latter, together
with norms, networks and other features of social organisation that facilitate coordinated action).

Considering that the concept of trust has not been addressed so far in the theoretical documents we will sketch here an essential map.

### 3.7.1 | Trust and social capital

For a concise but comprehensive intellectual history of the concept of social capital see (Woolcock 1998, 154–161). Some introductory definitions are in order:

I prefer a ‘lean and mean’ definition: social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness (Putnam 2007, 137).

Social capital comes in many forms, not all fungible. Not all networks have exactly the same effects: friends may improve health, whereas civic groups strengthen democracy. Moreover, although networks can powerfully affect our ability to get things done, nothing guarantees that what gets done through networks will be socially beneficial (Putnam 2007, 138).

Among the main determinants of social capital there is the importance of historical experience for a society to ensure cooperation among its citizens (long-term and short-term institutional influence): Banfield (1956), Putnam (1993), Fukuyama (1996).

The role of voluntary civic associations is as central as controversial. Putnam (1993) follows the Tocquevillian tradition where the thick web of socialisation embedded in civic association would have effects on democratic and cooperative values and norms (Putnam 2000). However, there is no firm empirical evidence that membership in voluntary organisations has a spill-over effect on democracy (Putnam’s famously phrased ‘learning schools for democracy’) and it seems that effects of self-selection into associations of people with already higher levels of trust are predominant. Research

---

20 A famous quote from *Democracy in America* opens Banfield’s book: “In democratic countries the science of association is the mother of science; the progress of all the rest depends upon the progress it has made” (de Tocqueville [1838] 1988 Vol II).
conducted by Dietlind Stolle and others in Germany, Sweden and United States on self-selection shows that:

membership [of voluntary associations] does indeed influence trust toward the other group members and personal engagement within the group, but with regards to *generalised* trust, the self-selection effects were more pronounced than the membership effects. This essentially means that people with higher levels of trust indeed self-select into associations (Stolle 2003, 25).

It goes without saying that voluntary associations vary greatly in terms of organisational forms, culture, goals, etc. and not all have the same potential and implications for generalised trust. ‘Face-to-face’ interactions are more important than ‘checkbox’ organisations. If relationships within the organisation put members in contact with people with a different background, it could have impact on ‘bridging’ social capital. Membership in hierarchic organisations which do not create mutuality and equality of participation do not have the same effect.

In the literature on social capital, ‘active participation’ is defined as active membership in civic organisations, as opposed to passive membership in the same kind of associations. A recent assessment of social capital in Europe (van Oorschot, Arts, and Gelissen 2006, 159) found that, among the countries where ALTERNATIVE research takes place, the United Kingdom has the highest score with an average of 0.7 active membership in civic organisations (on a scale going from 0 to 3), followed by Belgium (0.6), Austria (0.4) and Hungary (0.2). These levels compare with the maximum in Sweden (1.0).

Marc Hooghe argues that “membership in associations has incremental and reinforcing effects” on the formation of social capital through processes of value polarisation and convergence among the members. True, there is the documented self-selection effect into the association, but “subsequently [members] are being influenced by the values upheld by their fellow-members. This practically implies that socialisation effects are more prevalent in homogeneous settings where value patterns converge more easily.” (Hooghe 2003; Stolle and Hooghe 2003). The neutralising effect of non-homogeneous settings on the bridging potential of membership in associations is clearly relevant for
RJCIS and has been observed during field work, in particular in Northern Ireland and Hungary.

The non-linear relationship between membership in and diversity of civic organisations and social capital is well illustrated by the small town in Hungary, where a ‘vibrant’ civil society coexists with low levels of social capital, or at least of generalised trust (deliverable D5.2). Kiszváros is no Montegrano, to be sure, rather its opposite:

[The inhabitants of Kiszváros] are used to a buzz of activity having as its purpose, at least in part, the advancement of community welfare. [...] A variety of public-spirited undertakings [like] The Red Cross is conducting a membership drive. The [...] Club is raising funds to build [...] The [NGO association] are holding a banquet. [The Municipality] is discussing the feasibility of building an all-weather road [in one of the Roma-inhabited neighbourhoods]. [Civic guard] volunteers are being signed up. A local church has collected [xyz Euros] for a children’s hospital [...]. Meetings of the Parent Teacher Associations are being held in the school [...]

With a sleight of hand, this passage has been freely adapted from (Banfield 1956, 15) swapping Kiszváros for St. George, Utah, and it could be easily taken as an actual description of the goings on in the Hungarian town. St George is the small town in the American midwest that the author compares with the static, poor Montegrano in Southern Italy. Banfield tried to explain this ‘backward society’ in terms of “the inability of the villagers to act together for their common good. [...] This inability to concert activity beyond the immediate family arises from an ethos – that of ‘amoral familism’ – which has been produced by three factors [...]” (ibidem, 10).

In general, and as partial conclusion, recent research “does not imply that associations are not relevant for the establishment of a democratic political culture.” But at the same time it “suggest[s] that creating generalised trust and other civic attitudes (and the same can be said for political trust) is not the prime mechanism by which voluntary associations contribute to the strengthening of civic culture” (Hooghe and Stolle 2003).
3.7.2 | Social determinants of trust

Trust and related attitudes are usually part of social surveys where subjects are asked questions like – taking clue from the European Social Survey - “generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” (variable `ppltrst`); “do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?” (variable: `pplfair`); and “Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?” (variable: `pplhlp`). The answers to these questions constitute the datasets about trust that are used by social scientists trying to describe and explain trust with quantitative methods.

Alesina and La Ferrara (2002, 208) found that the following factors are strongly associated with low generalised trust in the United States:

a) A recent history of individual traumatic experiences (although this effect rapidly vanishes with time, i.e. after one year).

b) Belonging to a group that historically felt discriminated against (minorities).

c) Being economically unsuccessful (low income, low education).

d) Living in a racially mixed\(^{21}\) community and / or in one with a high degree of income disparity (while the diversity in ethnic background is not significant).

Religious beliefs and ethnic origins, on the contrary, do not significantly affect generalised trust. On the contrary, the signal from inequality is rather strong. In the United States, a country for which there are good time series data on trust.

There is a strong correlation between trust and inequality from 1960 to 1998. The bivariate $r^2$ is .54. As in this analysis, a simultaneous equation model shows that the relationships goes from inequality to trust, not from trust to more inequality. (Uslaner 2003, 184)

\(^{21}\) In their seminal study Alesina and La Ferrara introduce a quantitative definition of ‘racial fragmentation’ that will be adopted by several other authors subsequently. Racial fragmentation index: “the probability that two randomly drawn individuals in a [sampling area] belong to difference races’ as categorised by the US census; similarly for the ethnic fragmentation index where the ethnic background is defined in terms of the country of origin.”
According to Alesina and La Ferrara, generalised trust is therefore a ‘two equilibria’ phenomenon:

In the ‘good’ equilibrium (more likely to occur in homogeneous communities) individuals trust each other and for that reason more and more trust is built. In the ‘bad’ equilibrium (more likely to occur in heterogeneous communities) the low level of trust reduces trust building opportunities even more (Alesina and La Ferrara 2002, 209).

When we introduce our three measures of heterogeneity one at a time we find that Gini and racial fragmentation are significant, while ethnic fragmentation is not, even though it has the expected [negative] sign.(Alesina and La Ferrara 2002, 222).

The non significance of ethnic fragmentation as an explaining factor for low generalised trust is a result similar to what will be found by Marc Hooghe and colleagues (2009) for Europe.

As a component of social capital, generalised trust can be modelled following this economic abstraction with its stock and flows. What is of particular interest are the sources of trust generation, the psychological and social mechanisms that can (re-) produce trust, for example how can trust be restored after the stock of individual generalised trust has been depleted because of a traumatic experience of victimhood in a crime of even a bitter neighbourhood conflict.

The potential for the restoration of trust, sort of ‘trust in trustability’ or ‘trust in the restorability of trust’, is in principle independent from the stock of trust, so that a person affected by a crime or trauma may have a low level of trust but still high levels of ‘trust in trustability’ and thus a high potential for the recovery of overall trust levels. In the literature about restorative justice “the concept of trust comes close to what is for Braithwaite and Pettit (1990) the assurance dimension of the dominion, i.e the confidence that the others and the authorities will respect rights and freedoms” (Walgrave 2008, 172).

In this regard, RJ practices can focus on two inter-linked levels: at the social level keeping ‘trust in trustability’ high; as direct interventions on the restoration of trust
levels in the participants of specific cases of conflict. The connection between the two seems plausible but its far from obvious to prove analytically:

An important question is how much the level of somebody’s trust is influenced by the average level of trust in a community. [...] If a higher level of social trust leads to more individual trust we have the making of a multiple equilibria situation, since we have complementarities in trust (Alesina and La Ferrara 2002, 210).

This opens up interesting questions about the effects of migration as such, internal mobility between communities, regardless of the ethnic and racial diversity, on trust:

as far as mobility is concerned, what matters most for an individual’s inclination to trust is not his or her own mobility, but the stability of the community in which he or she lives (Alesina and La Ferrara 2002, 225).

This finding is echoed in the admission by Paul Collier that “the lifestyle such as that of my [post-national] family are dependent, and potentially parasitic, on those whose identity remains rooted, thereby providing us with the viable societies among which we choose” (Collier 2013, prologue).

3.7.3 | Trust and cultural diversity

According to Coleman “most individuals are less inclined to trust those who are different from themselves, because familiarity breeds trust” (quoted in Alesina and La Ferrara 2002). Trust is in general associated with a predictable environment but crucially the kind of trust that is more relevant for social capital and keeping cooperation going is generalised trust, or trust in the more abstract fellow citizen, not trust in neighbours or family (localised trust).

Social identities (continuously de- and re-constructed by social and political processes) constitute the ever shifting space over which metrics of perceived social distance (based on Milgram, 1970) can be defined (‘diversity’). Hence, one can trace a tentative chain of mechanisms as follows to attempt explaining the effects of ‘diversity’ on trust:
increasing social distance => increasing neighbourhood heterogeneity => lower predictability of social behaviour => higher information processing demands => ‘information overload’ => systemic shutdown, the psychological counterpart of social ‘hunkering down’ (Putnam 2007, 169).

In social psychology “trust seems easier to develop when we are familiar with the people around us, and particularly when they seem similar to ourselves” (Hooghe et al. 2009, 201).

In essence, ethnic or racial differences make it more difficult to rely on the future behaviour of one’s neighbours, friends and colleagues, reducing levels of interpersonal trust and eroding the capacity for cooperation and support for collective action (Hooghe et al. 2009, 201).

It is important to keep into account also the dynamic effects:

The different causal mechanisms of the threat hypothesis anchored in cultural distance and economic and political competition vis-à-vis majority groups are intensified with rapid changes of experienced diversity (Hudder et al. 2005, cit. in Hooghe et al. 2009).

Where cultural distance is a variable metric taking into account status, language, visible traits, racial identity, religion and so on.

In a comprehensive cross-country study following up Putnam’s research on Italian regions (1993), Knack and Keefer found that trust is indeed associated with stronger economic performance, but associational activity is not (as already shown in previous sections, the effects of the networking dimension of social capital are debatable). Crucially for the scope of this section,

trust and norms of civic cooperation [...] are stronger in countries that are less polarised along lines of class and ethnicity (Knack and Keefer 1997, 1252).

Putnam’s main finding in his *E pluribus unum* paper is that ethnic and racial diversity reduce generalised trust in the United States, such that “in ethnically diverse
Neighbourhoods residents of all races tend to ‘hunker down.’ Trust (even of one’s own race) is lower, altruism and community cooperation rarer, friends fewer.”

It is important to note that Putnam’s paper is not about ‘cultural diversity’ in broad terms, but the ‘ethnic and racial’ sort as categorised in the US census questionnaire whose data is part of the study dataset (“Hispanic, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black and Asian”). Apart from acknowledging the culturally ‘constructed’ nature of these categories, the link between ethno-racial identity and a wider context of cultural diversities exists but it is far from being univocal.

Putnam’s study had a strong impact also because it seemed to have dealt a serious blow to the ‘contact hypothesis,’ the assumption that diversity and everyday interaction between people of different ethnic backgrounds would foster inter-ethnic tolerance and social solidarity:

If we have more contact with people of other ethnic background [...] we will begin to trust one another more, [...] diversity reduces ethnocentric attitudes and fosters out-group trust and solidarity (Putnam 2007, 141–142).

At the same time, the findings to not seem to support directly even the conflict theory, according to which “diversity fosters out-group distrust and in-group solidarity” (ibid.) thus reinforcing the ‘bonding’ type of social capital (i.e. “ties to people who are like you in some important way”) and weakening the ‘bridging’ type (“ties to people who are unlike you in some important way,” ibid. 143).

“(1). Ethnic diversity will increase substantially in virtually all modern societies over the next several decades, in part because of immigration. Increased immigration and diversity are not only inevitable, but over the long run they are also desirable. Ethnic diversity is, on balance, an important social asset, as the history of my own country demonstrates. (2) In the short to medium run, however, immigration and ethnic diversity challenge social solidarity and inhibit social capital. In support of this provocative claim I wish to adduce some new evidence, drawn primarily from the United States. (3) In the medium to long run, on the other hand, successful immigrant societies create new forms of social solidarity and dampen the negative effects of diversity by constructing new, more encompassing identities. Thus, the central challenge for modern, diversifying societies is to create a new, broader sense of ‘we’” (Putnam, 2007, 138–139).
Based on his data, where in highly diverse localities people end up trusting less also those of their own ethnic background, Putnam advances his own hypothesis in the form of a new “constrict theory”:

the possibility that diversity might actually reduce both in-group and out-group solidarity – that is, both bonding and bridging social capital (ibid. 144).

Diversity seems to trigger not in-group / out-group division, but anomie or social isolation. In colloquial language, people living in ethnically diverse settings appear to ‘hunker down’ – that is, to pull in like a turtle (ibid. 149).

Another finding in Putnam’s study has interesting implications for a research programme like ALTERNATIVE’s that focuses on conflict as its main unit of analysis:

In areas of greater diversity, our respondents demonstrate: [...] lower frequency of registering to vote, but more interest and knowledge about politics and more participation in protest marches and social reform groups (ibid. 149).

Among the many possible explanations of this conflictual feature of highly diverse localities (e.g. urban bias), we would not discard for the moment the suggestion that generalised trust and the stable cooperative regimes that it tends to support are effective ways of managing social conflicts that are endemic and ‘physiologic’ in every society, but the levels of conformism and norms-shaped behaviour they require may tend also to suppress the manifestations of conflicts (e.g. the ‘culture of silence’ in the small town in Hungary). Where diversity is higher and trust weaker, conflicts are either not effectively addressed at the micro-level through cooperative regimes, or they cannot be addressed and need to be brought at higher level through political participation.

Diversity does not produce ‘bad race relations’ or ethnically-defined group hostility, our findings suggest. Rather, inhabitants of diverse communities tend to withdraw from collective life, to distrust their neighbours, regardless of the colour of their skin, to withdraw even from close friends, to expect the worst from their community and its leaders, to volunteer less, give less to charity and work on community projects less often, to register to vote less, to agitate for social reform more, but have less faith that they can actually make
We can sketch a tripartite field of tensions between various behavioural outcomes in intercultural contexts. First, isolation, ‘hunkering down’, withdrawal from collective life along with the securitisation of social conflict in general (from petty criminality to migrations). Second, destructive open conflict, bad race relations, hostility. Third, cooperation, where higher levels of socio-economic equality and hence of trust allow to address conflicts.

**Findings about Europe: weaker effects, still negative**

That the relation of ethnic diversity per se with trust is not highly significant in the United States, although with a negative sign, is a result quite similar to what was found in a multivariate analysis by Hooghe et al. (2009) and Gesthuizen, Van Der Meer & Scheepers (2009) in Europe. The stronger negative effects found in the United States by both Alesina & La Ferrara and Putnam are between trust and racial diversity. It seems that the main issue in the United States is the enduring legacy of slavery and racial discrimination (Portes and Vickstrom 2011), more than recent immigration. Besides, if social capital is the outcome of historical forces buried deep in the nation’s past, there is little point in promoting it as a cure for social ills and exhorting citizens to become more participatory (ibid. 469).

The ‘European’ studies however did not probe for changes in trust during the last few decades, although they did consider dynamic effects including migration flows in the model. True, levels of generalised trust across countries vary very slowly in time – “the aggregate correlation from the 1981 to 1990 is .91, n = 22” (Uslaner 2003, 178) – but in European countries that were ethnically highly homogeneous until the very recent past only probing for variations in trust would perhaps yield the effects, if any, of post WWII demographic changes due to migrations, just as Putnam (1995) observed and tried to explain changes in trust in US society. The difficulty perhaps is that there are no good and long enough time series on trust across countries, although the European Social
Survey started polling about trust – variable ppltrst: “Most people can be trusted or you can’t be too careful?” (‘ESS Data’ 2015) – back in 2002 adding more countries along the way.

European cross-country studies, if anything confirm that “income inequality is a consistently negative predictor of trust” and that “it is not diversity per-se but unequal diversity that makes a difference,” especially when high socio-economic inequality is combined with spacial segregation and ethnic difference (Portes and Vickstrom 2011, 471–472). Portes and Vickstrom’s own hypothesis:

even accepting that it is diversity itself, which mass immigration necessarily increases, that leads to a decline in social capital, [...] this is not so important. Mutual trust and bowling leagues are nice things to have, but they do not represent a sine qua non for a viable society (ibid. 472).

Hooghe et al. (2009) explore the associations between ‘diversity’ (partially as a consequence of migration) and trust (as central component of social capital). The authors often refer to ‘social cohesion’, a concept that is possibly even more blurry than ‘social capital’ itself, but relevant in Europe because it was, especially during the 1990s and 2000s, one of the stated goals of EU policy.

Conclusion: ethnic and racial diversity may be associated with lower generalised trust, and this effect should be taken into account, but this effect is much weaker and less significant than the association of trust with socio-economic inequality.

3.7.4 | Trust, inequality, cooperation and fairness

The issue of fairness has attracted a lot of attention among economists as well, in particular because the standard model based on a purely self-interested homo oeconomicus fails to explain certain well established results in experimental behavioural economics in public goods games or ‘dictator’ games. The experimental evidence shows that “people resist inequitable outcomes; i.e. they are willing to give up some material payoff to move in the direction of more equitable outcomes.”
Modelling “fairness as self-centred inequity aversion,” without introducing assumptions on intentions or motivations of moral nature, Fehr and Schmidt (1999) show that adding as unique deviation from the standard model the assumption that “there are a fraction of people who are motivated by fairness considerations” it is sufficient to theoretically explain the experimental results.

When assessing the opposite pulls of fairness and competition in market proposer games, the authors appraise the role of ‘punishment’ and sanctions and conclude that competition renders fairness considerations irrelevant if and only if none of the competing players can punish the monopolist by destroying some of the surplus and enforcing a more equitable outcome. (Fehr and Schmidt 1999, 835)

Confining the findings of the model to certain public goods games, it emerges how a certain number of “conditionally cooperative enforcers” ready to bear (up to a certain level) the costs of punishing defectors can be sufficient to force an equilibrium outcome of full cooperation.

* * *

Now it is time to link several separate findings. First, the strong, significant and negative association between socio-economic inequality and generalised trust. Second, the economic model able to explain cooperative behaviour in public goods, market and dictator games with the single introduction of a fraction of the population with sufficient fairness as inequity aversion. Third, the strong and significant association between generalised trust and sustained cooperative behaviour.

The inequality aversion in individual preferences could be postulated as one of the micro level mechanisms that contribute to explain the correlation between socio-economic inequality, low levels of trust and lack of cooperation.

