

https://dspace.org/

Making amends: towards a restorative practice in drama therapy

Mogomotsi, Mmabatho

2016-03-02
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/19891

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

MAKING AMENDS:

TOWARDS A RESTORATIVE PRACTICE IN DRAMA THERAPY

BY

MMABATHO MOGOMOTSI

MAKING AMENDS:

TOWARDS A RESTORATIVE PRACTICE IN DRAMA THERAPY

By

Mmabatho Mogomotsi

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN DRAMA THERAPY

In the Faculty of Humanities

University of the Witwatersrand

March 2015.

Supervised by Refiloe Lepere

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this research report is my own, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons. The research reported in this thesis have not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

Signature ……..

Date ……

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation and thanks are extended to those who have assisted me in completing this research. Special gratitude goes to Warren Nebe and Tamara Gordon-Robert of Drama For Life for bringing Drama Therapy to Africa – to us.

My husband Sello and our daughters, Tiro and Utlwang, who stood by me when I swopped roles to be a student. I will not forget your support and sacrifices in this time when I was chasing my dream and getting closer to me.

My family, especially my mother Mmamotlhakane Mogomotsi, who faithfully supported me throughout my studies. My dearly departed father and sister, you would be proud of me. Ke a lo leboga Bakgatla!!!!

My supervisor Refiloe Lepere, for her professional guidance and encouragement; I remain grateful for your support.

To God be the glory for the things He has done – all that I am and ever hope to be I owe to the One who leads me by the hand – always.

KAU WA MOKWENE!!!!!!

ABSTRACT

This research is a theoretical comparative examination of two practices through their similarities and differences based on a qualitative method with an Interpretative Social Science approach. The intention is to find where these two practices, Drama Therapy and Restorative Justice synergise- whereupon lies a collaboration of approaches. To achieve this, Role Method as advocated for by Robert Landy, one of the proponents of drama therapy was employed. The outcome is a role method-based Restorative Drama Therapy process that is aimed at juveniles in diversion with minor crimes.

It is the researcher's believe that through a restorative drama therapy, the client (juveniles in diversion) can be allowed to travel into the distant memory and retrieve the dormant roles, interrogate and rehearse them as they prepare to inhabit them. This is because drama therapy and restorative justice share similarities especially in role creation.

The synergy, I found in the similarities. In the differences though, is where I sit with the best practices in drama therapy to complement and anchor restorative principles in a drama therapy process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration…… 3

Acknowledgements…… 4

Abstract…….. 5

CHAPTER 1…….. 6

1.1 Introduction…… 8

1.2 Problem Statement……. 10

1.3 Rationale……. 11

1.4 Theoretical Approach…… 12

1.5 Methodology……... 12

1.6 Limitations of the Study…… 15

CHAPTER 2…….. 16

LITERATURE REVIEW: THE STAKEHOLDERS……. 16

2.1 Drama Therapy Overview……. 17

2.2 Role Method Overview …….. 22

2.3 Restorative Justice Overview ……... 26

2.4 Victim Overview…….. 31

2.5 Offender Overview…….. 37

CHAPTER 3…… 40

THE COLLABORATION……. 40

3.1 Restorative Justice Mediation…… 41

3.2 Case Analysis…….. 50

3.3 Drama Therapy Process …… 52

3.4 Case Analysis……. 64

CHAPTER 4…… **69**

EXAMINING THE COLLABORATION…… **69**

4.1 Differences in the Approaches…… **70**

4.2 Similarities in the Approaches…… **78**

4.3 Conclusion…… **88**

5.2 Reference List…… **90**

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In my honors research (2013) titled 'The Walking Wounded: Creating Safe Spaces for Community Healing Through Drama Therapy', I examined healing that can happen in our country using drama therapy for the walking wounded. That is, people who were hurt by the collective trauma suffered under apartheid. For that research, I used the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) as my case study. In that research journey I was struck by the findings that the victims were left even more victimized by the process itself, as well as how negatively they experienced the reconciliation and reparations of the TRC. Despite the efforts made by the process, my research demonstrated that many victims felt that the TRC favored perpetrators whilst compromising the concerns and interests of victims. To date, many of those victims are still fighting for reconciliation and or reparations.

Whether the TRC failed or achieved its aims and objectives, it is hailed as an example of a restorative practice, especially by people outside the South African justice system, who as outsiders, often fail to see the complete story. The reparations of many victims have not reached them and as a result many have been left re-traumatized. One has only to read the survivor's perspective of the TRC as compiled by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation called 'Telling it like it is…' Understanding the Truth and Reconciliation Commission from the Perspective of Survivors', to understand the situation from the point of view of the victims. One respondent had this to say:

"*I am actually not sure what their work was. All that I thought would happen like investigations, compensation and prosecution of perpetrators has not happened and I just don't see what it is that the TRC was here to do. What I do know is that it brought me heartache because I had such high expectations of it*" (Hamber, et al, 2000).