What motivates participants in laboratory games to alter others’ income at a cost for themselves is unclear. In standard public goods games norm enforcement through punishment is costly to the individual, but the rewards obtained by all through cooperation are also an incentive. To address this problem, Dawes and colleagues
(2007) designed an experiment that eliminates the rewards of cooperation because altering others’ income, positively or negatively, implies only a cost for the player. Besides total anonymity and continuous reshuffling of the groups of players, who know this, eliminates repeated games and the influence of reputations. The results suggest that egalitarian motives, or inequality aversion, are the main factor affecting income-altering behaviours. To check whether it is inequality itself that arouses negative emotions and these in turn influence behaviour, the researchers presented the subject with two hypothetical scenarios and questioned them afterwards about ‘anger’ or ‘annoyance’. The ‘high inequality’ where they encountered group members who obtained higher payoffs elicited much more annoyance and anger than the ‘low inequality’ where they encountered other players with similar payoffs. Even when the subjects knew that the source of income – and its inequalities – were completely random. “These findings support research that indicates human are strongly influenced by egalitarian preferences” (Dawes et al. 2007, 796).

In order to explain the prevalence of aversion to inequality in preferences, in turn, it is probably necessary to look at motivations and psychological evidence on social comparison and loss aversion, and the role of the environment – natural, as well as socio-institutional – in an evolutionary perspective.

In fact, “there is an important intersection between the distribution of preferences in a given population and the strategic environment” (Fehr and Schmidt 1999, 819). More specifically,

there are environments where the behaviour of a minority of purely selfish people forces the majority of fair-minded people to behave in a completely selfish manner, too. [...] Yet, we have also shown that a minority of fair-minded players can force a big majority of selfish players to cooperate fully in the public goods games with punishment (Fehr and Schmidt 1999, 856).

The social structure has a crucial role in maintaining cooperative regimes, that is “sustained cooperative behaviour within a population of adaptive agents for whom cooperative behaviour may be costly in the short run.” In particular, adopting Giddens’s approach, the social structure “determines the patterned character of interaction among agents or ‘who tends to interact with whom?’” (Cohen, Riolo, and Axelrod 2001, 6). A
crucial dimension of the definition of social structure in terms of patterning of interaction is the dynamic one, looking at the continuity in time of the pattern of relations of actors or groups. This ‘context preservation’ is very important for the development and consolidation of cooperative regimes. Agent-based simulations are controlled environments where the ‘social structure’ can be chosen at will and its evolutionary effects compared with those of others social structures and of different agents’ strategies. The authors call “shadow of the adaptive future” the different “effects of future interactions on the survival chances of variant strategies being generated by the adaptive processes of the present” (Cohen, Riolo, and Axelrod 2001, 7).

If the ‘social structure’ chosen for the agent-based simulations is one of random interactions with replacement, i.e. there is no stability whatsoever in social interaction, there is no sustainable cooperation. If the social structure, on the contrary, is extremely stable and “agents were assigned permanent positions” so that each agent keeps the same neighbours throughout the duration of evolutionary game, cooperation strategies appear, are sustained, widespread and strong, average payoffs are higher, near the theoretical maximum. With such substantive effects of the ‘social structure’, it is worth asking with the authors “what are the fundamental properties of spatial embedding that so dramatically alter dynamic processes within these populations?” (ibid. 10). First, “the imposition of fixed spatial locations means that agent parings do not change, even though the adapting agents may change their strategy after any period” (ibid. 11). Second, “the contact networks of agents are correlated. Paired agents have neighbours who are themselves paired” (ibid. 11; see the ‘clustering’ property of networks in graph theory). Of these two properties, only the former is sufficient for achieving sustained cooperation:

Context preserving social structures suffices for the emergence and maintenance of cooperative regimes, without paired agents having correlated networks (Cohen, Riolo, and Axelrod 2001, 12).

Spatial mobility and temporal dynamics can be simulated, altering the more ‘conservative’ social structure and “in each period a new randomly chosen partner was substituted (temporarily, as in the [random with replacement] case) for each fixed network partner with probability \( p_s \)” (ibid. 12). In this way varying a single parameter, \( p_s \), from zero to one allows the researchers to simulate a continuum of social structures,
from the more ‘conservative’ with fixed pairing, to the more fluid, where all interactions happen with randomly changing partners. Cooperation can be sustained for low values of $p$, but it gets progressively less widespread and the average payoffs decrease as the mobility of agents increase and it definitely breaks down for values of $p$ of approximately 0.5.

Around a parameter value of 0.3 the dynamics shift. The ability to sustain cooperative regimes weakens, and then, at levels of 0.5 and above it collapses. Those results for sets of population histories (i.e. individual runs of the model) strongly suggests that context-preservation plays an essential role in the emergence and maintenance of cooperative regimes (Cohen, Riolo, and Axelrod 2001, 13).

Persisting patterns of interaction are clearly a major determining factor for the emergence of cooperative regimes (ibid. 14).

It is worth noting that in these simulations cooperation emerges without introducing institutions of ‘punishment’, relying only on the freedom of the agents to defect and not being cooperative – or just threaten to be – in successive rounds of the game (although this in itself could be considered as a costly sanction imposed on the other player and the agent himself, but it is not construed as a sanction separate from the flow of the game itself). In other words, cooperation is achieved and sustained “without sword” (Ostrom, Walker, and Gardner 1992).

Different strategies, or the prevalence of them among the population of agents, evolve in time and the social structure again has a clear effect on the evolutionary outcome:

Once there is a sufficient density of friendly, unprovocable strategies, successful predatory exploitation by unfriendly strategies is inevitable. However, in context preserving structures, falling levels of friendliness are subsequently restored, while in randomly mixing systems, they are not. (Cohen, Riolo, and Axelrod 2001, 20)

Here’s what appears to be a stylised model for the restoration of cooperation. Friendly strategies that succeed are emulated; the likelihood to interact with similarly friendly strategies increases, thus yielding higher payoffs for all. But a friendly strategy is easy
game for an unfriendly one, that therefore succeeds and is emulated. If the social structure is preserving the context, however, i.e. there is no fresh addition of friendly strategies to prey on, unfriendly strategies will increasingly interact with each other resulting in high defection rates (uncooperative behaviour) thus lowering the payoffs of the agents, making them unsuccessful, thus not emulated, until the unfriendly strategies disappear from the population and cooperation is restored.

There is therefore a link between patternning of interaction mediated by social structure, societal ecology of the research action sites and the dynamic effects of mobility (from immigration mainly) on repeated interactions. Taking this into account, the takeaway for restorative justice interventions, apart form a sobering reminder about the conditioning force of the social structure, is that regardless of how a certain intercultural context has formed in the previous years, a certain degree of stability of the population – and long term engagement – is necessary in order to have some chances to open channels of nonviolent communication, restore trust, and achieve a modicum of cooperation in addressing conflictual issues of justice and security in the neighborhood or community. On the contrary, a social environment in constant flux, exposed to unmitigated blow of the roaring forties of globalised capitalism is no place for restorative work worth the name. Some kind protection policies, social or otherwise, are therefore needed.

3.7.5 Trust, the state and institutions

Can states, governments and their policies produce trust? In general it is safe to answer in the negative. But it is true that people in democracies tend to trust more, and that societies with higher levels of trust in turn tend to have better functioning institutions, hence the interest in studying this relationship. However, considering that “the roots lie in the deeper values societies hold and in the distribution of resources” (Uslaner 2003, 173) it is more likely that it is trust that produces better institutions, and not vice-versa (for a cross-country comparison see Bjørnskov 2006).
States can affect generalised trust through different channels or mechanisms that are all more or less plausible, although the evidence for each is far from definitive.23

a) Rule of law. Provided that laws are seen as ‘fair’ – hence the democratic requirement – their enforcement by the state ensures that cheaters are not getting away with it, property rights are enforced, expectations stabilised and legal requirements end up acquiring the strength or moral stipulations.

b) Protecting the rights of minorities, considering that being part of a historically oppressed or marginalised minority is one of the main sources of lack of trust.

c) Providing welfare and in general redistributive policies that reduce socio-economic inequalities in society, the other main source of lack of generalised trust.

d) Honesty in government may be associated with less corruption in society, and this in turn is strongly related with generalised trust. “The correlation between societal corruption and generalised trust across fifty-two countries is −.61” (Uslaner 2003, 172 trust data from the World Values Survey, corruption data from Transparency International)

e) Democratic regimes promote trust by empowering people with less resources in society, and this in turn allows to dynamically adapt the policy preferences and to orient them towards more redistribution and reduction of inequalities.

e) Effective government performance in democratic regimes makes people trust government more, this in turn reinforces the belief that they can influence the government policies and this growing sense of efficacy increases generalised trust.

Political trust, or the trust in political institutions, is associated with reciprocity and cooperative behaviour. The explanatory mechanism would be that political institutions can function as a third party enforcer that is attributed with implementing the moral norms that are conducive to reciprocal cooperation.

---

23 We follow here the review made by Uslaner (2003, 172–173) and we refer to it for the original citations.
Pre-existing levels of trust in order institutions (police and courts) and, to a lesser extent, trust in representative institutions (Parliament, government, political parties) have a significant and positive impact on the tendency to opt for reciprocal cooperation.

Low levels of political trust were associated with violating the assumption of equal and reciprocal cooperation. However, the association between trust in political institutions and attitudes to cooperation is weak at best (Hooghe and Marien 2010).

Among the political institutional variables, the only strong association is between generalised trust and long uninterrupted periods of democratic regime (Inglehart 1990) cit in (Inglehart 1997, 164).

Are there any differences in trust towards political institutions among residents with a migration background?

In this study, we investigate whether differences in generalized and political trust levels between immigrants and natives are related to immigrants’ relatively disadvantaged socio-economic positions in society. We compare trust levels for native Dutch respondents and Turkish and Moroccan minorities, based on the NELLS population survey (2009, n = 4,222). The results demonstrate that there are significant differences between immigrants and natives in the levels of generalized and political trust. Regarding trust in political institutions, however, the initially observed differences could almost fully be attributed to differences in economic position and social resources. We conclude that the economic and social integration of immigrants in society is most clearly associated with native-immigrant differences in political trust, but objective living conditions are also related to immigrants’ generalized trust. Therefore, policies aiming to improve immigrants’ economic and social integration in society will generally be conducive to generalized and political trust levels (Vroome, Hooghe, and Marien 2013).

Welfare state, taxation, redistribution and cultural diversity:

The argument that cultural diversity reduces the willingness to redistribute income has been formalized and investigated by two highly distinguished
Harvard professors, Alberto Alesina and Edward Glaeser. They posed the question of why there has been so much greater willingness to accept redistribution in Europe than in the United States. Their explanation was that the distinctive attitudes of the typical European country were grounded in its greater cultural homogeneity. There is also some evidence that what erodes the willingness to redistribute is the rate at which diversity increases rather than simply its level. However, the importance of the level of diversity is supported by a wide array of evidence. As predicted by the theory, the greater the level of cultural diversity, the worse the provision of redistributive public goods. (Collier 2013).

Public order institutions in liberal democracies, when sufficiently effective and perceived as ‘fair’ in the pursuit of their institutional goals (Jackson et al. 2011 the ESS asks questions about the respondent’s understanding of ‘fair’ as opposed to that of the police), are associated with higher levels of generalised trust, lower anti-social punishment and sustained cooperation (Herrmann, Thoni, and Gachter 2008). The main mechanism for this association would be through their institutional role in sanctioning defectors in a ‘fair’ way. But the involvement of police forces in ALTERNATIVE’s action research sites cases has generally proven problematic: for example, after calling the police for help with the ‘noisy neighbours’ in a Vienna social housing estate, subsequent communication between participants became more difficult (D4.4, 27).

**Trust and Welfare-state**

The neo-Toquevillian, mainly US-based, literature on social capital tend to see civil society and its multiple and multiform expressions of civic organisations as an important locus for the production of social capital, while state intervention in society is seen as neutral at best or disruptive at worse, witness the effects of really existing communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe in systematically undermining all ‘horizontal’ links in society, substituting them with ‘vertical’ and hierarchical ones where the individual or at most nuclear family interacts only with the social formation and institutions designed and authorised by the state. In Western social-democracies the welfare-state institutions were seen with suspicion in the debate about social capital in particular and the dialectics of ‘protection’ vs ‘emancipation’ in general.
However, a closer look at how welfare state institutions work in practice shows that, at least in Sweden:

the specific design of welfare-state policies matters for the production of social capital. [...] Contacts with universal welfare-state institutions tend to increase social trust, whereas experiences with the needs-testing social programmes undermine it. [...] The policy implication is that governments, by designing welfare-state institutions, can invest in social capital (Kumlin and Rothstein 2005).

The possible mechanism for this effect is the strong negative association between socio-economic inequality and trust as already shown in a previous section:

in democratic nations, the single biggest barrier to generalised trust is economic inequality (Uslaner 2003, 181).

This finding is perhaps the single most significant one in the literature on social capital (Alesina and La Ferrara 2002; Portes and Vickstrom 2011; Gesthuizen, Van Der Meer, and Scheepers 2009; Putnam 2007). If this is the case, the most effective way for governments to promote the attitudinal components of social capital, i.e. generalised trust, would be by redistributing resources.

Rothstein and Stolle examine the impact of the way that public services are delivered, referring to Esping Anderson’s classification of different types of welfare-states. On the one hand, systems based upon universal programmes are more likely to foster a sense of generalised trust, since they cultivate a sense of impartiality and fairness of political institutions and equality of all citizens. On the other hand, ‘selective’ or ‘conservative’ welfare-states that use means-tests to determine eligibility for benefits are more likely to stigmatise the needy and provide more scope for bias and fraud in the provision of services, thus undermining citizens’ likelihood of trusting each other.

More in general, Stolle observes that

for social capital to flourish it needs to be embedded in and linked to formal political institutions (Berman 1977; Foley and Edwards 1998; Levi 1998; Skockpol 1996; Tarrow 1996). [...] Social capital does not exist independently
in the real of civil society: Governments, public policies, societal cleavages, economic conditions and political institutions channel and influence social capital such that it becomes either a beneficial or detrimental resource for democracy. [...] Institutional engineering might be used to foster social capital (Stolle 2003, 21).

Hence, there are two potential mechanisms, or channels of inference associating RJCIS with higher trust, at least at the localised level of restorative interventions (generalised trust at the national level in fact changes only very slowly, if at all): a) acting on the sense of equality and fairness of the justice process; b) decreasing the ‘insecurity’ associated with ‘uncertainty’ in the expected behaviour of others through dialogue and restored communication.

3.7.6 | Trust and RJ in intercultural settings

Restorative justice, with its focus on responding to criminal wrongdoing within the ‘lifeworld’ and outside of the criminal justice ‘system’ and its coercive power, is well placed to work on trust building. Trust itself by its own nature cannot be enforced. Different institutional settings can affect generalised trust, but with limits. There is abundant literature about the importance of state enforcement of ‘fair’ laws in democratic regimes as one source of trust (see previous section), in particular

Coercion, or at least its credible threat, has been and still is widely practised as a means to ensure cooperation; in its extreme form, to ensure submission and compliance. But it falls short of being an adequate alternative to trust; it limits the extent to which we worry about, but does not increase trust. On the contrary: coercion exercised over unwilling subjects – who have not pre-committed themselves to being prevented from taking certain courses of action or who do not accept the legitimacy of the enforcement of a particular set of rights – while demanding less of our trust in others, may simultaneously reduce the trust that others have in us. It introduces an asymmetry which disposes of mutual trust and promotes instead power and resentment (Gambetta 1988, 220).
If, eschewing coercion in principle, restorative justice is particularly well placed to deal with trust, it is tempting to place trust at the centre of the whole restorative justice endeavour, seeing criminal wrongdoing as fundamentally a breach of trust; and the loss of trust, in turn as the essential harm caused by crime.

In fact, authors like Ross London (2003; 2011) advocate for reorienting the whole justice system towards the reparation of harm, and identify in the violation or breach of trust the essential harm that is caused by crime in general, both at the personal and societal levels. Hence, a restoratively reformed justice system should aim at the restoration of trust first and foremost.

The theme that consistently struck me as wholly original and crucial to the restorative justice perspective was the goal of repairing the harm of crime. [...] What distinguishes crime from other types of injuries, it seemed to me, is that it represent a fundamental breach of trust. For the victim, the experience of crime results in a loss of trust in the offender and in the society that failed to provide basic security. [...] What exactly is the harm of crime that needs repairing? Is it injury, property loss, psychological damage, or all of these? What can the system do to repair that damage? And what, if anything, can the defendant do to repair the damage he has caused? [...] What is the victim’s basic loss? [...] a single word answer: trust (London 2011, 6–7).

Considering that the ALTERNATIVE project deliberately deals with conflicts and not criminal wrongdoing does not allow to follow this lead to the end, even if it traces an original position.

On the effects of the Rule of Law and other justice institutions in producing trust the findings are rather weak and inconclusive. Considering crime as breach of trust that shatters expectations, the normative ones in particular, London’s stance could possibly be widened thinking about the immune function of Law in Luhmann as counterfactual stabilisation of normative expectations as the prime example of what trust in ‘public institutions’ – a variable regularly sampled in opinion polls – may refer to. This would point towards an immunological understanding of Coleman and Alesina’s contention that “trust is greater among the ‘similar’” explaining similarity as shared immune responses mediated however, and here’s the Luhmannian systemic twist, through a
quintessentially de-naturalising legal system that has the tendency to absorb everything and rather than protect the community from conflicts it operates through them: “Law does not only solves conflicts, but it makes them possible, it even produces them” (Luhmann 1982 own translation).²⁴

Sociability depends on a minimally effective immune system, the reasonable expectation not to be infected by other people's germs and the expectation that the average other will not be infected in the first place with especially threatening germs. If we share the same germs, our individual immune systems are similarly attuned and ready and we can socialise. Besides, if most people in the group are immunised against a certain germ this creates a 'group immunity' shielding also those that for some reason are not individually immunised. The group immunity constitutes an extension of the 'we' to include others that the self can trust.

Even if the effect of ethnic or racial diversity on generalised trust seems weaker and less significative in Europe (Hooghe et al. 2009; Gesthuizen, Van Der Meer, and Scheepers 2009) than in the United States (Putnam 2007) it still poses a problem for restorative approaches to alternative understanding of justice and security in intercultural settings.

If trust is central to action research practices in expanded restorative justice (RJCIS) as experimented in ALTERNATIVE, either as a simple instrumental condition for research or as an actual desirable outcome of the process, the cultural diversity of the setting affects the practice from within.

If “trust is essentially cultural but, like culture itself, is shaped our experiences” – especially collective ones, like how a society’s resources are distributed (Uslaner 2003, 183) then RJICS scope of intervention will be limited. While generalised trust seems out of reach, RJICS may contribute more to localised trust-building – preventing the transition to, or deepening of, low trust equilibria where lack of trust reduces interaction and breeds lower trust, especially in ethnically diverse communities.

The following chart tries to represent pictorially some of the relationships between trust, intercultural contexts, some state institutions and restorative justice, with hints to the possible causal mechanisms.
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'italks: possible mechanism
The concept of ‘trust’ was initially considered by the researchers among the project’s key concepts. It appeared only once at the second steering committee meeting, but it was eventually dropped. However, it returned with full force during the last year of the project at the seventh steering committee meeting when researchers across all sites discussed issues of trust building as a condition that is instrumental to carrying out action research and to prepare the ground to implement restorative justice in intercultural contexts.

Most references to ‘trust’ in ALTERNATIVE are found in the problem analysis in the small town in Hungary (D5.2) and in the analysis of inter-ethnic conflicts in Serbia (D6.2), as well as in the RJ manual (D7.5) and RJ contributions to peace-building (D7.2) developed by the team in Northern Ireland. In Vienna there are few explicit references to ‘trust’ although it could be argued that trust and solidarity are already embedded in an impersonal institutionalised form in welfare institutions. When analysing the importance of trust-building and its connection to restorative justice there are important differences among the research sites: from meta-level dialogue to handling concrete conflicts and the related questions of legitimacy/authority like whether to challenge or not the ‘culture of silence’ and how.

In Vienna trust building is not referred to explicitly and it is touched as lateral concern linked to the general question of the legitimacy to intervene (‘who are we to...?’, ‘did people ask for our help?’). Working with already established institutions and programmes, there isn’t an issue of ‘greenfield’ trust building. As already suggested, trust is not named as a concern in Vienna perhaps because it is already embedded in the welfare institutions. During the attempted circles in Vienna (D4.4), when presented with RJ or dialogical principles participants showed: “resistance, avoidance, falling back, dwelling on experiences of fear and xenophobia.” The last in particularly is associated with low trust.

In Hungary the researchers have identified in the so-called ‘culture of silence’ – the reluctance of the inhabitants in talking openly about conflicts – a central interpretation key that generates several questions. “What does it mean to want people to talk openly about their conflicts? Is silence a strategic tool? When is it OK to challenge and when is
it better to leave things as they are? When does breaking the silence make people vulnerable? Who benefits from the silence? How far can you go as a practitioner and how far must you go?”, etc.

After the restorative interventions participants showed more readiness to face conflicts and tensions, to listen to ‘the other’, to engage in dialogue. Considering the initial low trust – but arguably higher ‘trust in trustability’ potential – of the setting, these are all trust building activities (see also in the case of the ‘Healing circle’ from Kisváros).

During the participatory workshops in Serbia, working with experts, creating a safe space, capacity building, education, raising awareness, sharing knowledge are all seen as preparatory work laying the ground for future restorative interventions. The ALTERNATIVE researchers in Serbia explicitly posit the importance of the restoration of open dialogue and non-violent communication in order to leverage the contact theory in post-conflict societies:

Thus, the main factors that contribute to establishing and maintaining communication and dialogue include: optimal contact, readiness for communication, and gradual setting of conditions for constructive communication (dialogue). This provides a basis for cooperation, trust-building and moving conflicting parties closer to each other. The research of the ‘Third way’ model development confirmed the relevance of the contact hypothesis, and of the communication and dialogue as a means of changing attitudes, behaviours and relationships in post-conflict societies. It also suggested the importance of coordination of activities and cooperation that offers a good basis for the development of trustful relationships towards reconciliation (D6.3)

They articulate the potential of restorative circles as trust-building methods through “storytelling, which is important for both self reflection and for understanding others, and focusing on (re)building relationships, trust and mutual understanding” (Pranis 2005, quoted in D3.2) and focused on experiences of mutual trust during the second workshop in all three locations, highlighting among the main finding the mutual character of trust and the impact of different life experiences and differences among individuals in their attitude and practices of trust (D6.3, section 5.2.3).
But at the light of research on trust and social capital there are serious assumptions to be made in order for the contact hypothesis to work: if the participants in the putative dialogue are deeply unequal in terms of socio-economic conditions, education and diverse in ‘race’ (at least in the US context) there are little chances for a constructive communication to flow and this leading to increased trust. Rather, evidence points in the direction that it is more likely that the opposite may happen.

In fact, in post-conflict context like the societies emerged from the 1990s wars in the former Yugoslavia, and in particular in controlled environments like the seminars organised and conducted by the researchers in Serbia, if ‘ethnicity’ is the main factor of diversity dividing participants that are otherwise quite similar in socio-economic outlook (middle class working in government agencies, NGOs, education etc.) and education, the contact hypothesis and related communication methods have a much higher chance to work, as in fact they do.

Unlike the other action research sites, the researchers in Northern Ireland have actually been invited to intervene and their local partners (CARE, CRJI, Northlands centre) have strong roots in the communities. The working relationship with some of the partners in Belfast started before ALTERNATIVE. As a consequence there is no need for trust building in this site, and no legitimacy/authority questions as in some of the other sites. While working on issues of drugs, new social housing and hate crime they challenge the idea that trust building should be associated with neutrality and stand for all-partiality, transparency, a clear stance against violence and commitment to restorative based communities (personal communication to the author).

When community is relevant, one of the possible answers to the research questions of ‘what do we mean by restorative practices’ and ‘what to restore?’ could head in the direction of trust in particular and social capital in general (to take Putnam’s classic definition that sees the former as part of the latter, together with norms, networks and other features of social organisation that facilitate coordinated action).

Trust is based on the ‘esteem’ kind of recognition, to use the Hegelian semantic, and as such (unlike respect) it is not mandatory, it cannot be object of legal sanction and thus it is not universal. Economists are extremely interested in how this kind of social capital is re-produced, depleted etc. because there are good reasons to think that it is a very
important ingredient of economic success and growth in market economies. Should RJ and ALTERNATIVE set ‘trust’ and its restoration as goal in itself of just as an instrumental intermediate stage towards other ends?

If past experiences do have an impact on the participants initial negative attitude, considering that the negative association with trust tends to fade relatively fast (after one year Alesina & La Ferrara could not find significant impact) it is important to, first, engage participants at least in the medium term; second, to prevent as much as possible re-occurrences of the trauma, which is not easy in situation of continuous conflict where the structural determinants of the conflict are not likely to change. The traumatic experiences of the wars of the 1990s loom large in the memory of participants from Serbia, there are little doubts about how serious they are. But an important qualifying point emerging from the field research how the ‘small’ harassments in everyday life and repeated episodes of corrupt or predatory behaviour by local authorities keep bringing back the past traumas, (re)generating mistrust and making participants feel unsafe (D6.3).

The restorative practitioner who facilitated the circles in Vienna gives a remarkably compact and comprehensive formulation of what could be taken as a blueprint for an ‘expanded RJ’ approach (D4.4, 24-25):

- Raise the residents’ awareness of the structures they are living into and reproducing.
- Sharpen their senses for the interconnectedness with others.
- Provide a space for learning about the dynamics of conflict and dialogue in general and very specifically about conflicts in the communities the participants were part of, as well as the participants’ roles in these conflict situations with their possibilities of creating or impeding dialogue.
- Raise their ability to become co-creators of conditions for conflict and dialogue [restoration of communication] that strengthen the relationships within the community creating understanding, trust, cooperation, engagement.

The last part implies the active participation in the production, reproduction and restoration of public goods that are all components of *bridging* social capital.
3.8 | Cooperation

Trust is widely seen as an essential ingredient of successful cooperation. Something that for example is highlighted for its absence in Hungary where prevails a low trust – low cooperation equilibrium:

As several research programmes emphasised, the level of trust is quite low in Hungary (comparing with other EU countries). Hungarian people do not trust in each other (and even in institutions, organisations, political parties and MP’s, media etc.). Unsuccessful cooperation, exclusion and tension because of exclusion, frustration due to unsolved conflicts probably make distrust stronger. And without trust people may not be brave enough to reveal their own harms – as they do not feel safe at all and they feel they are vulnerable. However, without revealing their own harms there is no chance to solve problems on the community level (WP5 #64).

Why would cooperation be so important for restorative justice in conflicts in intercultural settings? The absence of coercion in RJ practices, at least of the legally sanctioned type enforced by state agencies, combined with the lack of some kind of organisation or ideological cohesion, exacerbated by the conflictual or adversarial setting, create a typical coordination problem. The agreement at the end of the typical restorative circle or conference where the parties commit to undertake certain actions aimed at repairing the harm caused by the ‘offender’ can be considered a specific case of ‘restored cooperation’ between people that before the restorative practice did not talk, and let alone trust each other.

3.8.1 | The dilemmas of sustained cooperation

Cooperating with complete strangers, people that a subject will never meet again, where reputation gains are small or absent is as widespread and historically encoded in complex institutions and norms, as it is puzzling to explain. Or at least it is if one follows a narrow, ‘selfish gene’ style, evolutionary approach, because cooperation does not yield direct gains to a participating individual. But cooperation is a very powerful cultural adaptation able to greatly increase the welfare of a group that practices it successfully
(Fehr and Schmidt 1999). Besides, cooperation is linked to inequality in wealth distribution, in particular its visibility, in complex ways. Recent experiments on public goods games suggest that when people can see wealth inequality in their social network, this not only lowers the overall welfare of the interacting group, but propels further inequality through reduced cooperation and reduced social connectivity (Nishi et al. 2015).

Among the explanations of cooperative behaviour put forward there are nepotistic motives like kin selection (that would not account for cooperation with genetically unrelated strangers, though) or selfish motives based on reputation-based indirect reciprocity (signalling theory) or reciprocal altruism.

Punishment seems to play an important role in fostering sustained cooperation and it is proposed as one of the possible explanations for the evolution of high levels of cooperation with genetically unrelated strangers in humans (Boyd et al. 2003). A particular kind of punishment of defectors or free riders that do not contribute to public goods games while enjoying the benefits of others’ cooperation is called ‘altruistic’. Those who mete it out bear a cost for it without receiving a direct, individual material gain, while at the same time contributing to a greater common good because their actions sustain cooperation and higher welfare for all the participants (Fehr and Fischbacher 2003; Fehr and Fischbacher 2004; Fehr and Gachter 2002).

Even if its systemic effects on cooperation are important for the general welfare of the population, its deep motivations are far from noble. The proximate mechanism behind altruistic punishment has probably something to do with negative emotions towards defectors, a deep thymotic substrate of envy, ressentiment and revenge. Based on observations of activation of the corpus striatum (a part of the brain implicated in the processing of rewards that accrue as a result of goal-directed actions) in people that learned about abuses of trust by defectors and cheaters and were given a choice of punishing them, it seems that “people derive satisfaction from punishing norm violators” (de Quervain et al. 2004, 1254).²⁵ Apart from these less than noble proximate

²⁵ As far as altruistic punishment is linked to preferences and eventually norms of inequity aversion and these in turn to fairness and justice, the findings of this stream of neurological, behavioural, game-theoretic and evolutionary theory will perhaps resonate with the readers of Kirkegaard and Nietzsche.
emotions, punishment even in its ‘altruistic’ form, can have negative effects on the general altruistic disposition of humans (Fehr and Rockenbach 2003).

**Antisocial punishment**

But punishment is not always directed at defectors and cheaters. When punishment on the contrary targets high contributors in public goods games it is called ‘antisocial’ and in some parts of the world (from Muscat to Ryad to Athens) this seems to be the behaviour of choice (Herrmann, Thoni, and Gachter 2008; Rand and Nowak 2011).

In a seminal study, Herrmann et al. carried out 16 public goods experiments around the world with volunteers taken from the same educated middle class that populates university campuses. They found that

Some participant pools punished the high contributors as much as they punished the low contributors. [...] In some participant pools, antisocial punishment was strong enough to remove the cooperation-enhancing effects of punishment (Herrmann, Thoni, and Gachter 2008, 1365).

Antisocial punishment is often linked with a strong sense of honour and revenge (Sylwester, Herrmann, and Bryson 2013; Elster 1990) and it is not necessarily an ‘irrational’ behaviour, on the contrary, it could be the most successful strategy in highly competitive environments with extremely scarce resources, although in this form it can lead to the complete breakdown of cooperation.

Interestingly, antisocial punishment correlates significantly with the civic values and respect of the rule of law in the country of the participant pool:

weak norms of civic cooperation [as they are expressed in people's attitudes to tax evasion, abuse of the welfare state, or dodging fares on public transport] and the weakness of the rule of law in a country are significant predictors of antisocial punishment.

The strength of the rule of law in a society might also have an impact on antisocial punishment. If the rule of law is strong, people trust the law enforcement institutions, which are perceived as being effective, fair,
impartial, and bound by the law. Revenge is shunned. If the rule of law is weak, the opposite holds. Thus, the rule of law reflects how norms are commonly enforced in a society (Herrmann, Thoni, and Gachter 2008, 1365).

So punishment in itself is far from being a silver bullet for cooperation:

punishment opportunities are socially beneficial only if complemented by strong norms of cooperation. [...] the cooperation-enhancing effect of punishment opportunity cannot be taken for granted (Herrmann, Thoni, and Gachter 2008, 1362, 1365).

More broadly and in evolutionary perspective:

Punishment is an important factor that can promote cooperative behaviour in some situations, but it is not a mechanism for the evolution of cooperation. All evolutionary models of punishment so far are based on underlying mechanisms such as indirect reciprocity, group selection, or network reciprocity. Punishment can enhance the level of cooperation that is achieved in such models (Nowak 2006, 1563).

Another way to obtain cooperation is making the game voluntary rather than obligatory: if players can choose to cooperate, defect or not play at all, then some level of cooperation usually prevails in dynamic oscillations (Nowak 2006, 1563).

A critical factor behind the cooperation-enhancing effect of punishment is “how people perceive the moral message behind punishment [of low contributors]” (Herrmann et al., 2008), whether with shame, hence the incentive to contribute more, or with piqued honour, hence the urge to take revenge against high contributors (even without knowing who the actual punisher was in the first place).

Honour may have an important role in the reactions to sanctioning. First, in its thymotic dimension as emotional reactions to ‘altruistic punishment’ and norms of revenge that are part of the cultural background of a minority. Second, as eudoxia (good reputation) it can be part of integrating mechanisms oriented at trustworthiness.
In culturally highly diverse contexts, it is more likely that perceptions of the ‘moral message’ behind ‘altruistic’ punishment will vary greatly. If this is further combined with the fact that those targeted by altruistic punishment more often happen to belong to a minority group that may have been discriminated in the past for other reasons (this is one of Alesina and La Ferrara strongest predictors of low trust), the likelihood of an ‘honour’ reaction to punishment with a retaliation of the ‘antisocial’ kind will increase and – via a decrease in generalised trust – the cooperation-enhancing effect of ‘altruistic’ punishment will collapse.

This kind of mechanism can describe up to a satisfactory level at least part of the dynamics in the ‘School’ case described in detail in deliverable D5.4 and grid #61 where three Roma pupils were suspected of theft, searched (nothing was found) and prevented to return home after a dog pup belonging to another child was lost. The teachers maintain that they acted in good faith, based on a reasonable clue (the three children had been seen walking out of the victim’s class, where they didn’t belong) and that they had to uphold the colour-blind, common rules that theft would not be tolerated in the school (thus they engaged in preliminary costly ‘altruistic’ punishment). The parents of the three suspected children disagreed. They were furious that they had not been informed in the first place. They were worried because their children had not returned home at the expected hour. They felt that their children had been targeted because of their Roma identity (oppressed minority group, low trust) and reacted with anger (honour, or self-esteem diminished) in turn accusing the teachers of being racists (‘antisocial’ punishment directed at the enforcers of supposed ‘altruistic sanctions’). It is moot to specify that cooperation could not flourish in circumstances of deep distrust, and even an attempt to organise a restorative circle with the parents and school representatives did not take off, ostensibly because of the passive non-cooperation of the principal, but this was probably more of an individualised symptom of a deeply compromised situation.

Particularly relevant for RJCIS are the findings in “Altruistic Compensation Vs. Altruistic Punishment: How People Restore Justice” (Leliveld, van Dijk, and van Beest 2008) a study about an experiment where outsiders observe a situation of injustice. The authors directly compare punishment and compensation behaviour by introducing a newly developed altruistic compensation game, and compare this to behaviour in the ‘standard’ altruistic punishment game. They show that outsiders were willing to
altruistically (i.e. costly) compensate the victim (experiment 1), even when they could also punish the perpetrator (experiment 2).

This suggests that actually observing economic injustice versus thinking about a strategy on how to act when justice might be observed (i.e. the strategy method) leads to different results (Leliveld, van Dijk, and van Beest 2008, 19).

Thinking of a compensation strategy for the victim of a potential injustice (experiment 1) is an approach to justice that perhaps partakes the taste of what Amartya Sen (2008, 9 introduction) calls niti, or the search for the ideal institutional arrangement ex ante, combined with behavioural correctness ('transcendental institutionalism', or the answer to the question ‘what would be perfectly just institutions?’). Reacting to an actual observed injustice while it is unfolding (experiment 2) partakes more of the nyaya side of justice, or the struggle against actual, historically determined cases of injustice, concerned with the lives that people actually live, where particular outcomes matter in trying to answer the question ‘how would justice be advanced?’ in these circumstances. These experiments seem to offer an insight in favour of the high relevance of nyaya and the importance of dealing with conflicts and struggles for justice though active participation.

3.8.2 | Restorative sanctions?

In RJCIS the wider conflictual setting can see a variety of forms of cooperation built on the previous stages of the restoration of communication and trust. Considering that some forms of ‘punishment’ are associated with higher levels of cooperation, how does RJCIS measures up with the possibility of introducing some sort of sanctions?

The issue of ‘punishment’ is one of the most divisive in the discipline of restorative justice and will not be reviewed here (see e.g. Wright 2003, 6–7; Walgrave 2008, 53–62). The evidence from behavioural and evolutionary social sciences invites to reconsider the role of punishment – or ‘restorative sanctions’ if one pleases – in order to restore cooperation and collective action. Granted, the individual motivations for punishment in the extremely simplified games of behavioural economics do not seem to reflect the lofty ideals proposed by Simone Weil of punishment as one of the “needs of the human soul” (Weil 1949), but if high levels of sustained and complex cooperation
are one of the most distinguishing features of the human species, and punishment has such a relevant role in keeping cooperation going, there is perhaps something deeper in it that several thousand years of state-organised ‘pain delivery’ tend to obfuscate.

Since restorative justice is in principle interested in addressing wrongdoing within the ‘lifeworld’, keeping the ‘system’ at arms length, for the sake of simplification we will only consider forms of punishment or sanctions that obey to rules that – up to a point – can be freely agreed upon by participants in restorative practices. Assuming that participants have full decision making authority and ownership of the restorative process, their first ‘constitutional’ debate and deliberation would be about the ‘rules of the game’, including whether to have any ‘restorative sanction’ at all. If they decide to allow some form of sanctioning, then they would debate and deliberate about its specific nature. The main constraint being that, in order to prevent illegal or ethically unsavoury practices, they would be sanctioning forms that must respect the outer frame of civil rights normally guaranteed by liberal democracies, but whose ‘rules of the game’ are preliminary discussed and agreed upon, while not resorting in any other way to the coercive power of the state. The stress on the constitutive or deliberative moment is important because research in experimental economics has shown that when participants are able to decide whether to play or not, first of all, and if so, according to which ‘institutional rules’, i.e. whether to allow punishment or not, the levels of cooperation achieved and the corresponding average payoffs tend to be higher.

For example, Elinor Ostrom and colleagues explored in seminal articles the comparative merits and conditions of possibility of covenants, ‘with or without a sword’. In covenants ‘with a sword’, communication is combined with sanctioning. It is important to stress that in these experiments, both communication and sanctioning are costly, and players therefore have to develop strategies about whether to resort to them or not considering the goal of the game. There is no sanctioning delegated to a third party and hence ‘free’ of cost for the participants (there might be indirect costs though).

Evidence shows that when offered the possibility, subjects tend to “overuse the sanctioning mechanism, and sanctioning without communication reduces net yield” (or payoff) of the game (Ostrom, Walker, and Gardner 1992, 413). If sanctioning is not allowed, experiments show that “communication alone can yield results leading to more
efficient outcomes.” But more interestingly is the case where participants are allowed the freedom to choose their system of rules:

Subjects who use the opportunity to communicate to agree to a joint investment strategy and choose their own sanctioning mechanism achieve close-to-optimal results [with very low defection rates, even in the high endowment game where defectors are particularly disruptive]. (Ostrom, Walker, and Gardner 1992, 413–414)

Stretching these results towards an idealised restorative practice, it can yield theoretical support to a radical approach on the importance of the full ownership and transparency of the process by the participants. Participants should be left free to use their improved / restored communication skills (where they had to follow the facilitator’s communication rules, and for good reasons) and the increased / restored ‘bridging’ trust within the conference or circle to debate and deliberate about their own rules of the game (constitutive process), including the possibility of sanctioning mechanisms (freely agreed upon, possibly with a coercive, nonviolent element, where the enforcers incur in a cost too), before the actual restorative circle or conference takes place.