The main questions to arise were: who hears the victims and more so, how does the system deal with them? Are the victims allowed to just 'deal with it' and in a way raise the already high numbers of trauma affected citizens or are they simply forgotten. The greatest concern though was, how can drama therapy contribute towards serving the victims positively and humanize them again, not forgetting the offender who also should not be prejudiced. So when I came across restorative justice, an approach to justice, which addresses the hurts and the needs of both victims and offenders in such a way that both parties are healed (Maepa, 2005:21), I was keen to start investigating and finding out what it is and how it applies what it advocates.

At first glance I noticed that it is much similar to the system that I could relate to in my Setswana culture called Lekgotla, which is the traditional way of solving community cases without going the formal route of the justice system. This traditional system brings both victim and offender together to be mediated by the community elders - only it is punitive towards the offender. For example flogging as punishment is a favorite measure of justice to appease the victim. The offender may also receive a fine of money or livestock as reparation. Restorative justice is based on such traditional practices; only it treats both the victim and offender fairly without favor. My interest thus lies with bringing the victim and offender together in order to work towards an

embodied restorative outcome in drama therapy. I hope this will lead to a positive behavioral change and self- perception.

Therefore my research is titled 'Making Amends: Towards a Restorative Practice in Drama Therapy' and it attempts to answer the question; ***In what way/s is Drama Therapy, through the Role Method, able to examine and transition roles of victim and offender in Restorative Justice?*** The research outcomes are aimed at being implemented in a diversion programme with juvenile offenders as a way of interrupting their incarceration by facilitating a shift towards a positive role adoption, using role method in drama therapy as advocated for by Robert Landy. This study is done as a theoretical investigation into the space between the two practices with the hope of finding some synergy where they meet. The synergy will be the basis for a restorative drama therapy intervention for use in a Victim–Offender Mediation (a restorative justice practice also abbreviated as VOM).

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The research is based on the assumption that somewhere in the course of their development, human beings unconsciously narrow their role repertoire and become fixated on certain roles. This is based on the assumption that in their quest to perfect a particular role, most people become fixated on it and the possibility of the other remains a distant memory. As Chesner puts it, their range of expression remains limited to the habitual (Chesner, 1994:115). Landy argues that in the interplay of internalization and externalization of role and counter role, individuals struggle with their contradictions. They are not motivated by the need to resolve them, but rather by the desire to discover ways to live in and among them (Landy, 2008:103). It is the researcher's

believe that through a restorative drama therapy, the client (juveniles in diversion) can be allowed to travel into that distant memory and retrieve these other roles, interrogate and rehearse them as they prepare to inhabit them. This is because drama therapy and restorative justice share similarities, especially in role creation and enrolling participants. These similarities, along with a few others as highlighted in chapter 4, are the basis for the merger concept.

The purpose of this study is to explore the feasibility of integrating drama therapy with restorative justice practices by bringing a therapy lens to Victim-Offender Mediation using role method. By exploring their similarities and differences, the researcher hopes to bring to the fore the practices shared capacities that can be beneficial to the clients in a restorative drama therapy intervention with juveniles in diversion, in cases of first time offenders and less serious crimes.

1.3 RATIONALE

With an emphasis on reparation and reintegration, restorative practices have become attractive alternatives to a criminal justice system characterized by punitiveness and marred by ineffectiveness (Miller, 2008: ix). This study acknowledges that restorative justice, although it is therapeutic i.e. it has a healing effect; it is not a therapy practice since its intention is not therapy. Restorative justice limits itself to matters of social relationships by excluding itself from matters of psychological healing. This limitation of the practice minimizes the potential of the victim and the offender optimally benefiting from its application. The significance of this study thus lies in bringing the therapeutic elements of restorative justice practice into the therapy milieu through drama therapy, in order to maximize its application. Drama therapy by definition, is the intentional and systematic use of drama/theatre processes to achieve psychological growth and

change (Emunah, 1994: 3 as cited in Jones 2007: 8). Based on the restorative justice principle of bringing the offender and victim together through Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM) in particular; this study intends through drama therapy, to employ role method to explore how the victim can transition to survivor, and the offender to a positive role that will allow for a socially acceptable identity adoption consequent to the phycho-social work invested between them.

1.4 THEORETICAL APPROACH

The nature of this study lends itself to the practical application of Role Theory and Role Method. This is because of the social roles of victim and offender that restorative justice already presents me with, which provide the basis for the approach. Role theory asserts that 'life is theatre' (Landy, 2001:29) in essence holding the view that most of our everyday activity is the acting out of socially defined roles that dictates our behavior. While a number of earlier role theorists and practitioners held the view of this theatrical metaphor as life is like theatre, it was Jacob Moreno who insisted that life is not like theatre; but rather life is theatre (ibid). It is this view that Robert Landy maintained when he developed his role method for drama therapy, which this study leans on. Role theory in drama therapy begins with the premise that human beings take on and play out roles as a natural means of expression (Landy, 2005:96).

1.5 METHODOLOGY

This research is a theoretical comparative representation of two practices through their similarities and differences based on a qualitative method with an Interpretative Social Science (ISS) approach. ISS is concerned with how people interact and get along with each other (van Rensburg et al, 2010: 25).

For this research, a set of data was derived by mining relevant documents. A number of academic documents on drama therapy and literature on restorative justice and Victim-Offender Mediation were studied in detail. In particular, a restorative mediation case is analyzed in line with ISS approach. Interpretative Social Science emphasizes a detailed reading or examination of text, which could refer to a conversation, written words or pictures. Other ISS researchers analyze transcripts of conversations or study videotapes of behavior in extraordinary detail, looking for subtle non-verbal communication, to understand details of interactions in their context (Neumann, 2011:88).

Researchers in social sciences do not necessarily need to actually observe or question people, but can use existing data to answer a new question or problem, van Rensburg et al asserts (2010:175). They outline three advantages to collecting and using existing data (ibid):

- The method is unobtrusive.
- The method is practical.
- The reliability and validity can be confirmed.

What I find pivotal to this kind of research is its emphasis on the fact that the researcher must take into account the social actor's reasons and the social context of their action, which essentially denotes that a human being does not exist in isolation. As pointed out, interpretative approach holds that social life is based on social interactions and socially constructed meaning. Once people accept social creations as being facts or as real, very real consequences follow. For example, if a socially constructed reality tells me that the man who moved into an apartment next

to mine is someone who has committed violent crimes and carries a gun, I will behave accordingly, whether or not my constructed belief fits actual physical reality (Neumann, 2011:89). The same argument holds true in the case of the social labeling of individuals as offender and victim, where consequently, the attributed behavior is entrenched and perpetuated, as is the case with the subjects of this research.

An interpretative research project may read like a novel or a biography. It is rich in detailed description of something else. The researcher provides some generalizations and organizing concepts, but the bulk of the report is a detailed description of the related concepts (ibid: 92). This is true to this research as 'the theory and evidence are interwoven to create a unified whole; the concepts and generalizations are wedded to their context' (ibid), most of which is evident in the literature review, which was used to identify and discuss key factors that are related and contributing to the core of the research.

For ethical concerns, fieldwork was not implemented for the purpose of this study; similarly no interviews and questionnaires were used to gather evidence for the research. Throughout this study, audio-visual recordings and written cases of victim-offender mediation intervention were reviewed. The intention thereof was to gain insight into the practice, then choose one case study for analysis. Consequently, a possible treatment using drama therapy tools will be suggested. In essence this study is a theoretical review of what drama therapy can provide towards restorative practices, which are rooted in restorative justice towards an integrative approach.

1.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is at this stage that the researcher wishes to declare that she is trained as a drama therapist. Therefore her knowledge of restorative justice is thus surpassed by her drama therapy knowledge. The researcher would like to state that this study was responding to a new academic discourse. The findings are therefore paving a way for new work instead of being an authority.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW: THE STAKEHOLDERS

> *The rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders is based on the assumption that individuals are not permanently criminal, and that it is possible to restore offenders to a useful life in which they can contribute to themselves and to society. In essence, this requires changing behavior that is dysfunctional on various levels and harmful to the self, others and society to behavior that is functional, harmless and contributory (Smith and Padayachee, 2012:2).*

The above quote is significant in that the same can be said about victims of a crime, because not only is crime a violation of one's personal space, but the different effects thereof linger on in the affected party such that their lives are often altered for the worst. As Wemmers asserts, victimization can be upsetting, frightening, infuriating, depressing, and an anxiety-provoking experience; and it is well known that victims may experience a host of different emotions (Wemmers, 2002:45). They too, also need to overcome and change the debilitating feelings of fear and all the related effects of the event of the crime in order to regain control of their lives.

This literature review provides historical and theoretical background that informs the central concepts of this research and lays the foundation and understanding of how they relate or begin to address the research question.