Assuming for a moment that this approach might work, it is worth asking with Gürerk and colleagues: “would a sanctioning institution deliberately be adopted when individuals can choose between a sanctioning and sanctioning-free institution?” (Gürerk, Irlenbusch, and Rockenbach 2006, 108). The choice between two institutional arrangements, even in simulations, is not so free as it may sound once we take into account the pressure of ‘institutional competition’ in human societies (something that in the real world often takes the trappings of ‘nations’, ‘civilisations’ or consensus on a set of economic institutions named after some city).

[Gürerk et al.] show experimentally that a sanctioning institution is the undisputed winner in a competition with a sanction-free institution. Despite initial aversion, the entire population migrates successively to the sanctioning institution and strongly cooperates, whereas the sanction-free society becomes fully depopulated. The findings demonstrate the competitive advantage of sanctioning institutions and exemplify the emergence and
manifestation of social order driven by institutional selection. (Gürerk, Irlenbusch, and Rockenbach 2006, 108)

Takeaway for RJ: letting participants decide about the rules of the game, and about sanctioning institutions in particular, could be advisable taking into account the higher likelihood of a cooperative outcome and the ownership in participation principles. However there is a caveat: participants may not decide for a sanctioning institution in the first place even if this choice is a second best from the historical / evolutionary point of view when it is only the pressure of institutional competition that brings forward the affirmation of sanctioning regimes. This will largely depend on the environment, societal ecology, prevailing norms and, yes, also the preparatory work in restoring communication and trust, while creating a safe environment for strong reciprocators to steer the cooperative equilibrium without eliciting a counter-reaction from the perceived free-riders that instead consider themselves as discriminated minority. If the abstract simulations, in the absence of other experimental live references, might be of any guidance:

The initial establishment of the ‘norm to cooperate and punish free-riders’ is mainly driven by the steadfastness of the strong reciprocators to punish noncooperative subjects, despite severe individual losses. Although strong reciprocators are a minority, they manage to establish and enforce a cooperative culture that attracts even previously noncooperative individuals and this resolves their social dilemma (Gürerk, Irlenbusch, and Rockenbach 2006, 110).

Institutional deliberative freedom of course could contemplate also positive sanctions, i.e. rewards for cooperative behaviour. In fact, these are foreseen in Gürerk et al.’s simulated models, although participants do not use them as often (1 : 1.66 ratio) as negative sanctions of the standard punishing kind.

It seems that positive sanctions are not perceived as an unambiguous encouragement to increase the contribution [in the public goods game] (Gürerk, Irlenbusch, and Rockenbach 2006, 110).

There is in fact a fundamental asymmetry between positive and negative sanctions:
Positive sanctions are addressed to those who already abide by the social norm and, to preserve the approval of cooperation, a continuous application of the instrument is required (ibid.).

Whereas a negative sanction if well targeted against a free rider who ‘understands the moral message behind it’ may elicit a change in behaviour without need to be repeated.

This peculiarity emerging from the simulations and the stream of positive sanctions, less obviously effective but still necessary, cannot but recall the constant demand of duties elicited by the community bond, the never exhausted pull of gifts, contribution, offices (Esposito 1998; also commented and expanded in Pavlich 2014). Keeping a cooperative regime working is therefore costly and requires continuous attention because it is a fragile equilibrium. Direct costs deriving from negative sanctions decrease in highly conformist societies where the threat of the sanction is sufficient, but the ‘positive sanctions’ costs deriving from the simple existence of the community bond as mutual co-obligations are always necessary, although often hidden, built into the community bond itself.

Punishment, it goes without saying, in principle has nothing to do with ‘justice.’ It is a tool, among others, that can sustain cooperation and this is the reason why it is being considered here. Even proponents of some kind of ‘restorative punishment’ acknowledge that

punishment alone is an extraordinarily poor way of restoring trust either in an offender or in society. It is only when coupled with other ‘indicia’ of trust – and especially, when punishment is voluntarily undertaken in the context of apology – that punishment becomes transformed into an effective instrument of restoring trust both in the offender and in society (London 2011, 105).

The voluntary submission to a deserved sanction also reinforces the restorative function of apology by differentiating apology from mere excuse (London 2011, 107).

From the restoration of trust perspective [...] the potential ability of punishment to operate as an instrumentality of healing is realized, however, when it is administered in combination with all other means of restoring
trust, including the expression of apology, the agreement to pay restitution, and the agreement to undergo necessary rehabilitation. It is this nexus of factors that makes each an expression of an offender’s desire to make amends and to rejoin the moral community of trustworthy people (London 2011, 108).

Again with an eye to explain the dilemma of cooperation in society, the evolutionary approach to behavioural sciences has tried to simulate complex social phenomena like ‘apology’ and ‘forgiveness’ – each worth a library of enquiry – in stylised games going beyond crude ‘punishment’ strategies, with some interesting findings. In fact,

our innate capacity to create, and commit to, prior agreements has been proposed as an evolutionarily viable strategy inducing cooperative behaviour in social dilemmas. It provides an alternative to different forms of punishment of inappropriate behaviour, or of rewards of the proper one (Martinez-Vaquero et al. 2015, 1).

Robert Frank defines commitments as “prior agreements with potentially posterior compensations in case the agreements fail” (Frank 2001, 57). Commitments have the potential for facilitating cooperation in long-term interactions, especially when they are freely agreed upon, because they “induce behavioural differences in repeated games: [...] with a] shift from a conditionally reciprocal to unconditionally cooperative behaviour” (Martinez-Vaquero et al. 2015, 1). During repeated games, players may make ‘mistakes’ even unintentionally (and in general intentions are not modelled in these simulations, or are left to participants to guess): “trembling hands” and “fuzzy minds” that lead to a decline in performance of ‘tit-for-tat’ style, conditionally reciprocal strategies (Nowak 2006, 1560) Another strategy that might ensure that ‘mistakes’ are not repeated, or at least not misunderstood as breaking of commitments, is ‘forgiveness’. Martinez-Vaquero and colleagues found that if supported by a ‘costly apology’,

in case of [accidental mistakes] forgiveness provides a restorative mechanism that ensures that beneficial relationships can still continue, notwithstanding the initial harm (Martinez-Vaquero et al. 2015, 2, emphasis added).
The simulation shows also how expensive the apology should be, relative to the other values and tokens of the game, for it to be credible and accepted by the co-player that issues his or her forgiveness in order to continue a cooperative agreement that is beneficial for both.

Takeaway for RJ: how does the apology ‘cost’ translate in actual practices, does it have to be linked to some sort of ‘restorative sanction’ lingering in the background?

The subject of restorative sanctions emerged during the discussions in the seminar in Bačka Palanka where some participants argued for a “retributive use of some restorative measures such as apology, dialogue and community work” (WP6 #56). The conditions attached to apology in particular bear out the importance of its ‘cost’ in order to make it credible:

Apology [...] can be public as an apology for one’s behaviour. I say, not just to a specific person, but a public apology. A public apology on the radio, TV, in front of someone who is an authority figure [...] So, an apology that will lead him to the position in which he was when he was abusing someone. Not apology as an apology [...] it is easy to say sorry, that’s not a problem (WP6 #56).
4 | Outcomes

The outcomes at personal, societal and institutional level. No research has been done on the applicability of RJ approaches to the types of conflicts envisaged in the project. Is RJ applicable to cases of conflict in intercultural setting? If the persons involved in a conflict belong to different ‘cultures’, what is the potential of RJ methods like conferencing, peace-circles, social mediation, and other hybrid models which offer added-value when dealing with conflicts that affect broader communities?

4.1 | Defining the evaluation space

The choice of the evaluation space and its metrics can be seen as part of the wider struggle to define reality as fundamental epistemological politics, an approach that has shaped the ALTERNATIVE project from the very beginning. Since ALTERNATIVE departs from the established restorative justice domain, in principle it means that the definition of new evaluation criteria, the choice of new outcomes, is part of the research itself. There are common themes that emerge with a distinct profile from the comparative analysis that lend themselves as candidates for this new evaluation space: the restoration of communication, trust and cooperation as processes and outcomes.

Based on the conceptual realignment, ‘security solutions’ within the new methods experimented within ALTERNATIVE are formulated first and foremost as issues of communication, trust and cooperation and therefore folded into these larger processes.

Justice emerges from the research sites as multi-layered, multi-dimensional and fragmented. Its whole range of references has been analysed in chapter 3. If there were one single feature of the ‘justice’ tapestry that emerges across the research sites is a confirmation of the implications and ramifications of self-centred inequality-aversion as a hypothesis with strong explicatory power that should be taken into account in the definition of the expanded evaluation space as well.

The following section will assess first the outcomes that are closer to the standard approach to restorative justice and have been encoded in the database on the case studies. In particular, the reparation of harm will be analysed in depth using the QCA
methods. The following sections will look at the ‘extended’ outcomes in the restoration of communication and trust, security and – as concluding chapter – justice.

4.2 | Defining and analysing outcomes

The cases’ database encoded the following restorative outcomes, that are reproduced here together with the complete dataset for each case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caseno.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IIo</th>
<th>jfO</th>
<th>LW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c01</td>
<td>Mediation G-M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c02</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c03</td>
<td>Frauencafe ws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c04</td>
<td>Frauencafe circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c05</td>
<td>Bassena ws</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c06</td>
<td>Film-making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c07</td>
<td>Bassena circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c08</td>
<td>Mediation S-O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c09</td>
<td>Mediation K-G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c01</td>
<td>Butcher's festival</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c02</td>
<td>Charity provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c03</td>
<td>Civic guard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c04</td>
<td>Roma conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c05</td>
<td>The school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c06</td>
<td>Healing circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c01</td>
<td>Wshop BP 1 comm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c02</td>
<td>Wshop BP 1 sec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c03</td>
<td>Wshop BP 3 RJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c04</td>
<td>Wshop M 1 comm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c05</td>
<td>Wshop M 1 sec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c06</td>
<td>Wshop M 3 RJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c07</td>
<td>Wshop P 1 comm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c08</td>
<td>Wshop P 1 sec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6-c09</td>
<td>Wshop P 3 RJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c01</td>
<td>Polish family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c02</td>
<td>SH housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c03</td>
<td>Dunmurry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c04</td>
<td>Musgrave Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A first round of analysis searched for binary implications (subset inclusion) between conditions and outcomes applying Ragin’s qualitative method. The following table summarises the main findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implication</th>
<th>Explanation of the subset inclusion relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC =&gt; ot</td>
<td>Justice Claim =&gt; no ongoing treatment... but the latter has not been coded carefully : not significative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hc =&gt; LW</td>
<td>In the absence of explicit harm claims, the case stays further from formalisation of justice and its latent coercive potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI =&gt; PUB</td>
<td>Wherever security was important in the case there was a public stakeholder participating (and there are no recorded continuation of treatment of the case).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI =&gt; ot</td>
<td>All the cases with higher intervention intensity led to at least some form of restoration of communication among participants along dialogic and non-violent lines (we would say that this is perhaps true by definition in the adopted formalisation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF =&gt; ot</td>
<td>Whenever the case was morally framed as wrongdoing there are no recorded continuation of treatment (but this is not very significant, see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc =&gt; OC</td>
<td>In the few cases where not even a modicum of communication was restored among participants the conflict is ongoing, or are situations of structurally continuous conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A =&gt; PF</td>
<td>Agreements among participants – regardless of their subsequent implementation – were reached only in more formalised practices, where the participants explicitly claimed some serious harms and where (by construction) some sort of communication among participants had been restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A =&gt; HC</td>
<td>These ‘necessary conditions’ for the reparation of harm will be analysed in more detail in the following section (page 152).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A =&gt; RC</td>
<td>Complementing what was already observed above, here are four ‘necessary conditions’ for the cases where treatment was recorded as continuing even after the action research period: formal practices with low security intensity, low moral framing and where at least some communication had been restored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Implications (subset inclusion) between conditions and outcomes
Apart from these high membership score inclusions it is worth mentioning the implication between justice formalisation and participation even if it has a slightly lower inclusion membership score in one case only. It is informative to observe that participation was high in (almost all) cases with high justice formalisation, i.e. a relatively shorter distance from the formal justice system and its latent coercive power.

Plotting the formalised representation of the cases in the idealised *restorative justice space* (participation, ‘lifeworld’ as informal justice, reparation) shows three clusters. First cluster, low participation combined with informal justice (i.e. distant from the

*Illustration 14: Justice formalisation, participation, reparation of harm*
coercive shadow of legally enforced formalised justice) and medium-low reparation (including reaching an agreement). Second cluster: high participation, relative formalisation of justice, low reparation. Third cluster: high participation, informal justice, medium-low reparation (including agreement).

The three cases with higher reparation of harm (two mediations in Vienna, the Polish family in South Belfast) are not clustered. They all see medium to high participation, but in two cases the police intervention was not symbolic and made them score lower in ‘lifeworld’, defined here – perhaps too narrowly – as distance from the coercive potential of the formal justice system. There are no cases with low participation and formalised justice (regardless of the reparation outcome).

4.3 | Repairing harm

Identifying, recognising and claiming harms. Reaching an agreement between the participants in the restorative practice aiming at the reparation of the harm claimed in the conflict. Implementing the agreement as a specific case of cooperative action for justice.

Main finding: if the practice is closer to the standard RJ model, an explicit, initial and unilateral harm claim is necessary for the restorative process to take off, without of course ensuring that this claim will be acknowledged by others and that it will be repaired. On the contrary, if the harm claim is not made explicit the restorative process cannot begin in its more or less standard form.

If there are counter-harm claims made by different participants it is still possible in principle to trace them and include them in the analysis, see for example the School case in the small town in Hungary.

This fsQCA analysis – implemented in R (code in annex) using Thiem and Duşa’s library package (2013) – is restricted to cases with high or intermediate-high intervention intensity where some kind of reparation might be expected even if it was not explicitly sought. In fact, some of the interventions and practices observed by the researchers were not self-consciously or explicitly restorative and their effectiveness for reparation
of harm is therefore in the eye of the beholder. The cases' dataset limited to high intervention intensity cases, and excluding therefore the intervention as a condition, looks like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP4-c01 Mediation G-M</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Outcome=RH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c02 Graffiti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c04 Frauencafe circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c01 Butcher's festival</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c02 Charity provision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c01 Polish family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c02 SH housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c03 Dunnurmy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c07 Bassena circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c08 Mediation S-O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c09 Mediation K-G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **JC**: Justice claims
- **PF**: Practice formalisation
- **HC**: Harm claims
- **SI**: Security intensity
- **PUB**: Public stakeholders
- **RI**: Researchers involvement
- **MF**: Moral framing
- **VOC**: VOC participation model
- **P**: Police officers participating
- **RH**: Repaired Harm