2.1 DRAMA THERAPY OVERVIEW

What is Drama Therapy

Emunah (1994:3 as cited in Jones, 2007) captures the essence of what drama therapy is when she says `Drama therapy is the intentional and systematic use of drama/theatre processes to achieve psychological growth and change. The tools are derived from theatre; the goals are rooted in psychotherapy'. In a nutshell she captures the idea that drama therapy, while it puts its emphasis on the age-old traditions of healing through drama, it also has its roots in psychology and psychodrama as well.

According to Aristotle, drama's purpose is not primarily for education or entertainment, but to release harmful emotions which will lead to harmony and healing in the community (Boal, 1985 in Andersen-Warren and Grainer, 2000:104) and this is done when the state of catharsis is reached. Catharsis, Aristotle's theory and the most celebrated explanation of the therapeutic effect of drama according to Andersen-Warren and Grainger (2000), refers to the purging or emotional release experienced in a drama therapy space which is seen as a catalyst to healing (Andersen-Warren and Grainger, 2000: 221). Consequent to this theory, the re-emergence of drama as therapy in western cultures began in Europe in the nineteenth century with the publication of numerous articles about the healing effects of catharsis, and the building of theatres in psychiatric hospitals in France and Germany. In Russia the dramatic approach associated with Stanislavsky was elaborated into 'therapeutic theatre', founded upon the experience of catharsis but involving improvisation and play (Andersen-Warren and Grainger, 2000:14) which is the basis of Moreno's psychodrama.

The collaboration of methods between drama and healing was formalised by J.L Moreno in 1912. As a physician, Moreno integrated his understanding of improvisation with healing by developing a type of group therapy in which spontaneous action on the stage/theatre was the main component: psychodrama (Erikson, 2010: xxi). The American Society of Group Psychotherapy & Psychodrama (ASGPP) captures Moreno's approach thus:

'*Psychodrama employs guided dramatic action to examine problems or issues raised by an individual (psychodrama) or group (sociodrama). Using experiential methods, sociometry, role theory, and group dynamics, psychodrama facilitates insight, personal growth, and integration on cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels. It clarifies issues, increases physical and emotional well-being, enhances learning and develops new skills* (American Society of Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 2010).

Besides Moreno's influence, and according to Renée Emunah (1997:108), the merger between art and healing dates back at least 20,000 years to "the dramatic healing rituals of shamanistic cultures" (Emunah, 1997:108 in Leib 2010:6). Ritualistic civilizations dating back to ancient times utilized shamans as conduits to bring messages of healing back from the spirit world, which was often expressed through dance, music, chanting, and theatrical performance (Landy, 2010: 9 in Leib, 2010: 6).

Drama therapy organically grew from the experimental theatre movements of the 60's and 70's "which explored the psychological, spiritual, and consciousness-raising aspects [of] theater and challenged the traditional boundaries between actor and audience" (Emunah, 1997:109). This

expressive therapy was given its name by Peter Slade in 1954 but was rather founded by many practitioners 'who saw in themselves and others, the therapeutic value of their art' (Emunah, 1997).

Drama therapy and psychodrama are both based on a common source, but they are not identical. The one big difference in the fore is that psychodrama engages the client directly with their real narrative while drama therapy employs metaphor to achieve distance between a person and their narrative using drama processes (games, improvisation, storytelling, role play) and tools (puppets, masks, plays/performances) to help people understand their thoughts and emotions better and thus impacting their behavior. The distance is what is sometimes referred to as "aesthetic distance" or "aesthetic illusion" which Andersen-Warren and Grainger explain as the awareness that art is only art, encouraging us to draw nearer to its subject matter of people, events and ideas, all of which are part of our own reality (Andersen-Warren et al. 2000: 14); together with Cattanach, they agree that it creates a safe environment for the group to express themselves (Cattanach, 1996).

Drama Therapy as a Treatment Modality

It is axiomatic that action methods have been used to heal since the dawn of history. Early tribes co-created enactments to ward off evil, heal trauma, and return participants to harmony. They knew that the very act of embodying painful experiences in a metaphorical way and transforming those experiences to hoped-for, wished-for futures allows for profound positive shifts in perspective and experience (Garcia, 2010:4). When it comes down to it, dramatherapy credentials lie in the fact that drama itself is a fundamental human experience. Augusto Boal

(1992) describes it as the capacity possessed by human beings to observe themselves in action. Human beings are themselves social organism therefore the activities they engage in and the experiences that shape them are mainly but not exclusively socially influenced. This is therefore to acknowledge the socio-political context of dramatherapy process and also the fact that its theatrical roots are themselves socially generated (Jennings et al, 1994:40).

A drama therapy session, while it utilises the elements of theatre, it minimalises the conventional elements of the process in order to bring it to the reality of the individual involved in therapy and to foreground drama as the essence of process over its theatricality. Pitruzzella (2004) mentions three crucial elements that can be removed without cancelling the transformative quality. First to be removed is the whole theatrical technical apparatus (the illusion machine): the stage, scenery, costumes, and props. What is needed is a physical space that can be redefined as a threshold place (Pitruzzella, 2004:7). This however is not a general application and does not exclude the use of theatre techniques and tools where and when necessary. For example in it use of the distancing technique rather than working directly with the personal experiences of the clientele, a symbolic or metaphoric setting is created with the use of stories, theater games, improvisation, script work, and performance, with tools like masks, costumes, lighting and staging, from which the clients work through in a distanced manner (Jennings & Minde 1993).

The script also becomes unnecessary for the personal narrative of the individual takes centre stage. Dramatic action must certainly tell a story…the theatre cannot live without the narrative dimension of the 'fabula', of the soul's tale. But the dramatic action cannot need a pre-existing script: on the contrary, the script can spring from it, or better from the creative process sustaining

it. Most important of all, even the actors technique becomes unnecessary. To perform the actions, actors don't have to be 'make-believe technicians, they are only people living an experience. The limits of their skills are not obstacles, but become elements of shared language (Pitruzzella, 2004: 7-8). Meldrum (1994) agrees with Pitruzella when she says that drama does not need a stage, nor does it need costume, props and scenery. What drama does need is an individual or group of people who use themselves – their bodies and their minds – through the action and often through speech to tell a story (Jennings et al,1994 :14).

Drama therapy certainly involves role play because it acknowledges our inert nature as human beings to play and 'try life out for size', by using our ability to assume roles while holding back from teaching us exactly what roles to adopt (Andersen-Warren and Grainer, 2000:28-29).

Emunah (1994) outlined five specific goals of drama therapy. First, the "expression and containment of emotion", which means learning to control one's emotions, and release them appropriately and acceptably. Second, "the observing self," or the "director within us," that finds hope, sees the broader perspective, and considers choices and options. Third, "role repertoire," or the experience of experimenting with different identities, and finding and practicing new ways of reacting, coping, and behaving. Fourth, "modification and expansion of self-image," or the inverse of role repertoire, as it enhances an understanding of the many aspects within ourselves. And fifth, the last goal Emunah raised, "social interaction and interpersonal skills," which are practiced and developed within the group that functions like a microcosm for society (Emunah, 1994: 31-33). Drama therapy in this research will be used as an over-arching framing practice whose application will be geared towards a restorative intervention.

2.2 ROLE METHOD OVERVIEW

Role is a social term. It is not possible to think of being in a role except with reference to other people. So role is the behaviour that the person engages in when taking on a position in relation to others. These others too have expectations of how the person should behave in that role (Meldrum, 1994:76). Moreno viewed people as being the composites of the roles they play. He viewed role as a specific group of behaviours that society recognises and labels in a particular way. He felt that each of us play roles from the moment we take a breath (Moreno, 1946 in Eva Leveton, 2010:14). In drama therapy though, Landy advocates that the client assumes different realms of reality, the: present and past, rehearsal and performance, the studied moment and the spontaneous moment, everyday life and the life of imagination, internal and external, fiction and nonfiction, the ordinary and the wonderful, the expected moment and the enhanced moment, actor and role, and "me" and "not me" (Landy, 1993:11).

Robert Landy devised role method through which to apply role theory in a group setting. The method is proceeded by the following eight steps:

1. Invoking the role
2. Naming the role
3. Playing out the role
4. Exploring alternative qualities in sub-roles
5. Reflecting upon the role play
6. Relating the fictional role to everyday life
7. Integrating roles to create a functional role system

8. Social modelling: Discovering ways that client's behaviour in role affects others in their social environments (Landy, 1993:46).

> Morstad in her research paper titled drama's role in school counseling asserts that Landy (1993) took his idea and value of role through theory and methodology, and even developed a "taxonomy" of roles or a "theatrical archetype system" (Landy, 1993:163). Roles are organized under the six categories of: somatic, cognitive, affective, social/cultural, spiritual, and aesthetic. Roles are further categorized by type, quality, and/or function she reeterates (Morstad, 2003: 34).