Among all the possible outcomes in the dataset, we choose the reparation of harm (RH). There are three cases, out of 12, where some reparation of harm was recorded. A quick and dirty look at Pearson’s correlations between conditions (an imperfect complement of the analysis of binary subset inclusions already discussed above) between shows that, as already hinted at during the conceptual realignment section on justice, a serious moral framing (crime or wrongdoing) is associated with more formal practices.

```
# Pearson correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

26 Not aiming at an analysis of variance, which would be in contradiction with the chosen method, but just as a hint to relationships to be further analysed using QCA’s own set-theoretical tools
Stronger justice claims seem to be associated with situations where security – regardless of its scope – is more of a concern, but looking at the charts this could be an effect of the higher number of cases from Vienna in the dataset, with their low justice claims and low security intensity.

Illustration 15: Justice claims, security intensity in high intervention intensity cases.

It would have been more significative if the top-left quadrant had been empty (thus positing a putative sufficient relationship between high security intensity and justice claims). But in a qualitative analysis even a single case matters, it cannot be ruled out as an outlier.
Besides, we can notice how researchers were less directly involved in cases with high intervention intensity that saw participation of police officers.

During the first stage of a qualitative comparative analysis we carry out some formal tests to check if the cases and conditions are meaningful, sufficiently informative and diverse with regard to the chosen outcome.
Most Similar – Same Outcome cases (MSSO)

Very similar cases with the same outcome are in principle not particularly informative for a qualitative analysis. A simple look at the dataset table, shows that two mediation cases in Vienna (WP4-c09 Mediation K-G; WP4-c08 Mediation S-O) look almost the same under this formalisation.

Most Different – Same Outcome cases (MDSO)

The following cases have in common the non-reparation of harm despite being very different between themselves. Considering that it is a negative outcome it is reasonable to expect that there are a wide variety of combinations of conditions that are associated with the lack of meaningful reparation.

WP7-c02 SH housing ←——> WP4-c01 Mediation G-M
WP5-c06 Healing circle ←——> WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c02 SH housing ←——> WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c03 Dunmurry ←——> WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c03 Dunmurry ←——> WP5-c01 Butcher’s festival
WP4-c07 Bassena circle ←——> WP5-c01 Butcher’s festival
WP7-c03 Bassena circle ←——> WP5-c02 Charity provision
WP7-c02 SH housing ←——> WP5-c06 Healing circle
WP7-c03 Dunmurry ←——> WP5-c06 Healing circle
WP4-c07 Bassena circle ←——> WP5-c06 Healing circle
WP4-c07 Bassena circle ←——> WP7-c02 SH housing

Most Similar – Different Outcome cases (MSDO)

More informative are the following couples of cases that are similar – but crucially not identical – in their combination of conditions and still have different outcomes.

WP4-c08 Mediation S-O ←——> WP4-c01 Mediation G-M
WP4-c09 Mediation K-G ←——> WP4-c01 Mediation G-M

Of the three mediation cases from Vienna one was ‘unsuccessful’ (G-M) while the others achieved some degree of reparation and satisfaction of the participants, despite the fact that the conflict is still ongoing due to the structural conditions of the situation. In fact, the reasons behind the difference in outcome have been analysed in detail in deliverable D4.3.

WP7-c02 SH housing ←——> WP7-c01 Polish family
In these two cases from Belfast, the similarity is only relative and formal, considering that the first is centred on a series of public assemblies and the second is a restorative conference. Besides, we observe that all MSDO relationships are circumscribed to separate research sites.

A last formal test checks that the various conditions are actually informative about the different cases and allow to discriminate among them. If two conditions assume the same values across all the cases they are either too inter-dependent or not sufficiently well assessed and therefore one of them should be discarded. The minimum distance among conditions – measured as the sum of the fuzzy XOR operator between the two condition vectors with indices running over the cases – is 2.53 out of a total of 12 cases and therefore sufficient to ensure informative variety. As a conclusion of this preliminary triage phase, all cases initially considered can be kept in the dataset.

**Testing for necessary Conditions: C <= O**

A combination (logical product) of six conditions \((PF*HC*PUB*ri*VOC*P)\), emerges as candidate necessary condition with high inclusion (0.83) and complete coverage of the cases. A separate analysis that takes into account the context – i.e. that the research sites are located in different countries, codified through the working package – as additional condition confirms that this combination is a necessary condition for the outcome in this dataset.

As customary when doing a fuzzy set QCA it is necessary to test for spurious causality, namely whether also the negation of the candidate combination turns out to be a necessary condition for the outcome (\(c <= O\)) or if the candidate combination would be a necessary condition also for the negation of the outcome (\(C <= o\)). The inclusion and coverage scores of the candidate product \((PF*HC*PUB*ri*VOC*P)\) are very low (less than 0.17) for both cases.

Therefore, the combination, or logic product, of practice formalisation, harm claims, participation of public stakeholders (including police officers), a ‘standard’ Victims–Offenders–Community participation model and, incidentally, the non involvement of researchers are the ‘necessary condition’, or condition of possibility for observing reparation of harm in the cases considered.
Testing for sufficient conditions: C => O

Outcome: RH: Repaired Harm

Complex solution for all cases:

\[ n \text{ OUT} = 1/0/C: 3/9/0 \]
Total: 12

Number of multiple-covered cases: 0

M1:

\[ j*c*PF*HC*si*PUB*ri*mf*VOC*P + JC*PF*HC*SI*PUB*ri*MF*VOC*P \Leftrightarrow 0 \]

incl cov.r cov.u cases
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1  jc*PF*HC*si*PUB*ri*mf*VOC*P  1.000  0.610  0.553  WP4 Mediation S-O, WP4 Mediation K-G
2  JC*PF*HC*SI*PUB*ri*MF*VOC*P  1.000  0.277  0.220  WP7 Polish family
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
M1 1.000 0.830

Factorisation of solution M1

F1: HC*P*PF*PUB*ri*VOC*(jc*si*mf + JC*SI*MF)

The complex solution of the QCA procedure yields a ‘necessary and sufficient’ condition with complete inclusion and very high coverage. It is composed of the necessary condition already found before, namely \( HC*P*PF*PUB*ri*VOC \) (which is independent from the context, i.e. country or working package), that is a situation characterised by the simultaneous (logic product) presence of explicit harm claims where a formal practice following ‘standard’ (apart from the salient intercultural setting) RJ approach has been organised and implemented without a significant role of the researchers (who observed it, but did not co-organise or plan it), where victims, offenders and community roles are well delineated and among the participants there are public institutions, including police forces.

Apart from this combination of conditions, common to both research sites where some reparation of harm has been observed, there are sufficient paths, one covering Vienna cases, the other covering the South Belfast case, consisting of the logical product of three terms that appear all negated in the first and all present in the second thus pointing to two quite different constellations of conditions.

For the mediations in Vienna, \( jc*si*mf \) hints at an essentially pragmatic constellation (no justice claims, no stress on security, low moral framing).
On the contrary, in the case of the Polish family in South Belfast, \( JC*SI*MF \) (high justice claim and high moral framing and security intensive) evokes a higher temperature situation, with crossed accusation of hate crime and lack of respect of the flag and Loyalist identity.

The test for sufficient conditions for the negated outcome ( \( C \Rightarrow o \) ) yields no meaningful result (see annex).

It goes without saying that the QCA ‘causality’ language it is not meant to be taken in any epistemologically strong way. It makes sense within its formalism based on (fuzzy) boolean optimisation of set membership and does provide an accurate, focused and rich comparative description of the observed conditions in the cases where somehow the harm claimed by the participants has been repaired to a certain extent.

Considering that the ‘necessary condition’ holds for cases in different research sites it is perhaps worth commenting it further. It is a confirmation that the tried and tested (not necessarily new types designed by the researchers) practices of restorative justice (mediations and conferences in these cases) can be effective also to address well defined conflicts arising in intercultural contexts provided that the harms are claimed explicitly, even if this can heat up the situation, and when this happens those affected want to be taken seriously, that is, they would better participate in a formal practice facilitated by trained practitioners where the involvement of public institutions – including police officers – perhaps contribute to the perceived formality and seriousness (provided that these are considered sufficiently ‘neutral’ relative to the parties involved and this could be a critical factor in certain intercultural constellations), even perhaps adding some negative incentive to sustain cooperation in implementing the agreement reached by participants.

### 4.4 | Restoring communication

The clearest signal coming from the research sites is about the centrality of open, non-confrontational communication in restorative justice approaches to conflicts in intercultural settings. The main features of a ‘restorative dialogue’ are that it is (a) inclusive (it involves all the parties directly affected by the conflict, at least both victim
and offender, in some settings also the community); (b) grounded in restorative principles and values and (c) hosted by a facilitator. Restorative dialogues are used to identify the needs and interests of the participating parties and tend to favour reparation of harm rather than retribution (WP4 #50 quoting Barbara Raye and Ann Warner Roberts from the ‘Handbook of Restorative Justice’, 2006). This is all well known and it is perhaps the ‘killer app’ that the ALTERNATIVE researchers brought in the rucksack from their RJ mainland. The consensus on the centrality in theory and practice of restorative dialogue across the research sites is so robust, and this rapporteur’s specific expertise about it so limited, that this pithy section will only enumerate a few observations while leaving a full bodied analysis to the individual action research reports from each sites (D4.4, D5.5, D6.3, D7.6) and a broader overview in D1.3.

Communication and open dialogue are more than ‘techniques’. For example, the ALTERNATIVE researchers in Northern Ireland adopted a working definition of community as a communication process itself, both object and means to a widened restorative approach to justice, i.e. restoring communication while restoring community and vice-versa, a non-referential and inter-subjective communication that accepts and assumes ‘otherness’. While researchers in Northern Ireland moored their conceptualisation of community as a communicative process to the Habermasian pier, it is worth mentioning as counter-point the other, Luhmannian-systemic side of communication as part of an immune system. Community cannot exist in its pure form, it needs some form of immunisation. Communication is immunisation because it allows the system to self-referentially grow. A restored, frictionless communication immunises the system because it turns the outside into the inside. It immunises the community from its constitutive latent violence by slowly and systematically emptying the community itself (Esposito 2002, 53–55, ref. to N. Luhmann, Soziale Systeme, Grundrisseiner allgemeinen Theorie, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1984).

In Vienna’s circles – or workshops preparing for actual restorative circles – communication was (partially) restored by slowing it down, asking a participant to repeat what her interlocutor had just said to her, until the person who made the utterance in the first place was satisfied that her message has reached the intended recipient and there were no misunderstandings. This redundancy is standard practice in communication protocols, to be sure, but its specific significance here goes beyond a
technical requirement of bitwise message reproduction: it is meant to tune up attention, listening attitude and respect (and, why not, given the effective bandwidth limitation imposed by the protocol with its retransmission overload, it may also act as an incentive for self-restraint on the more effusive participants).

[As one participant put it:] ‘the effect of this method is to prevent the participants from losing their empathy for each other. [...] There is] a potential for communicative processes facilitated in this way to counter-act dynamics of “othering”. (D4.4, 34)

The specificities of restorative dialogue as a space for story-telling (D4.4, 35; D6.3, 17), are amplified by the deliberate choice of participatory film-making as an action research method throughout the project. The combination of story-telling and a certain formalisation of communication creates a performative atmosphere that echoes the dramatic character of the criminal trial in court, but with the key difference that the circle is egalitarian, participation is active and free, there is no coercion and so on.

ALTERNATIVE researchers in Serbia leveraged existing findings based on the ‘Third way’ model.

The ‘Third way’ model is defined as a non-conflict, inclusive, two-way communication of people with different experiences of war and other conflicts about the past, which implicates dealing with all crimes, victims and perpetrators regardless of their ethnic or other belonging, affiliation or personal features (Nikolić-Ristanović and Srna 2010). This model has been recognised by some authors as a possible way of applying restorative justice in post-conflict societies (Aertsen et al. 2008, Liebmann 2007, Nikolić-Ristanović 2006). [D6.3, 7]

Participants in the workshops organised in three localities in Serbia reacted positively to this kind of restorative dialogue, as a communication framework that can contribute toward handling of conflicts between people in their local communities.

[Participants] found that meeting conditions for optimal contact contributes to changes of communication patterns and enables constructive communication (dialogue). Seminar participants found it important to set the
communication framework that allows for mutual respect and trust, facilitates respectful encounter and trust building, enables self-reflection and understanding others, fosters openness and support, and contributes to reducing prejudices towards other groups and existing antagonisms (D6.3, 9).

These results, similar to others from the various research sites in which participants “sharpen senses and acknowledge interconnectedness,” highlight the link between restoration of communication and restoration of trust:

Such space for story-telling might not only serve the purpose of conflict resolution, but also the purpose of making oneself aware of conflicts or harms that we have long gotten used to and almost do not perceive as such anymore (D4.4, 35).

Or, from another conceptual angle, when communication is restored in this or similar ways, the counter-acting effect on ‘othering’ could be seen as a potential for the production of raw ‘bridging’ social capital.

It all sounds very good and promising, but there’s a catch. The communication – in the sense of techniques, processes and tools – that RJCIS wants to restore should be a communication that participants can understand and be reasonably comfortable with. In fact, it should be a ‘restoration’, not an implant that is not recognised, a ‘communication that cannot communicate’ because external to the (localised) social system (see remarks on the ‘foreignness’ of the dialoguing techniques of open discussion of conflict when confronted with the prevailing ‘culture of silence’ in Kisváros).

For the empirical findings about the link between communication and the restoration of trust please refer to section 3.7.7 at page 132.

4.5 | Security, uncertainty and trust

The evaluation of the changing perceptions of personal safety was only marginally addressed by the action research in any of the sites. The researchers in Hungary
conducted a baseline poll on security perceptions based on Likert scales during the problem analysis phase but did not follow up with a final poll after the action research interventions. The researchers in Serbia did include security as safety perceptions in their initial quantitative survey but likewise did not follow up with a final poll also because there was no ‘intervention’ as such beyond the local workshops and simulated restorative circles.

The evidence emerging from the sites is still about the potential substitution of techno-institutional security solutions with relational de-securitisation (or prevention of securitisation tout court), but it isn’t conclusive. As seen above in section 3.3 the methodological disjunction of the security scope (from personal safety to threatened collective identities) from the security intensity (how important is the security signifier in the case) allows to identify different clusters of cases. It is important to recall here that a high security intensity is quite different from the successful securitisation of an issue as intended by the ‘Copenhagen school’ of security studies. The combination of high security intensity and larger scope (top-right quadrant) in the formalisation of cases defined here can be considered as being part of the conditions of success of a potential securitisation move, but are far from being tantamount to it. In fact, in one case – the ‘Polish family’ in South Belfast – a successful restorative justice intervention by a trained practitioner was able to defuse a potentially volatile situation in which the typical zero-sum characteristics of securitised issues were becoming apparent (my security is based of someone else being made insecure). Not only violence was averted and some harms were repaired, but the intervention restored a way of living together in the neighbourhood – extending recognition to the immigrant family – that arguably may influence the conditions of success of subsequent securitising moves involving the community identity and migrants.

The top-left quadrant in the chart – represented by the ‘graffiti’ case from Vienna – stands for a space of either de- or un-securitised issues (depending on the temporal dynamics that are not included in the current schematisation) where there is some language of threatened collective identities, but this is not important or particularly relevant for the participants and the development of the case. But the majority of cases are more or less evenly distributed in four clusters according to the possible combinations of socio-economic security with low (centre-left) or high intensity (centre-
right); and personal safety with low (bottom-left) and high security intensity (bottom-right).

Illustration 17: Security intensity, security scope, reparation of harm

Does the level of generalised trust in society affect the conditions of success of securitising speech-acts, in particular in the societal sector? Vice-versa, does widespread securitisation sap trust? It is not an obvious relationship: it is possible to think of highly trusting and homogeneous societies that live with a strong security predicament, e.g. threat to national survival by an external foe. In this case the high level of trust and
cooperation is arguably the consequence of the need to unite against the common enemy, but it is likely that trust and cooperation will be confined within the limits of the collective ‘we’, without bridging to the ‘other’.

Once one starts to consider threats to collective identity in an intercultural context it is more likely that high securitisation goes together with – or is actually premised on as a condition of success of securitisation itself – lower levels of trust and cooperation in a ‘hunkering down’ scenario. In Vienna, the oldest members of the Frauencafé:

expressed their feeling of insecurity or rather uncertainty regarding the question of what kind of behaviour one may expect from others when and where, and when one is entitled to insist on compliance with house-rules (D4.4, 39).

In Serbia the analysis of participants’ experiences of inflicted injuries or harms suggests that:

the verbal descriptions of the experiences of inflicted injuries or caused damages include a wide spectrum of mixed feelings, mainly anger (resentment, bitterness), fear (discomfort, insecurity, uncertainty, anxiety, danger) and sadness (sorrow, despair, disappointment) (D6.3, 67).

Thus, they closely associate insecurity with uncertainty about the expected behaviour of others or the more impersonal “growing uncertainty in society and the recent economic crisis” that in Hungary “has brought citizens’ prejudices against minorities (and other vulnerable groups) to the surface” (WP5 context report, 5). Similarly, in South Belfast, where “budget cuts have contributed to uncertainty over the viability of certain police stations” and “a noticeable withdrawal from engagement from the community policing” thus compounding the overall uneasiness of the community over previous cuts to educational and youth provision, anti-social behaviour in the former premises of an abandoned school, constant delays and lack of transparency in the building of a new social housing project (grid WP7 #47).

This uncertainty affects trust and norms, informal institutions as patterns of expected behaviour – ‘rules’ – independent of individual actors. Sustained, open communication of the kind championed by restorative justice practitioners can contribute to reduce
uncertainty, up to a point. It is important to bear in mind that trust is not about absolute ‘objective’ certainty, but it always implies by definition some kind of firm belief in others’ reliability, hence unmasking the fetishism of total certainty normally implied by the typically non-falsifiable and self-fulfilling predictions of securitising speech-acts. Restorative justice’s open communication provides a safe environment for the expression of emotions alongside reflective and logic reasoning. It is therefore inclusive not only vis-à-vis the variety of stakeholders, but also in terms of ways of thinking, both fast (intuitive, emotional) and slow (logic, deliberative) (Kahneman 2011). Restorative justice practices that combine openness, inclusivity, trust-building and long term insertion in the idiosyncratic societal ecology – community, neighbourhood, etc. – potentially allow not only for the cooperative handling of conflicts, but also for the emergence of an alternative discourse and local leadership reasonably equipped to challenge the credibility of securitising actors, undermining their claims, intervening on the conditions of success of a securitising move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security conceptualisation</th>
<th>RJCIS level of engagement</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Likelihood of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security (security as safety, including socio-economic sec.)</td>
<td>It is the conceptualisation of choice in the project</td>
<td>Directly working with persons and communities through communication and trust-building. Cooperative action for (social) justice.</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securitisation ('Copenhagen school')</td>
<td>Pre securitisation: Conditions of success of securitising speech-acts. Post-securitisation: see below.</td>
<td>Uncertainty reduction through open dialogue. Empowering alternative discourses and local leaders. De-coupling socio-economic inequality from cultural diversity through cooperative action for social justice.</td>
<td>Medium at the local level but usually these are national processes (or higher, e.g. EU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security apparatuses ('Paris school')</td>
<td>Engaging security agencies through multi-agencies coordination</td>
<td>Advocacy and moral suasion to influence operational level procedure. Inclusion of representatives of the security agencies when relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>Medium to Low when taking into account the inner, autonomous dynamics of security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: RJCIS vis-à-vis different security conceptualisation frameworks

The two conceptual approaches to security that for reasons of simplification are called here the ‘Copenhagen school’ and ‘Paris school’ are more inter-connected than academic
flag waving would have you believe once a dynamic element is considered (see D1.1 and Pali B., Ragazzi M., *Security identity immunity*, forthcoming, for a review). Copenhagen and Paris, securitisation and governmentality, could be seen as conceptualisations of different stages of what security does and from such a dynamic perspective they are both rather useful at analysing different things. Once securitisation is successful and the security provider of choice is some kind of government agency – as often happens, although it does not have to – the extraordinary measures and exceptional resources allocated in its wake build or reinforce a bureaucratic security apparatus. Even if its origins lie in an exception, the apparatus and the regime it portends become the new norm. It functions like other bureaucratic organisations, tending to reproduce itself. Once a security regime is entrenched, a normative preference for de-securitisation as political strategy to bring an issue back to the political fold and let liberal-democracy work normally – as posited by Waever et al. – has little chances to happen within the same security bent regime. Barring an external shock – e.g. military or financial – the security apparatus is not going to allow itself to be reformed quietly through a ‘normal’ procedure of democratic debate. What is perhaps more likely to happen is that securo-bureaucratic liberal regimes have shown a need for continuous re-securitisation (the exceptional character of security cannot be bridled by rational-bureaucratic order) otherwise the rational-bureaucratic side of the regime ends up ‘normalising’ the security exception and slowly eroding its features. Typically re-securitisation moves – following the same script as for the first securitisation itself – are aimed at stymieing possible attempts, by the judiciary (Ragazzi 2015) or other institutions at ‘checking and balancing’ the extraordinary prerogatives of the security apparatus.

Once agreed on a normative agenda for de-securitisation, or the prevention of securitisation tout court, RJCIS can contribute to influence the conditions of success for primary securitisation speech-acts at the local level working on the reduction of uncertainty that may result from sustained open communication and restoration of trust. It is important to highlight that in some of the cases analysed here, the potential securitising actors were themselves situated at the community level: community leaders and local grassroots political organisations addressing district level politicians as ‘security providers’. An admittedly rather faint signal about this possibility has emerged from a few cases – like the Polish family in Belfast – from the ALTERNATIVE dataset.
5 | Conclusions

ALTERNATIVE proposes a new approach for research, action and practice of restorative justice in conflicts in intercultural settings (RJCIS) that leverages the *pistipoietic* potential\(^{27}\) of restorative justice in generating, begetting, bringing-forth, producing and reproducing localised ‘bridging’ trust, while acting on the social and political conditions of possibility of ‘trust in trustability’ or trust in the restorability of trust. Since RJCIS is more concerned with the interpersonal, communicative dimension of social matters this author prefers to introduce this expression rather than the more economic sounding ‘production’ of trust as a component of social capital.

The new approach is articulated in three phases or interlinked dimensions that are logically distinct but develop in practice in tight conjoined sequence: restoration of communication, restoration of trust, restoration of cooperative action for justice. It is intended as a generalisation and extension of established RJ practices with a stronger emphasis on trust-building beyond its instrumental role. The formulation of this approach is a reasonably descriptive, analytical and normative generalisation of the observations coming from the four action research sites that have been comparatively analysed here.

One major underlying assumption for this new approach is to treat restorative justice processes in intercultural settings as essentially public goods provision problems where trust and cooperation are of paramount importance. From this point of view, as an example of how the new approach includes the standard RJ methods, let us consider the agreement that the parties eventually reach through mediations, circles and conferences and its implementation. It can be considered as a form of cooperative solution to a public goods problem – ‘making’ justice by reparation, reintegration and reconciliation – with varying degrees of negative (latent) and positive sanctions, ‘costs’ (emotional, social if not necessarily financial) borne by participants, possibility of free-riding, institutional check etc.