She also acknowledges that:

> The core thesis of Landy (1993) seems to be that roles available in the art of theatre are comprehensive, and thus provide us roles to practice with for our everyday lives. This is important because in order to grow and adapt to our inherent struggles, we must incorporate various roles into our lives. With a repertoire of roles to choose from, we can deal with the contradictions of humanity…confront the internal and external good and evil. Ambivalence is inherent in both human nature and drama (ibid).

Intergral to role method is the technique of role reversal and role doubling. The way role reversal operates is that, in a group setting, clients will swop roles with one playing the other. For example, the offender would play the victim and visa versa. When each play the role of the

other, many opportunities arise: one can develop empathy for the other's position; one can develop a deeper understanding of the situation at hand and gain greater perspective on the situation. One can develop compassion; one can become unstuck; one can gain insight into new ways to solve a problem and; one can see oneself as others see her. Finally, through role reversal a person can begin to see ways that we are more alike than different. The other person may actually feel similarly to how I feel (Garcia, 2010:19).

Garcia also explains the technique of role doubling as follows: 'The double is an auxilarry ego who is a kind of inner voice that expresses one's heretofore unexpressed thoughts and feelings. For example, if the double notices that the protagonist is speaking with a calm voice, but has his fists clenched, he might say, "I'm speaking to you calmly and controlling my feelings, but I am really angry". If the double is accurate, the protagonist repeats or puts in his own words what was said. If the double is inaccurate, the protagonist corrects the statement. Sometimes in a drama a protagonist has a permanent double, and sometimes group members or the director spontaneously come up and make doubling statements to assist the protagonist's expression (ibid)

The above mentioned techniques will be put in an example of a restorative drama therapy session plan in chapter 4.

2.3 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE OVERVIEW

Restorative justice, the term, is a fairly new concept but the practice itself is not new to the traditional cultural practices of Africa. Prior to colonization, African societies did not have prisons. While this does not deny the existence of crime, it implies that people followed other mechanisms to resolve disputes, which enabled normal co-existence (Makhathini, 1996:9 in Steyn, 2010:102). Restorative justice is based on an age-old African traditional justice system that is still commonly practiced in traditional rural areas called Lekgotla, a Setswana word that denotes a meeting place for village assemblies, court cases, and meeting of village leaders (www.thefreedictionary.com/.2013). Modern restorative justice practice, however; has its roots in victim-offender mediation, which became popular in the Western world during the 1970s. The term 'restorative justice' began to be applied to such practices during the 1980s, and was first comprehensively presented as a theorized model in 1990 by Howard Zerh (Skelton, 2008:45). Since then there has been numerous definitions of restorative justice with the common denominator between them being the involvement of the victim, perpetrator and, where possible, the relevant community in solving matters related to the crime. Tony Marshall, for example, defines it as: a process whereby parties with a stake in a specific offence collectively resolve how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future (Marshall, 1999:5 in Edgar and Newell, 2006: 11).

However there is now what seems to be a universal definition of restorative justice which defines it as 'any process in which the victim and the offender, and, where appropriate, any other individual or community members affected by the crime, participate together actively in the resolution of matters arising from the crime, generally with the help of a facilitator (Skelton,

2008:38). There are many terms that are used to describe the restorative justice movement. The handbook on restorative justice programs lists them as including "communitarian justice", "making amends", "positive justice", relational justice", "reparative justice" and "community justice", among others (Criminal Justice Handbook Series: 6).

The first known South African attempt at restorative justice came through the National Institute for Crime Prevention and Reintegration of Offenders (NICRO) which established and later evaluated South Africa's first victim-offender mediation project (Skelton and Batley, 2008). In an effort to contextualize the practice within the juvenile justice system, the South African legislature has twice defined restorative justice, which was then a fairly new approach in its 'Western packaging'. The first definition was as outlined in the Probation Services Act no 116 of 1991 (as amended by Act 35 of 2002), where it was defined as '*the promotion of reconciliation, restitution and responsibility through the involvement of a child, and the child's parents, family members, victims and the communities concerned*'. It was again outlined for the second time in the Child Justice Bill (B 49B2002), passed by the National Assembly on 25 June 2008. It is stated as: 'An approach to justice that aims to involve the child offender, the victim, the families concerned and community members to collectively identify and address harms, needs and obligations through accepting responsibility, making restitution, taking measures to prevent a recurrence of the incident and promoting reconciliation (Skelton and Batley, 2008:38).