Since restorative justice makes a clear normative and methodological option for voluntary and non coercive participation, there is a reasonable case for introducing some elements of economic analysis of cooperation dilemmas. The working definition adopted by ALTERNATIVE researchers in Northern Ireland of community as a communication process, both object and means of a widened restorative approach to justice, also falls in this generalisation and already beckons it. Restoring communication while restoring community and vice-versa implies trust (re)building not only of the ‘bonding’ kind, but also inter-group ‘bridging’ type. This can be assessed from successful inter-community cooperation on justice and security matters.

A new approach?

Some clarifications are in order before introducing a new approach in an already crowded field. The following synoptic table compares the main definitions and features of criminal justice, ‘standard’ restorative justice, the restorative practices approach (RP) and ALTERNATIVE’s own, trying to highlight the latter’s original insights by similarity and difference analysis.

The proponents of restorative practices (Wachtel and McCold 2004) consider them as more general than restorative justice, although historically derived from RJ. In their view, RP encompasses RJ as a particular field of application, alongside education, businesses, etc. In a similar geometric metaphor, ALTERNATIVE aims at expanding restorative justice beyond its standard area of applicability and conceptualisation, but in different directions while keeping it firmly anchored in the quest and question of justice that lays at its core. The following synoptic table tries to summarise the main features of the various RJ approaches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criminal Justice</th>
<th>Restorative Justice ('core')</th>
<th>Restorative Practices (without ‘justice’)</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE (RJCIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal locus</strong></td>
<td>‘system’</td>
<td>‘lifeworld’</td>
<td>‘lifeworld’</td>
<td>‘lifeworld’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Participation (in the shadow of hierarchy or non problematised new governance models)</td>
<td>Participatory learning and decision-making</td>
<td>Participation as ownership (participation with power and property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited selection of stakeholders</td>
<td>Wider selection of stakeholders</td>
<td>Wider selection of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main goal</strong></td>
<td>Doing justice through retribution</td>
<td>Doing justice through reparation of ...</td>
<td>Build social capital and achieve social discipline</td>
<td>Understanding justice and security in intercultural Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of analysis</strong></td>
<td>micro (interpersonal) meso (cases of collective harm, e.g. by a legal person like a corporation)</td>
<td>micro (interpersonal) partially meso (local community)</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>micro (interpersonal) meso (local community) macro (ethno-national, society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>criminal wrongdoing</td>
<td>harm caused by: “criminal wrongdoing” (restricted) or generically by an offence (expanded)</td>
<td>harm caused by offence + develop community, manage conflict and tensions</td>
<td>Conflict, with varying moral framing (wrongdoing, misbehaviour, neutral c. of interests), harm claims and justice claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural setting</strong></td>
<td>n.a. (one CJ for the whole society within a state)</td>
<td>Limited diversity or not problematised</td>
<td>not problematised</td>
<td>Greater diversity (by design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of practice formalisation</strong></td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Continuum from low to high</td>
<td>Continuum from low to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main stakeholders and their needs</strong></td>
<td>Tightly defined by criminal procedure</td>
<td>victims (obtaining reparation) offenders (taking responsibility) their communities of care (achieving reconciliation)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of restorativeness</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Restorative Justice (‘core’)</td>
<td>Restorative Practices (without ‘justice’)</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVE (RJCIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring the norm by confirming it.</td>
<td>The most restorative processes involve the active participation of all three sets of primary stakeholders. Victims’ harms are repaired. Offenders take responsibility. Community is reconciled.</td>
<td>A stable restorative milieu: “an environment that consistently fosters awareness, empathy and responsibility in a way that is likely to prove far more effective in achieving social discipline than our current reliance on punishment and sanctions” (Wachtel, 2013).</td>
<td>open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restorative outcomes

| n.a. | “Restorative outcome” means an agreement reached as a result of a restorative process. Restorative outcomes include responses and programmes such as reparation, restitution and community service, aimed at meeting the individual and collective needs and responsibilities of the parties and achieving the reintegration of the victim and the offender. (ECOSOC) | Build social capital and achieve social discipline through participatory learning and decision-making. | Restoration of communication Restoration of trust Restoration of cooperative action for justice |

Table 21: Taxonomy of restorative (justice) approaches
There are obvious similarities between RJCIS and both the ‘standard’ RJ and the ‘restorative practices’ approaches, but important differences that qualify the new approach experimented in this project:

- RJCIS focuses on conflicts instead of criminal wrongdoing or offences or harm, without considering conflict as a necessarily negative manifestation of social life. Within each conflict, justice claims, harm claims and moral framing of the issues are as central as they are contested.

- RJCIS critically problematises the importance of the intercultural context as central variable, rather than a background concern source of secondary degree adaptations. This is especially relevant for the design and implementation of open communication approaches to restorative dialogue: communication as restorative outcome.

- RP proponents seems to consider the restorative methods as sort of generic formats — like ‘circle’, ‘conference’, ‘mediation’ — whose application and instantiation in specific fields (from education to RJ) are the actual restorative practices. ALTERNATIVE’s action research may also deploy and adapt certain restorative practices, but one of its key insights is that practices-as-techniques are not neutral, do not translate seamlessly into different socio-institutional arrangements, and it is important to analyse critically their implications as restorative governmentality (see D1.3).

- Adding depth to the informal-to-formal continuum of practices format, ALTERNATIVE thematises also an informal-to-formal continuum of justice: from the highest formalisation in the criminal justice system to the most informal ideas (expectations, practices etc.) of justice that each participant holds and are acted upon in the various case studies.

- RJCIS critically problematises the implications of new governance models on participation and proposes a radical approach to active participation as full process ownership (participation with power and property).

- Open communication, repeated interaction and uncertainty reduction for the restoration of localised trust, and improvements in the perceptions of personal safety.
• At the same time, with a parallel problematisation of the structural conditions that lead to lower generalised trust, namely socio-economic inequality in itself and especially when combined with ethnic diversity.
• Hence, the new approach has a renewed focus on justice (as opposed to the technicalisation and neutralisation of restorative practices) as the original multi-level, multi-dimensional raison d’être of the field. Multi-dimensional but with a relative hierarchy of priorities: distributive justice has a direct implication on the conditions of possibility of the restoration of communication and trust in highly diverse intercultural settings.

Restorative justice and securitisation

If the direct evidence from the dataset is not conclusive, it is however possible to underline some general conditions of possibility, or rather incompatibility between securitisation and restorative justice approaches to conflicts in intercultural settings that should be taken into account at the policy making level.

In general, security-as-securitisation has by definition an inner, autonomous dynamic that tends to trump and sideline other concerns (‘security overlay’), in particular the procedural guarantees that are common – although declined quite differently – to restorative justice and the criminal justice system (at least until the latter has not been ‘reformed’ under pressing emergency powers, e.g. suspension of habeas corpus, extension of detention without warrant, recourse to torture etc.) Strategies of easy coexistence with, or even symmetric engagement of restorative justice and ‘security’ should therefore be treated with extreme prudence.

The emergency character of securitisation, the limitations of debate, the speed imposed on decision making are hardly compatible with an RJ approach based on inclusive, non-violent and inevitably slow communication. Securitisation by definition extends the shadow of the threat of coercion into society under the screen of emergency powers. This move is premised on, and justified by the need to reassure the public, often through a rhetorical mechanism of self-fulfilling predictions. Even assuming that securitisation might have some psychological reassuring effects on part of the public in the short run, this can hardly be the premise of the restoration of trust for a number of reasons. First the zero-sum character of securitisation – someone’s security is premised on making
someone else insecure – introduces a structural asymmetry, a wedge within the population in societal securitisation processes in particular. This is not compatible with the restorative justice public-goods type, positive-sum approach where all participants stand to gain from the process, even the ‘offenders’ in standard RJ participation models (Strang 2002, 177). Second, trust is by definition not based on coercion-backed absolute certitude of the type typically promised through the self-fulfilling arguments of securitisation moves. Third, as discussed above, the internal logic of securitisation sits uneasily with bureaucratic normalisation and calls for constant and periodic re-securitisation.

Once agreed on a normative agenda for de-securitisation, or the prevention of securitisation tout court, restorative justice approaches to security in intercultural contexts can contribute to influence the conditions of success for securitisation moves at the local level where its practices are organically inserted in social dynamics. Restorative justice approaches to conflicts in intercultural settings work on the reduction of uncertainty that may result from sustained open communication and restoration of trust; empowering alternative discourses and local leaders able to challenge the credibility of securitising actors; and de-coupling socio-economic inequality from cultural diversity through cooperative action for social justice.

**RJCIS and social justice**

Waves of securitisation of migration as a threat to the collective identity of Western European national communities tend to coincide with periods of financial, fiscal, political, hegemonic crisis. They started in the 1970s and became more prominent after the end of the Cold War and the neoliberal restructuring of European economy with the Treaty of Maastricht (Wæver et al. 1993). The current phase of global turmoil, beginning with the double security and financial crisis of 2003 (invasion of Iraq) and 2008 (subprime mortgage crisis), built on the preceding cycles of crisis and restructuring and deepened the linkages between Europe and the wider Middle East in terms of regional security dynamics. While this report is not the place where to analyse in depth these broader developments, let it suffice to situate the phenomena studied here in the broad
frame of analytical reference that sees periods of crisis as part of changes in social property relations and how they affect the whole international system.

Social property relations, mediating the relations between major classes, primarily define the constitution and identity of political units. The time-bound balances of social forces find expression in politically constituted institutions – petrified praxes – that set the parameters for class-specific, and therefore antagonistic, rules of reproduction. [...] While politically constituted property regimes institutionalise social conflicts and set the limits of class-specific strategies, they may themselves be contested in times of general crisis [(Teschke 2003, 7), based on (Brenner 1976)].

It is the current global material constitution based on the dominance of financial interests and unfettered movement of capital, goods and labour that co-produces and ceaselessly reshuffles the intercultural settings and high socio-economic inequality that this project has been grappling with. This is the historic-analytical locus where the broader determinants of the current research are situated.

After having observed the strong effect of socio-economic inequality on trust and cooperation, and taking into account some of the structural processes among whose consequences there is a steep rise of socio-economic inequality, it would be simplistic to react with calls for mechanistic social protection. In a recent essay, Nancy Fraser (2013) cast a Polanyan glance at the current historical crisis of the capitalist system. A simple translation of Karl Polany’s ‘double movement’ of social ‘protection’ (be it social-democrat, soviet communist, New-Deal, fascist etc.) as a reaction to ‘commodification’ (the unbridled self-regulating capitalist market) that brilliantly analysed the crisis of the 1930s does not provide a satisfactory interpretation of the current situation. Binary oppositions do not apply anymore – if they ever did – because since the 1960s a new ‘movement’ entered the stage with feminist, civil-rights, LGBT, post-colonial struggles: ‘emancipation’ based on identity recognition. Here is how a ‘triple movement’ has to be considered, where each component has its internal normative ambivalences and can combine with the others in various ways.

| Social protection: Relief to communities from disruptions brought by self-regulating markets | vs | Entrenches domination within and among communities |
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Commodification: Ceaseless disruption of “all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations” substituted by “naked self-interest” vs Some protections and organic traditions it disintegrates may be oppressive

Emancipation: Liberation, exposure of gendered exclusions in traditional protection schemes vs Strains the fabric of existing solidarities, clearing the path for markets

In fact, Fraser’s assessment is that during the last three decades ‘emancipation’ lost its original critical stance towards the neoliberal order, while socio-economic inequalities were reaching belle époque levels (Piketty 2013), and relatively more diverse global elite accumulated an ever bigger share of income and wealth.

With its broad, although far from unilateral, embeddedness in the new governance discourse (Pavlich 1996; D1.2), restorative justice itself has its own ambivalences (Woolford and Ratner 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RJ</th>
<th>Stakeholders empowerment; emancipatory focus with recognition of identities, viewpoints; victim/offender parity</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Structurally open (embedded in discourse) to new governance model and their potential for more active but also more competitive models of citizenship, weakening solidarities, bypassing universal institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If RJCIS advocated for less ‘protection’ because of its inherent interference, colonisation and sterilisation of the ‘lifeworld’, and for more ‘recognition and participation’ without touching the status quo of unbridled commodification that produces both ever more mobile and unstable intercultural contexts and higher socio-economic inequality it would fall prey of the kind of negative loop exemplified in Putnam’s findings: instead of communicating, trusting and cooperating with each other, people ‘hunker down’. Another source of critical distance from social protection is the need to de-securitise the welfare state – and citizenship rights in general – while keeping its strong potential for providing a source of collective identity that can foster a sense of equality among the population (strongly associated with trust and stronger institutions).
Restorative justice approaches to conflicts in intercultural settings as practiced in ALTERNATIVE’s action research sites operate directly at the micro-meso level in local communities, neighbourhoods, housing estates and small towns. But there is evidently a need to be active at the macro-institutional level too, contributing to the debate about the future of welfare, justice system and public provision in general. At the light of the finding of the literature on social capital and from the research sites, RJCIS should advocate for a universal approach to welfare. But, isn’t restorative justice itself part of the general turn towards selective and means-tested welfare – or public services in general – inasmuch as the access to RJ is limited by socio-economic and cultural factors? When looking at the connection between the justice system and rising socio-economic inequalities in Europe during the last thirty years its main problem is probably not simply the pain it delivered, but its cooptation as a tool of social control and class warfare by the social bloc hegemonised by corporate financial interests. While RJ itself could initially prosper in the crevices of the fragmentation of justice, if it wants to consistently realign with the strong evidence from this research and a variety of connected disciplinary fields it has to champion the emancipatory power of an intensive universalism in social provision and share a substantial part of the agenda of critical criminology.

In order to bring these contradictions to its ultimate consequences, RJCIS advocates for a double strategy. On the one hand, RJCIS sees a natural, programmatic alliance with ‘emancipation’ in locating itself within social struggles, while making conflicts explicit in their socio-economic dimensions and taking them as central units of analysis. This move aims at countering vertical ascription with horizontal solidarity.

On the other hand, taking into account the requirements for a certain stability in the social context for communication, trust-building and cooperation to have a chance, and the strong impact of socio-economic inequalities on diminished trust, RJCIS advocates for and alliance with ‘social protection’ that under the current socio-historical circumstances will inevitably occur “in the shadow of hierarchy” (Héritier and Lehmkuhl 2008; Héritier and Rhodes 2011; Smismans 2008). Introducing a participatory corrective to welfare systems where these are hegemonic, or strengthening public provision via consultation and more effective representation where these are weak in order to reduce the competitive factors should potentially counter the well
known side-effects of further colonisation of the ‘lifeworld’, funding-driven logic, cutting civic organisation off their base, etc.

This is supported by the general finding of this research whereby strong leadership and steering by public institutions combined with effective socio-economic redistributive policies are associated with lower levels of active participation on the one hand, and higher perceptions of personal safety – or at least de-securitisation of issues – on the other (Vienna, Hungary in some circumstances). When public actors are effectively hegemonic, the restorative approach experimented in the project seems to act as a complementary corrective, contributing (through improved communication and dialogue) towards a more effective representation of interests and identities of stakeholders, including a partial re-appropriation of conflicts. Conversely, higher levels of active participation and mobilisation in the presence of weaker social public provision are potentially open to exclusionary practices, are associated with heightened perceptions of insecurity and are more prone to securitising dynamics. In these more competitive constellations, the restorative methods experimented in the project – in particular peace-making circles or ‘community mediation’ – might contribute towards strengthening social solidarity between stakeholders, building inter-group ‘bridging’ trust, increasing the sense of fairness in the process and improving the perceptions of safety.
References


## Project documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Place</th>
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<td>D4.4</td>
<td>2015-07</td>
<td>Kremmel, Katrin; Pelikan, Christa</td>
<td>Towards restorative circles: Action research interventions in Vienna’s social housing estates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna</td>
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<td>Nikolić-Ristanović, Vesna; Ćopić, Sanja; Petrovic, Nikola; Saciri, Bejan</td>
<td>Conflicts, security and justice in intercultural context of Serbia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
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<td>Katrin Kremmel</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Newcomers and traditions</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
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<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Perception of victim - victimisation</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović</td>
<td>Victim / victimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Social class hinders recognition in mediation</td>
<td>Christa Pelikan</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Police as a source of insecurity</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Interethnic relations, security, contacts and socialising</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Post-conflict society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Economic and legal safety</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>On justice in the case of “Strpče kidnapping”</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>On conflicts in Bačka</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>On justice and conflict resolution in Medvedja</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>On dialogue in Bačka</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović, Sanja Ćopić</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Misuse of Drugs in Derry</td>
<td>Hugh Campbell, Derick Wilson</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Drug misuse, an official view in Derry</td>
<td>Hugh Campbell, Derick Wilson</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>Tim Chapman</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Hate Crime, Inter-Community Conflict</td>
<td>Tim Chapman, Philip McCready</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Race hate crime and restorative justice</td>
<td>Tim Chapman</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Race hate crime</td>
<td>Tim Chapman</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Key concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Construction of minorities around a charity ball</td>
<td>Dori Szegő</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Civil society organisations - strategic action vs community</td>
<td>Dori Szegő</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>László Balla</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>New ‘Civic guard’</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>‘Butcher festival’ case (3), a reflexive view</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Social inclusion / exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>‘Butcher festival’ case (1), discussion at city council</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>‘Butcher festival’ case (2), local Roma leader views</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Social inclusion / exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>On conflict, on the denial of conflict and on violence talk</td>
<td>Christa Pelikan, Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>CCTV case and surveillance</td>
<td>Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>CCTV case middle-age resident interviewed by youth</td>
<td>Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>On the continuity of neighbourhood conflicts</td>
<td>Christa Pelikan</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Loyalist network for restorative justice</td>
<td>Tim Chapman, Philip McCready</td>
<td>Strategic v communicative action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Youth Provision in Seymour Hill</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Community Integration and Active Citizenship</td>
<td>Tim Chapman, Philip McCready</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Active Participation in Lifeworld – System conflict</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Seymour Hill</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
<td>Tim Chapman, Philip McCready</td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Inter-generational conflict</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Capacity building workshop at the Bassena</td>
<td>Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Social housing construction postponed again</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Strategic v communicative action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Restorative processes</td>
<td>Tim Chapman, Philip McCready</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Key concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Belonging and systems of care</td>
<td>Christa Pelikan, Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Workshop at Frauencafé and togetherness</td>
<td>Christa Pelikan, Katrin Kremmel</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Intra-ethnic conflicts</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović</td>
<td>Restorative principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>(Imagined) Roma kinship relations</td>
<td>László Balla</td>
<td>Intercultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Restorative principles – mediators perspective</td>
<td>László Balla</td>
<td>Restorative principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Trust building with a minority group</td>
<td>László Balla</td>
<td>Strategic v communicative action, Minorities, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>The local school as an open conflict space</td>
<td>Dori Szegő</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Healing Circle 1, Exclusion</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Social inclusion / exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Healing Circle 2, Conflict</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Healing Circle 3, Conflict</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Healing Circle 4, Security</td>
<td>Gábor Héra</td>
<td>Security / Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>SB housing launch</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>SB PSNI budget cuts</td>
<td>Philip McCready</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexes

A.1 Comparative evaluation grid templates

These are the ‘third generation’ comparative evaluation grid templates as approved at the Belfast researchers’ meeting (June 2014) for subsequent use in the ALTERNATIVE project. The first is the concept-centred variant: a note for the chosen key concept. The second is the session-centred variant: it records several observations and related concepts occurred during a single research session, like an interview, focus group, meeting etc., so there is no need to repeat the same thick description.

**ALTERNATIVE comparative analysis grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Your ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thick description:**


**ETIC conceptualisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key concept [characterising what is thickly described above]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local language for concept and related terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final comments and observations:
### A.2 Analysis of reparation of harm (QCA)

Analysis restricted to cases with high or intermediate-high intervention intensity, raw R output.