The latter definition has resonance with me in that it points to the restoring nature of restorative justice, which assigns the moral human agency to the offender. It also has resonance with the five R's as conceptualized by Rev Don Misener, which are central to the approach in its current form. Considered together, the 'five R's connect the offender with those who have been offended

and make the healing of the broken relationship possible (Batley, 2005:22). They are stated as follows (ibid):

1. Facing reality: This is the first step on the road to freedom, and is where the cost of restoration begins.
2. Accepting responsibility: While facing reality acknowledges the truth of the situation, accepting responsibility goes further in recognizing that a personal response is required.
3. Expressing repentance: Accepting personal responsibility for the consequences of one's actions lead to an action of repentance. This constitutes sorrow and regret for the actions - a realization that the actions were wrongful and should not have occurred. The usual way that this is done is by making an apology to the person who has been wronged, and by asking forgiveness from the supernatural being that the offender relates to.
4. Knowing reconciliation: Being willing to face the full force of wrongfulness, and refusing to take refuge in excuses or rationalization make it possible to know reconciliation with the person who has been wronged. While there is no guarantee that the person who has been wronged will be willing or able to offer reconciliation, full reconciliation is not possible if the wrongfulness has not been faced.
5. Making restitution: This is a practical act of facing the consequences of behavior. It is a way of demonstrating the credibility of the words that were expressed when making an apology and expressing of thankfulness for reconciliation.

Restorative justice developed as a method of responding to certain kinds of problems that crime leaves at its wake, for victims, for offenders and for their communities. It is different from

conventional justice processes in that it views crime primarily as injury (rather than primarily law breaking), and the purpose of justice as healing (rather than punishment alone). It emphasizes accountability of offenders to make amends for their actions, and focuses on providing assistance and service to the victims. Its objective is the successful reintegration of both victim and offender as productive members of safe communities (van Ness, 1997:2 in Edgar and Newell, 2006:10). Edgar and Newell (2006) also share the sentiment that the primary goal of restorative justice is healing the harms that arise from a crime. In this regard they say it is like reparation, which they regard as what the offender gives back to the victim as compensation for the loss or damage caused. A restorative process typically builds a consensus about what harm was done and how those harms might be made good (Edgar and Newell, 2006:10).

The main aspects of restorative justice that attracted me to the practice are firstly, its victim-centered approach. This approach goes against the norms of retributive justice, which is punitive towards the offender without involving the victim, against whom the crime was committed; instead retributive justice uses the victim as an accessory to the case. The second aspect, as previously stated, is the restorative nature, which speaks to its therapeutic element that gives the offender a moral agency (Batley, 2005:22). It is also vital that the offender takes responsibility for the final agreement, which will normally include some opportunity for the offender to make amends. In restorative justice healing is voluntarily undertaken by the offender- it is not imposed by the state ((Edgar and Newell 2006:11). Howard Zehr (1990/95) wrote that the offender must be willingly involved in order for the process to be restorative: '*We can require offenders to make right, but they cannot fully be responsible without some degree of voluntarism*' (Zerh, 1990/95: 198).

Restorative justice has three approaches through which it realizes its aims. Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM) is one of them and it differs from the other two in that the mediation is exclusively for victim and offender and does not include additional support from friends, family and community. Umbreit (2001) describes it as a process that provides interested victims of primarily property crimes and minor assaults the opportunity to meet the juvenile or adult offender, in a safe and structured setting, with the goal of holding the offender directly accountable for his or her behavior while providing important assistance and compensation to the victim (Umbreit, 2001 in Umbreit et al, 2004). VOM is sensitive towards the socio-relational aspect of crime and gives the victim a participatory role in resolving the conflict resulting from the offence (Muntingh, 1997:33).

VOM aims to function as a true diversionary mechanism and therefore has particular case selection guidelines. Muntingh (1997) outlines them as follows:

- Offenders should be over the age of 14
- Criminal charges resulting from family conflict are to be avoided
- Violent and sexual offenders are excluded
- The programme is accessible to imprisoned offenders but they are not the primary focus
- The offender is planning to plead guilty and accepts responsibility for his or her actions
- The offender has already pleaded or is planning to plead guilty
- The offender must be willing to participate in mediation
- There must be an identifiable victim
- Losses or damages must be easily identifiable and definable.