```
### QCA settings

##### Parameters in superSubset function

incl.cut = inclusion cut-off threshold
cov.cut = coverage cut-off threshold

supsub.incl.cut <- 0.8
supsub.cov.cut <- 0.7

##### Parameters in truthTable function

ncut = specifies the minimum number of cases needed in order to not code a configuration as a logical remainder as indicated by "?" Default = 1

incl.cut1 = minimal sufficiency inclusion score for a non-remainder configuration to be coded as true ("1")

incl.cut0 = offers the possibility of coding configurations as contradictions ("C") when their inclusion score is neither high nor low enough to consider them as true, respectively false. If the inclusion score of a non-remainder configuration falls below incl.cut0, it is always coded false ("0").

tt.incl.cut1 <- 0.8
tt.incl.cut0 <- 0.5
```

### Cases synopsis: conditions and outcomes

**Conditions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c01 Mediation G-M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c02 Graffiti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c04 Frauentaza circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c01 Butcher's festival</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c02 Charity provision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c01 Polish family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c06 Healing circle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c02 SH housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7-c03 Dunnmury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c07 Bassena circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c08 Mediation S-O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c09 Mediation K-G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>CIS/SP</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>IIO</th>
<th>jfO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c01 Mediation G-M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c02 Graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4-c04 Frauentaza circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5-c01 Butcher's festival</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP5-c02 Charity provision 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 1
WP7-c01 Polish family 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0
WP5-c06 Healing circle 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
WP7-c02 SH housing 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0
WP7-c03 Dummurry 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0
WP4-c07 Bassena circle 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 1
WP4-c08 Mediation S-O 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1
WP4-c09 Mediation K-G 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 0

Keys: Conditions
JC  Justice claims
PF  Practice formalisation
HC  Harm claims
SI  Security intensity
PUB Public stakeholders
RI Researchers involvement
MF  Moral framing
VOC  VOC model
P  Police

Keys: Outcomes
RC  Restored Communication
TR  Taking responsibility
CP  Changing positions
A  Agreement
RH  Repaired Harm
OC  Ongoing Conflict
OT  Ongoing Treatment
CIS/SP  Change in security / safety perceptions
P0  Participation (vs delegation)
IIO  Intervention intensity
jfo Justice informality (lifeworld vs system)

########################################################################
#                           Pearson correlation matrix                     #
########################################################################

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### end of statistical analysis

########################################################################
#                           QCA section                                  #
########################################################################

#### Chosen outcome for QCA: O <- RH Repaired Harm

########################################################################
#                           Distance matrices for cases                  #
########################################################################
Most Similar - Same Outcome cases

Very similar cases with the same outcome that you may consider removing from the dataset or review in depth

WP4-c09 Mediation K-G  <----->  WP4-c08 Mediation S-O  distance = 0.68

Most Different - Same Outcome distance matrix between cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4-c01</th>
<th>4-c02</th>
<th>4-c04</th>
<th>5-c01</th>
<th>5-c02</th>
<th>7-c01</th>
<th>5-c06</th>
<th>7-c02</th>
<th>7-c03</th>
<th>4-c07</th>
<th>4-c08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-c02</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c04</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c01</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c02</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c01</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c06</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c02</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c03</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c07</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c08</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c09</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum distance among MDSO cases: 5.83 (compared with theoretical maximum of 9 conditions)

Level 0: most dissimilar cases among those with the same outcome

WP7-c02 SH housing  <----->  WP4-c01 Mediation G-M
WP5-c06 Healing circle  <----->  WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c02 SH housing  <----->  WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c03 Dunmurry  <----->  WP4-c02 Graffiti
WP7-c03 Dunmurry  <----->  WP7-c02 SH housing
WP7-c03 Dunmurry  <----->  WP5-c01 Butcher's festival
WP7-c03 Dunmurry  <----->  WP5-c02 Charity provision
WP7-c02 SH housing  <----->  WP5-c06 Healing circle
WP7-c03 Dunmurry  <----->  WP5-c06 Healing circle
WP4-c07 Bassena circle  <----->  WP7-c02 SH housing

Most Similar - Different Outcome distance matrix between cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4-c01</th>
<th>4-c02</th>
<th>4-c04</th>
<th>5-c01</th>
<th>5-c02</th>
<th>7-c01</th>
<th>5-c06</th>
<th>7-c02</th>
<th>7-c03</th>
<th>4-c07</th>
<th>4-c08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-c02</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c04</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c01</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c02</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c01</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-c06</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c02</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-c03</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c07</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c08</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-c09</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum distance among MSDO cases: 1.68 (compared with theoretical minimum of zero, i.e. no difference)
Level 0: most similar cases among those with different outcome

WP4-c08 Mediation S-O  <----->  WP4-c01 Mediation G-M
WP4-c09 Mediation K-G  <----->  WP4-c01 Mediation G-M
WP7-c02 SH housing     <----->  WP7-c01 Polish family

End cases selection

Distance matrices for Conditions

Conditions with minimum distance across cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JC</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PUB</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

minimum distance among conditions: 2.53

QCA on all cases

Analysing Necessity Relations: Condition <= Outcome (C <= O)

Outcome: RH: Repaired Harm

incl  cov.r

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VOC*P 1.000 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ri<em>VOC</em>P 0.943 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PUB<em>VOC</em>P 1.000 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HC<em>VOC</em>P 0.887 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PF<em>VOC</em>P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P 0.943 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HC<em>ri</em>VOC*P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>VOC*P 0.887 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PF<em>ri</em>VOC*P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>VOC*P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>VOC*P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>VOC</em>P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P 0.830 1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing for spurious: c <= 0

incl  cov.r

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PUB<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HC<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PF<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HC<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PF<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>VOC</em>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing for spurious : C <= o

incl  cov.r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOC*P</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PUB<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HC<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PF<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HC<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PF<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HC<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PF<em>PUB</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>ri<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PF<em>HC</em>PUB<em>ri</em>VOC*P</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#####################################################################
##################      Sufficient conditions      ##################
#####################################################################

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

# Testing for sufficient conditions : C => O	

Outcome : RH : Repaired Harm

Complex Solution for all cases :

n OUT = 1/0/C: 3/9/0
Total : 12

Number of multiple-covered cases: 0

M1: jc*PF*HC*si*PUB*ri*mf*VOC*P + JC*PF*HC*SI*PUB*ri*MF*VOC*P <= 0

incl  cov.r  cov.u  cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>jc<em>PF</em>HC<em>si</em>PUB<em>ri</em>mf<em>VOC</em>P</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>0.610</th>
<th>0.553</th>
<th>Mediation S-O, Mediation K-G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JC<em>PF</em>HC<em>SI</em>PUB<em>ri</em>MF<em>VOC</em>P</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>Polish family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Factorisation of solution M1, necessary and sufficient condition:

F1: HC*P*PF*PUB*ri*VOC*(jc*si*mf + JC*SI*MF)

A.3 QCA application code in R

```r
source("ALT - Initial setup.R")
source("ALT - plot 3D.R")
source("ALT - Statistical analysis.R")
source("ALT - QCA setup.R")
source("ALT - QCA all cases.R")
source("ALT - QCA WPs.R")
```

## Select outcome
```
outselected <- "CRJO"  # defaults to comprehensive outcome calculated by FileMaker
```

## End initial settings

```
library(RJDBC)
library(QCA)
library(QCA3)
library(scatterplot3d)
library(rgl)
```
```R
# Initials <- function (string){
#     fn <- function(x){
#         v <- unlist(strsplit(x, split = " "))
#         v <- toupper(v)
#         v <- substring(v, 1, 1)
#         v <- paste(v, collapse = "")
#     }
#     sapply(string, fn)
# }

# fuzzyxor <- function (x,y){
#     fn <- function(a,b){
#         z <- fuzzyor(fuzzyand(a,1-b),fuzzyand(1-a,b))
#         return(z)
#     }
#     mapply(fn,x,y)
# }

# fuzzyAimpB <- function (x,y){
#     fn <- function(a,b){
#         z <- fuzzyor(1-a,b)
#         return(z)
#     }
#     mapply(fn,x,y)
# }

# Connect to FileMaker database via JDBC

altdb <- dbConnect(drv, "jdbc:filemaker://localhost:2399/Alternative\_testing", "alternative", "project")
casesraw <- dbGetQuery(altdb, "SELECT  * FROM "Cases" WHERE "QCA" = 1");
outcomelist <- dbGetQuery(altdb, "SELECT  * FROM "Outcomes" WHERE "QCA" = 1");
condlist <- dbGetQuery(altdb, "SELECT  * FROM "Conditions" WHERE "QCA" = 1");
#outcomelist <- outcomelist$Outcome # take only the Outcome column
numc <- casesraw$"Total cases"[1]
cases <- data.frame(matrix(rep(numeric(numc),0),nrow=numc))
#condlist <- data.frame(matrix(rep(numeric(1),0)))
outcomat <- data.frame(matrix(rep(numeric(numc),0),nrow=numc))
casenames <- casesraw$"Short Title"
row.names(cases) <- casesraw$"Case name"
row.names(outcomat) <- casesraw$"Case name"

# Conditions
#condlist <- as.matrix(condlist$Condition)

for (rr in 1:dim(cases)[1]) {
    for (ii in 1:dim(condlist)[1]){
        cases[,ii] <- casesraw[,which(names(casesraw) == condlist[ii,1])]
    }
}

names(cases) <- Initials(condlist$Condition)

names(cases)[which(names(cases)=="PS")]["PUB"]

names(cases)[which(names(cases)=="WM")]["VOC"]

row.names(condlist) <- names(cases)

# Total number of conditions
lastc <- dim(cases)[2]
```

---
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for (rr in 1:dim(cases)[1]) {
  for (ii in 1:dim(outcomelist)[1]) {
    mtc <- grep(outcomelist$Outcome[ii], casesraw$Outcomes[rr])
    # assign(paste("cases$O",ii, ",","",sep = ""),
    grep(outcomelist[ii], casesraw$Outcomes[rr]))
    outcomat[rr, ii] <- length(mtc)
  }
}
names(outcomat) <- Initials(outcomelist$Outcome)

# Process variables as outcomes already calculated by FileMaker
outcomat$Part <- casesraw$"Participation as outcome"
outcomat$Part <- casesraw$"COpart"
outcomelist <- rbind(outcomelist, c("Participation (vs delegation)", ""))
outcomat$II0 <- casesraw$"Intervention as outcome"
outcomelist <- rbind(outcomelist, c("Intervention intensity", ""))
outcomat$jf0 <- casesraw$"Justice informality as outcome"
outcomelist <- rbind(outcomelist, c("Justice informality (lifeworld vs system)", ""))

outcomat$LW <- casesraw$"COlw"
outcomat$LW <- casesraw$"Lifeworld vs system"

# Reparation outcome pre-calculated by FileMaker
outcomat$Rep <- casesraw$"CAmp" 
outcomalist <- rbind(outcomalist, c("Reparation overall outcome", ""))

# Comprehensive RJ outcome pre-calculated by FileMaker
outcomat$CRJO <- casesraw$"CRJOoutcome"
outcomelist <- rbind(outcomelist, c("Comprehensive restorative justice outcome", ""))

### Testing a multi-value outcome ... not working yet
#cases$O <- ifelse(outcomat$RC & outcomat$PO & outcomat$jf0 & outcomat$RH, 2, 
#                   ifelse(outcomat$RC & outcomat$RH & !outcomat$jf0, 1, 
#                          ifelse(outcomat$RC & ! outcomat$RH, 0, 
#                                 ifelse(outcomat$RC & outcomat$RH, 0, 
#                                        0)
#                          )
#                   )
#
#context <- data.frame(matrix(rep(numeric(4),0),nrow=numc))
#rownames(context) <- casesraw$"Case name"
#WPs <- substr(row.names(cases),start=1,stop=3)
#WP <- as.numeric(substr(row.names(cases),start=3,stop=3))
#context <- context[-numc,]
#nn=dim(context)[1] # rows as number of cases
#mm=dim(context)[2] # columns as number of WPs
#for (rr in 1:nn){
#  for (cc in 1:4){
#    context[rr,cc] <- ifelse(substr(WPs[rr],start=3,stop=3)==cc+3,1,0)
#    cc=cc+1
#  }
#  rr=rr+1
#}

writeLines("203")
### Cases synopsis: conditions and outcomes

#### the whole dataset: cases conditions + outcomes

```r
allCCO <- cbind(cases[,1:lastc],outcomat)
print(cbind(cases[,1:lastc]," ",outcomat))
writeLines("\n")
condlist <- as.matrix(condlist[,2])
colnames(condlist) <- "Condition key:"
row.names(condlist) <- names(cases[,1:lastc])
print(condlist, quote = FALSE, justify = "left")
writeLines("\n")
outcomelist <- as.matrix(outcomelist[,1])
colnames(outcomelist) <- "Outcome key:"
row.names(outcomelist) <- names(outcomat)
#outcomelist <- outcomelist$Outcome
print(outcomelist, quote = FALSE)

### Frequencies

```r
for (ii in 1:lastc-1){
  barplot(
    table(factor(cases[,ii], levels = 1:5)),
    xlab = paste(names(cases)[ii],condlist[ii,1]),
    ylab = "Frequency"
  )
}
#barplot(
#  table(factor(cases$PUB)),
#  xlab = "PUB",
#  ylab = "Frequency"
#)
cat("#### Frequency charts displayed in side window "
### "")
```

#### Set Outcome based on initial setup

```r
cases$O <- cases$HC    # initialisation only
cat("Select outcome: enter initials of any of the outcomes shown in the table above (it defaults to CRJO: comprehensive outcome )")
outselected  <- scan(nmax=1, what = "character",fill = TRUE,skipNul = FALSE)
outselected <- ifelse(length(outselected) == 0, "CRJO", outselected)
cases$O <- outcomat[, outselected]
cat("#### Chosen outcome for QCA: O ",outselected,outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected),])
```

#### End of initial setup

```r
```
# Plotting cases data in 3D+1 space

```r
plotmat <- cbind(cases/5, outcomat)
plotmat$WP <- WP
plotmat$LW[plotmat$WP == 6] <- 0.9
ev2plot <- c("LW", "Part", "Rep", "II")
cat("Select variables to plot (defaults to LW, Part, Rep, II): ")
ev2plot <- scan(nmax=4, what = "character", fill = TRUE, skipNul = FALSE)
if (length(v2plot) == 0) v2plot <- c("LW", "Part", "Rep", "II")
cat("### Chosen variables to plot: x=", v2plot[1], " y=", v2plot[2], " z=", v2plot[3], " r=", v2plot[4])
plotmat$x <- plotmat[, which(names(plotmat)==v2plot[1])]
plotmat$y <- plotmat[, which(names(plotmat)==v2plot[2])]
plotmat$z <- plotmat[, which(names(plotmat)==v2plot[3])]
plotmat$r <- plotmat[, which(names(plotmat)==v2plot[4])]^(1/3)
plotmat$x[plotmat$x == 0] <- 0.1
plotmat$y[plotmat$y == 0] <- 0.1
plotmat$z[plotmat$z == 0] <- 0.1
plotmat$r[plotmat$r == 0] <- 0.1
plotmat$x <- plotmat$x + runif(numc, min=-0.1, max=.1)
plotmat$y <- plotmat$y + runif(numc, min=-0.1, max=.1)
plotmat$z <- plotmat$z + runif(numc, min=-0.1, max=.05)
plotmat$pcolor[plotmat$WP == 4] <- "#89ACCA"
plotmat$pcolor[plotmat$WP == 5] <- "#FC0475"
plotmat$pcolor[plotmat$WP == 6] <- "#6ECA96"
plotmat$pcolor[plotmat$WP == 7] <- "#F7B87B"

with(plotmat, {
  s3d <- scatterplot3d(x, y, z,
                      color=pcolor, pch=19, lwd=2,
                      xlim=c(0,1), ylim=c(0,1), zlim=c(0,1),
                      type="h", cex.symbols=2.5,
                      xlab=v2plot[1], ylab=v2plot[2], zlab=v2plot[3],
                      highlight.3d = FALSE)
  #P <- s3d$xyz.convert(LW, Part, Rep)
  #segments(0,0,P$x,P$y,pch=16,lwd=2,col=pcolor,lty="dotted")
})

with(plotmat, {
  s3d <- plot3d(x, y, z,
                col=pcolor, pch=19, lwd=5,
                xlim=c(0,1), ylim=c(0,1), zlim=c(0,1),
                type="s", radius=r/15, size = 20,
                xlab=v2plot[1], ylab=v2plot[2], zlab=v2plot[3],
                main = paste("r:", v2plot[4]),
                box = FALSE, axes=FALSE, aspect=1, expand=1,
                lit = TRUE, shininess = 100.0, alpha=c(0.7), textype = "rgba")
  #plot3d(x, y, z,
  #        col=pcolor, pch=19, lwd=5, size=20,
  #        xlim=c(0,1), ylim=c(0,1), zlim=c(0,1),
  #        type="h", add = TRUE)
  #plot3d(0,0,0,
  #       col="black", pch=19, lwd=5,
  #       type="p", size=10, add = TRUE)
  grid3d(c("X","Y","Z"))
  #writePLY("~/Desktop/Plot.ply", withNormals = F)
})
```
### Statistical Analysis

Convert the boolean condition / variable PUB to numeric value homogeneous with the other variables

```r
#cases$PUB <- ifelse(cases$PUB == "Yes", 5, ifelse(cases$PUB == "No", 1, cases$PUB))
#cases$PUB <- as.numeric(cases$PUB)
```

Scale to [1..4] interval instead of [1,2,4,5] in order to keep proportionality at least for the statistical analysis QCA thresholds are already calibrated for the 1:5 interval

Only conditions + one selected outcome

```r
casesr <- cases
```

Conditions + all outcomes

```r
#casesr <- allCCO
```

```r
#casesr <- cases[,-8]
#nn=dim(casesr)[1] ## rows as number of cases
#mm=dim(casesr)[2] ## columns as number of conditions
#for (rr in 1:nn){
#  for (cc in 1:mm){
#    casesr[rr,cc] <- ifelse(casesr[rr,cc] == 4 | casesr[rr,cc] == 5, casesr[rr,cc]-1, casesr[rr,cc])
#    cc=cc+1
#  }
#  rr=rr+1
#}
```

Optionally add random white noise to data

```r
# casesr <- casesr + replicate(dim(cases)[2], rnorm(dim(cases)[1],mean=0, sd=.5))
```

### Pearson correlation matrix

```r
rmatrix <- cor(casesr)
# Plot only lower half of the rounded matrix to check for significant correlations
print(as.dist(round(rmatrix,digit=2)))
my.mat <- rmatrix
numrows <- dim(my.mat)[1]
for (ii in 1:numrows){
  for (jj in ii:numrows) {
    my.mat[jj,ii]<-NA
    jj <- jj+1
  }
  ii<-ii+1
}
my.mat <- my.mat[-numrows,]
my.mat <- my.mat[,-1]
s3d.dat <- data.frame(cols=as.vector(col(my.mat)),
  rows=as.vector(row(my.mat)),
  value=as.vector(abs(my.mat)))
colors <- floor((1-s3d.dat[,3])*10+1)
scatterplot3d(s3d.dat, type="h", lwd=12, pch=" ", angle = 50, color = colors,
  x.ticklabs=colnames(my.mat), y.ticklabs=rownames(my.mat),
  xlab="",ylab="",zlab=""
# Pearson correlation matrix between variables (abs)

main="Pearson correlation matrix between variables (abs)",highlight.3d = FALSE, 
lab=c(numrows,numrows,1),lab.z=8)

# Tries to capture automatically the variables with the less insignificant correlation values
#interesting <- which ((rmatrix > 0.6) & (row(rmatrix) != col(rmatrix)),arr.ind = TRUE)
#print(interesting)
#cor.test(casesr[,row.names(interesting)[1]],casesr[,row.names(interesting)[2]],conf.level = 0.99)

# Correlation analysis on the selected variables

writeLines("\n
Enter the names of two variables for a deeper correlation analysis:
(it defaults to JC and PF)
")

corrvar <- scan(what = "character", nmax = 2)

if(length(corrvar) == 0) corrvar <- c("JC", "PF")

correlresults <- cor.test(cases[,corrvar[1]],cases[,corrvar[2]],conf.level = 0.99, method = "pearson")
correlresults$data.name <- paste(corrvar[1],corrvar[2])
print(correlresults)

# Plotting more significant correlations

#plot(cases$HC,cases$JF)
#abline(0, 1)
#text(cases$PF, cases$JF, labels = rownames(casesr))
#symbols(cases$PF, cases$JF, circles=cases$H/pi,inches=0.3, fg="white", bg=ifelse(WPs == "WP4","red",ifelse(WPs == "WP5","cyan",ifelse(WPs == "WP6","green",ifelse(WPs == "WP7","magenta",""))))), xlab="PF", ylab="JF")

writeLines("\n
####################################################################
#  Cases correlation matrix
# 
")

revmatrix <- cor(t(casesr))

# Plot only lower half of the rounded matrix to check for significant correlations

#print(as.dist(round(revmatrix,digit=2)))

#### filter the cases with high correlation

totcases <- dim(cases)[1]

#for (cc in 1:totcases){
# for (dd in cc:totcases){
# 
# revmatrix[dd,cc] <- ifelse(revmatrix[dd,cc] > 0.9,round(revmatrix[dd,cc],2),NA)
# 
# dd<-dd+1}
# cc<-cc+1}

for (cc in 1:totcases){
  for (rr in cc:totcases){
    revmatrix[rr,cc] <- NA
    rr<-rr+1
  }cc<-cc+1}

#for (cc in 1:totcases){revmatrix[cc,cc]<-NA}

writeLines("Very similar cases in conditions and outcomes that you may consider removing from the 
dataset or review in depth \n"
)

VSC <- which(revmatrix > 0.9, arr.ind = TRUE)
if (dim(VSC)[1] > 0) for (ii in 1:dim(VSC)[1]){
  cat(c(row.names(cases)[VSC[ii,1]]," <----->      ", row.names(cases)[VSC[ii,2]],"      corr 
  ", round(revmatrix[VSC[ii,1],VSC[ii,2]],2)," \n"))
}
writeLines("#### end of statistical analysis ###################################################################
#### press 'enter' when ready to continue ###################################################################")

scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("####################################################################
#######################     QCA section     #########################
####################################################################")

#######   Threshold for deciding that two cases have the same outcome
Odiffmin <- 0.2

#####################################################################
#######   Set Outcome based on initial setup  ###########################
#####################################################################
cat("Current selected outcome :
")
print(outselected)
cat("Select another outcome if you wish : enter initials of any of the outcomes shown in the table
above (it defaults to the current outcome )
")
outselectedcurrent <- outselected
outselected <- scan(nmax=1, what = "character",fill = TRUE,skipNul = FALSE)
outselected <- ifelse(length(outselected) == 0, outselectedcurrent, outselected)
cases$O <- outcomat[, outselected]
cat("#### Chosen outcome for QCA: O
<-",outselected,outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected),])

writeLines("\n\n####      End of Outcome setup                  #####################
####      press 'enter' when ready to continue   ####################")

scan(nmax=1)

########################################################################
#######   Calibration     #########################
# set thresholds for Conditions
thcond <- c(1.5,3,4.5)    ## standard values
# set thresholds for Outcome
thO <- c(0.30,0.50,0.70)
# prepare calibrated data matrix from cases (without added random noise for replicability)
casescalib <- cases

## calibrate one condition at a time, excluding the Outcome variable


n=dim(cases)[2]-1
for (ii in 1:n){
  casescalib[,ii] <- calibrate(cases[,ii], type = "fuzzy", thresholds = thcond, include = TRUE,
  logistic = FALSE,idm=0.95,ecdf=FALSE,p=1,q=1)
  ii=ii+1
}
## calibrate the outcome variable
casescalib$O <- calibrate(cases$O, type = "fuzzy", thresholds = thO, include = TRUE, logistic =
  FALSE,idm=0.95,ecdf=FALSE,p=1,q=1)
casescalib <- round(casescalib,2)
## calibrate also the CRJO even if not selected as outcome for QCA
outcomat$CRJO <- round(calibrate(outcomat$CRJO, type = "fuzzy", thresholds = thO, include = TRUE,
  logistic = FALSE,idm=0.95,ecdf=FALSE,p=1,q=1),2)

########## Normalisation (alternative to proper calibration) ##########
############ normalisation to five categories (sets) in the interval [0..1] ############
# casescalib <- (cases-1)/4
# combine the context crisp conditions with the calibrated fuzzy conditions

writeLines("##### Distance matrices for cases #####

")
totcond <- dim(casescalib)[2]-1   # number of conditions, excluding the outcome, including the WP
totcases <- dim(casescalib)[1]

#### initialisation of variables
distBcases <- data.frame(matrix(nrow=totcases,ncol=totcases))
row.names(distBcases)<-substr(row.names(casescalib),3,7)
names(distBcases)<-substr(row.names(casescalib),3,7)
MDSO <- distBcases
MDSO <- distBcases

#### calculate fuzzy distance matrix between cases with a sum over fuzzy XOR
#### between all conditions, excluding the WP, excluding the Outcome
for (cc in 1:totcases){
  for (dd in cc:totcases){
    distBcases[dd,cc]<-
      round(sum(fuzzyxor(casescalib[cc,2:totcond],casescalib[dd,2:totcond])),digit=2)
    dd<dd+1
    cc<cc+1
  }
}
for (cc in 1:totcases){distBcases[cc,cc]<-NA}

#### filter the cases fuzzy distance matrix to select only cases with the Same Outcome
for (cc in 1:totcases){
  for (dd in cc:totcases){
    MDSO[dd,cc] <- ifelse(abs(casescalib$O[dd]-casescalib$O[cc]) <=
                        Odiffmin,distBcases[dd,cc],NA)
  }
}
for (cc in 1:totcases){MDSO[cc,cc]<-NA}

#### filter the cases fuzzy distance matrix to select only cases with Different Outcome

for (cc in 1:totcases){
  for (dd in cc:totcases){
    MSDO[dd,cc] <- ifelse(abs(casescalib$O[dd]-casescalib$O[cc]) > Odifmin,distBcases[dd,cc],NA)
    dd<-dd+1
    cc<-cc+1
  }
  for (cc in 1:totcases){MDSO[cc,cc]<-NA}
}

mostdif <- max(MDSO,na.rm=TRUE)
mostsim <- min(MDSO,na.rm=TRUE)

writeLines("
################################### MSSO ####################################

Most Similar - Same Outcome cases
Very similar cases with the same outcome that you may consider removing from the dataset or
review in depth \n")

MSSO <- which(MDSO < 1, arr.ind = TRUE)
if (dim(MSSO)[1] > 0)   for (ii in 1:dim(MSSO)[1]) {
  cat(c(row.names(casescalib)[MSSO[ii,1]],"<------>",row.names(casescalib)[MSSO[ii,2]],"distance =",MDSO[MSSO[ii,1],MSSO[ii,2]]," \n"))
}

writeLines("### press 'enter' when ready to continue ####################################
"
scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("################################### MDSO ####################################

Most Different - Same Outcome distance matrix between cases \n")
print(as.dist(MDSO))

cat("\nMaximum distance among MDSO cases: ", mostdif, "(compared with theoretical maximum of","totcond-1","conditions) \n")

writeLines("\nLevel 0: most dissimilar cases among those with the same outcome \n")

MDSOsel <- which(MDSO>=mostdif*0.8,arr.ind = TRUE)
for (ii in 1:dim(MDSOsel)[1]) {
  cat(c(row.names(casescalib)[MDSOsel[ii,1]],"<------>",row.names(casescalib)[MDSOsel[ii,2]]," \n"))
}

writeLines("### press 'enter' when ready to continue ####################################
"
scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("################################### MSDO ####################################

Most Similar - Different Outcome distance matrix between cases \n")
print(as.dist(MSDO))

cat("\nMinimum distance among MSDO cases: ", mostsim, "(compared with theoretical minimum of zero,\ni.e. no difference) \n")

writeLines("\nLevel 0: most similar cases among those with different outcome \n")

MSDOsel <- which(MSDO<=mostsim*1.2,arr.ind = TRUE)
for (ii in 1:dim(MSDOsel)[1]) {
  cat(c(row.names(casescalib)[MSDOsel[ii,1]],"     <----->      ", row.names(casescalib)[MSDOsel[ii,2]]," 
"))
}

writeLines("  #########################    End cases selection   #########################
  ##################################################################")

writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue ##########################")

scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("  ##################################################################
  ############          Distance matrices for Conditions          ############
  ##################################################################")

#### initialisation of variables

distBconds <- data.frame(matrix(nrow=totcond-1,ncol=totcond-1))
row.names(distBconds)<-names(casescalib)[2:totcond]
names(distBconds)<-names(casescalib)[2:totcond]

#### calculate fuzzy distance matrices between conditions with a sum over fuzzy XOR

for (cc in 1:(totcond-1)){
  for (dd in cc:(totcond-1)){
    distBconds[dd,cc]<-round(sum(fuzzyxor(casescalib[1:totcases,(cc+1)],casescalib[1:totcases,(dd+1)])),digit=2)
    dd<-dd+1
    cc<-cc+1
  }
  for (cc in 1:(totcond-1)){distBconds[cc,cc]<-NA}
}

writeLines("  ############ Conditions with minimum distance across cases ############
  ")

print(as.dist(distBconds))

mindistconds <- min(distBconds,na.rm = TRUE)
cat("\nminimum distance among conditions:", mindistconds, " 
")

my.mat <- distBconds

s3d.dat <- data.frame(cols=as.vector(col(my.mat)),
  rows=as.vector(row(my.mat)),
  value=as.vector(my.mat))

numrows <- totcond-1  # to account for the WP condition that has to be ignored here

for (ii in 1:(numrows-2)) {
  jj <- floor(ii / (numrows+1)) +3
  s3d.dat$z[iii]<-s3d.dat[ii,jj]
  ii<-ii+1
}

s3d.dat <- s3d.dat[,3:(numrows+2)]

colors <- floor(211
\[
\text{(s3d.dat[,3]-min(s3d.dat[,3],na.rm = TRUE))} \\
/ \\
(\text{max(s3d.dat[,3],na.rm = TRUE) - min(s3d.dat[,3],na.rm = TRUE)}) \\
*10+1)
\]

colors <- heat.colors(11)[colors]

scatterplot3d(s3d.dat, type="h", lwd=20, pch=" ", angle = 50, color = colors, 
x.ticklab=colnames(my.mat), y.ticklab=rownames(my.mat), 
lab=" ",xlab=" ",ylab=" ",zlab=" ", 
main="Fuzzy distance between conditions",highlight.3d = FALSE, 
lab=c(numrows,numrows,1),lab.z=8)

#writeLines(" 
########################################################
# End conditions selection  "
########################################################")
#writeLines(" 
########################################################
#### Testing binary implications between conditions, outcomes #### 
########################################################")

allCO <- cbind(casescalib,outcomat)
#allCO <- outcomat
allCO$WP <- casescalib$WP
allCO$LW[allCO$WP==6] <- 0.9
allCO$Rep <- outcomat$Rep
allCO$O <- NULL
allCO$IIO <- NULL
allCO$TR <- NULL
allCO$WP <- NULL
allCO$Rep <- NULL
allCO$WP[allCO$WP=="4",] <- 0.9
allCO$WP[allCO$WP=="4",] <- 0.9
allCO <- dim(allCO)[2]
allCOcases <- dim(allCO)[1]
AimpBvect <- data.frame(ncol=allCOcases)
aimpBvect <- data.frame(ncol=allCOcases)
Aimpbvect <- data.frame(ncol=allCOcases)
AimpB <- data.frame(matrix(nrow=totCO,ncol=totCO))
aimpB <- data.frame(matrix(nrow=totCO,ncol=totCO))
Aimpb <- data.frame(matrix(nrow=totCO,ncol=totCO))
for (ii in 1:totCO) {
  for (jj in 1:totCO) {
    AimpBvect <- fuzzyAimpB(allCO[,ii],allCO[,jj])
    aimpBvect <- fuzzyAimpB(1-allCO[,ii],allCO[,jj])
    Aimpbvect <- fuzzyAimpB(allCO[,ii],1-allCO[,jj])
    testAB <- 1
    testaB <- 1
    testAb <- 1
    for (cc in 1:allCOcases) {
      testAB <- fuzzyand(testAB,AimpBvect[cc])
      testaB <- fuzzyand(testaB,aimpBvect[cc])
      testAb <- fuzzyand(testAb,Aimpbvect[cc])
    }
    if (testAB > 0.8 && ii!=jj ) {
      print(paste(names(allCO)[ii]," => ",names(allCO)[jj]))
      AimpB[ii,jj]<- "=>"
    } else AimpB[ii,jj]<- " "
    if (testaB > 0.8 && ii!=jj ) {
      print(paste("!",names(allCO)[ii]," => ",names(allCO)[jj]))
      aimpB[ii,jj]<- "=>"
    } else aimpB[ii,jj]<- " "
    if (testAb > 0.8 && ii!=jj ) {
      print(paste(names(allCO)[ii]," => ",names(allCO)[jj]))
      Aimpb[ii,jj]<- "=>"
    } else Aimpb[ii,jj]<- " "
  }
}
names(AimpB) <- names(allCO)[1:totCO]
row.names(AimpB) <- names(allCO)[1:totCO]

writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue ####################################################")
scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("#### QCA settings
supsub.incl.cut <- 0.8
supsub.cov.cut <- 0.7

writeLines("#### Parameters in truthTable function
tt.incl.cut1 <- 0.8
tt.incl.cut0 <- 0.5

writeLines("QCA on all cases
");
writeLines("Include or exclude the WP 'context' as condition for the analysis of _all_ cases
1 to include
2 to exclude")

wpin <- scan(nmax=1)
lastc <- dim(casescalib)[2]-1 #all conditions minus outcome

writeLines("Chosen outcome for QCA:

cat("Outcome O <-",outselected,outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected),])
writeLines("")
writeLines("\n")
# Analyzing Necessity Relations Condition <- Outcome ( C <= O )
writeLines("Analysing Necessity Relations : Condition <= Outcome ( C <= O ) \n")
cat("Outcome : ", outselected, ":", outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected)], ":", 
     \n")
casesNR <- superSubset(casescalib, outcome = "O", conditions = names(casescalib)[wpin:lastc],
incl.cut = supsub.incl.cut, cov.cut = supsub.cov.cut)
print(casesNR)

# Testing for spurious / paradoxical necessity inclusions of the conditions found by superSubset
# the existence of a necessity inclusion for the negation of all combinations found by
# superSubset() and saved in casesNR, and the outcome
writeLines("Testing for spurious : c <= O ")
print(pof(1-casesNR$coms, outcome = "O", casescalib, neg.out = FALSE, relation = "nec"))

# Testing for the existence of a necessity inclusion between a condition found by superSubset and
# the negation of the outcome
writeLines("Testing for spurious : C <= o ")
print(pof(casesNR$coms, outcome = "O", casescalib, neg.out = TRUE, relation = "nec"))

# plotting necessary conditions found by superSubset
#
# plot(casesNR$coms"$SC+ii", casescalib$O, pch = 19, xlab="necessary condition : Securitisation +
# not (Intervention intensity)", ylab="outcome : Justice formalisation")
# abline(0,1)
# identify(casesNR$coms"$SC+ii", casescalib$O, labels = casenames, plot = TRUE)
writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue ###################")
scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("### press 'enter' when ready to continue ****************************")
scan(nmax=1)

writeLines("# Analyzing Sufficient Relations Condition -> Outcome ( C => O )
writeLines("Analysing Sufficient Relations : Condition => Outcome ( C => O ) \n")
casesTT <- truthTable(casescalib, outcome = "O", neg.out = FALSE, conditions = names(casescalib)[wpin:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1, incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0, complete = FALSE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"), decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)
cat("Outcome : ", outselected, ":", outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected)], ":", 
     \n")
casesSC <- eqmcc(casesTT, explain = "1", include = "1", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp = c(), rowdom = TRUE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)
writeLines("Complex Solution for all cases :\\n")
print(casesSC)

writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue ****************************")
scan(nmax=1)
### Testing for sufficient conditions: C => o (negated outcome) ####

casesTTneg <- truthTable(casescalib, outcome = "O", neg.out = TRUE, conditions =
names(casescalib)[wpin:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1, incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0,
complete = FALSE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"), decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)

# Boolean minimisation: Complex Solution for negated output
casesSCneg <- eqmcc(casesTTneg, explain = "1", include = "1", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp =
c(), rowdom = TRUE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)

writeLines(" Complex Solution for negated output :")
print(casesSCneg)

# print(factorize(casesSCneg))

writeLines("parsimonious solution for all cases 
")

writeLines(" Parsimonious solution for all cases 
")
casesTTall <- truthTable(casescalib, outcome = "O", neg.out = FALSE, conditions =
names(casescalib)[wpin:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1, incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0,
complete = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"), decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)
casesSP <- eqmcc(casesTTall, explain = "1", include = "?", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp =
c(), rowdom = FALSE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)

# print(factorize(casesSP))
print(casesSP)

writeLines("parsimonious solution for negated output 
")

writeLines(" parsimonious solution for negated output 
")
casesTTallneg <- truthTable(casescalib, outcome = "O", neg.out = TRUE, conditions =
names(casescalib)[wpin:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1, incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0,
complete = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"), decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)
casesSPneg <- eqmcc(casesTTallneg, explain = "1", include = "?", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp =
c(), rowdom = FALSE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)

# print(casesSPneg)
# print(factorize(casesSPneg))

QCA restricted to one WP at a time

#cat(" enter WP number to analyse (4, 5, 6 or 7) 
")
ii <- scan(nmax=1)
## Apply the superSubset function separately on the four WPs

```r
casesNRWP <- list()
casesNRWP[[ii]] <- superSubset(casescalib[which(casescalib[, "WP"] == ii), ], outcome = "O",
conditions = names(casescalib)[2:lastc], incl.cut = supsub.incl.cut, cov.cut = supsub.cov.cut)
cat("\nNecessary conditions for cases in WP", ii, " only 
")
cat("\nOutcome : ", outselected, ":", outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist) == outselected), ], ",\n")
print(pof(casesNRWP[[ii]]$coms, outcome = "O", casescalib[which(casescalib[, "WP"] == ii), ], neg.out = FALSE, relation = "nec"))

```

```r
cat("\nTesting for spurious : c <= O ")
print(pof(1-casesNRWP[[ii]]$coms, outcome = "O", casescalib[which(casescalib[, "WP"] == ii), ], neg.out = FALSE, relation = "necessity")
# Testing for the existence of a necessity inclusion between a condition found by superSubset and the negation of the outcome
cat("\nSufficient conditions for cases in WP", ii, " only")
print(pof(casesNRWP[[ii]]$coms, outcome = "O", casescalib[which(casescalib[, "WP"] == ii), ], neg.out = TRUE, relation = "necessity")
```
# Boolean minimisation : Complex Solution for o (negated outcome)

casesSCnegWP[ii] <- eqmcc(casesTTnegWP[ii], explain = "1", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp = c(), rowdom = TRUE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)
cat("\n
#####################  Complex Solution WP",ii,":   #####################
")
cat("Outcome : ",outselected,"":",outcomelist[which(row.names(outcomelist)==outselected),],"\n")
print(casesSCWP[ii])
writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue "
) scan(nmax=1)
cat("\n
###########  Complex Solution WP",ii,"for negated outcome:   ############
")
print(casesSCnegWP[ii])
writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue "
) scan(nmax=1)

##################### Parsimonious solution WP ################################
casesTTallWP[ii] <- truthTable(casescalib[which(casescalib[,"WP"]==ii),], outcome = "O",
    neg.out = FALSE, conditions = names(casescalib)[2:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1,
    incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0, complete = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"),
    decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)
##### truth table for negated outcome
casesTTallnegWP[ii] <- truthTable(casescalib[which(casescalib[,"WP"]==ii),], outcome = "O",
    neg.out = TRUE, conditions = names(casescalib)[2:lastc], n.cut = 1, incl.cut1 = tt.incl.cut1,
    incl.cut0 = tt.incl.cut0, complete = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, sort.by = c("incl", "n"),
    decreasing = TRUE, use.letters = FALSE)

#### boolean minimisation both for O and o
casesSPWP[ii] <- eqmcc(casesTTallWP[ii], explain = "1", include = "?", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp = c(), rowdom = FALSE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)
casesSPnegWP[ii] <- eqmcc(casesTTallnegWP[ii], explain = "1", include = "?", all.sol = FALSE, omit = c(), direxp = c(), rowdom = FALSE, details = TRUE, show.cases = TRUE, use.tilde = FALSE, use.letters = FALSE)
cat("\n
##################  Parsimonious Solution WP",ii,":   ##########################
")
print(casesSPWP[ii])
writeLines("#### press 'enter' when ready to continue "
) scan(nmax=1)
cat("\n
########  Parsimonious Solution WP",ii,"for negated outcome:   ############
")
print(casesSPnegWP[ii])

############################ end WP ################################

217