2.4 VICTIM OVERVIEW

According to oxford dictionary the term victim denotes one who is harmed or killed by another, especially by someone committing a criminal or unlawful act. Victim is described in the Minimum Standards on Services for Victims of Crime attached to the Victim's Charter (2004) as any person who suffered physical, mental or emotional injury, material loss or impairment as a result of crime (Victim's Charter 2004). In our justice system, the very victim is stripped down to obscurity such that they do not count, because crime is perceived to be an 'unlawful act', in essence a crime against the law, which refers to the state. The discipline of victimology, which is the study of the relationship between the victims and offenders, however informs us that that was not always the case. It refers us back to what Walklate (1989:xi) calls the 'Babylonian times' where the rule of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth applied. This implied that justice was meted out according to the crime and the victim was central to that process as the reparations were in their favor. As Walklate puts it, the responsibility of prosecution lay with the victim (Walklate, 1989: 108). It was not until the emergence of what Walklate refers to as the 'new' police that the relationship between the victim and the justice system diminished. The police forces not only took on the role of searching for and apprehending offenders but also took over the victims' role in prosecution (Walklate, 1989: 111). This is the prevalent state of affairs in South Africa where restorative justice is not applicable. Victims of crime are turned into secondary participants by the punitive justice system, which sees crime as an act against the state as opposed to the person against whom the act was carried out. The aim of the system therefore, is to punish the perpetrator; but in the process it alienates the victim.

Cavanagh sums it up when he says that Retributive Justice (the prevalent system) focuses on determining what law was broken, who broke it and how they will be punished (Cavanagh, 2000:1). This process, according to Faulkner (2001), requires the co-operation of victims in order for the crime to be investigated, prosecuted and punished. He maintains that victims have been 'conscripted' into an operational role within the criminal justice system, and are frequently conceptualized as its 'servants' or 'agents' (Faulkner, 2001 in Doaks and O'Mahony, 2006:159).

In the contrary, in restorative justice system, crime is seen as offence against the victim. Generally, victims have the need to tell offenders about the impact the crime had on them, and also to ask questions that in some cases only the offender can answer (Plaatjies M. F, 2008:124). A crime is a profound disrespect for the victim as a person (Zehr, 2001:88). Therefore, victims of crime suffer tremendously not only from physical injuries and financial losses, but also from psychological trauma such as helplessness, powerlessness, loss of sense of autonomy and vulnerability (Choi, Green and Kapp, 2010: 267). Choi et al (2010) further point out that Zehr (2001: 189) put the trauma of victimization as disorder, disempowerment, and disconnection. This suggests that it is important for victims to regain some power and control over their lives (ibid).

In its effort for a victim-centered justice system, the ministry of Justice and Constitutional Development drew up a Victim's Charter whose ultimate goal, as per minister in office at the time, B.S Mabandla, is victim empowerment through meeting victim's needs, be they material or emotional. These rights are encompassed in the Service Charter for Victims of Crime in South Africa (2004) and summarized where necessary as follows:

- **The right to be treated with fairness and with respect for dignity and privacy:**

  The victim has a right to be treated by the service providers in a manner that will prevent them from being subjected to secondary victimization throughout the process, including conducting interviews in private in the victim's language of choice.

- **The right to offer information**:

  A victim is free to contribute and participate in the process by making known to the officials the information they have through statements, evidence to courts and written inputs. In other instances to just be able to talk about the crime, their feelings, even their fears from their point of view, or to just repeat the events that are important to them because they still cannot believe what happened to them, as Plaatjies (2008:227) postulates.

- **The right to receive information:**

  This gives the victim access to information to proceedings, what role they will be playing, the duration, fees, court dates and all the information that will keep them updated on the court proceedings and status of the case. Garkawe (1994:601) as cited in Plaatjies (2008:228) maintains that victims should not only get information because its their right to, but also because they have a genuine interest to know what is happening with their case, as they might need to prepare themselves, for instance, to appear in court or at a parole hearing.

- **The right to protection:**

This ensures the victim is free from intimidation, harassment, fear, tampering, bribery, corruption and abuse. If you area witness, you must report any such threats to the police or senior state prosecutor. If and when necessary, in case where the victim is a witness, they have a right to the witness protection programme.

Fattah (2006:15) in Plaatjies (2008:230) reminds us that victims need a sense of safety more than punishment for the offender.

- **The right to assistance:**

  The victim has the right to request assistance and, where relevant, have access to available social, health and counseling services, as well as legal assistance, which is responsive to the victim's needs i.e. special needs. The police, prosecutors, office managers and other officials are there to assist with necessary services in the victim's benefit.

- **The right to compensation:**

  The victim has a right to compensation for loss of or damage to property suffered as a result of a crime being committed against them. 'Compensation' refers to an amount of money that a criminal court awards a victim who has suffered loss or damage to property, including money, as a result of a criminal act or omission by the person convicted of committing the crime. The clerk of the court will assist with the enforcement of a compensation order granted by the court. According to Plaatjies (2008:232), a parole board chairperson of the Eastern Cape, Reverend Irion, cautions that paying of compensation should not be seen as primary to restorative justice, as it would exclude the majority who are poor. The danger

also exists that someone who repaid the victim might equate that to restorative justice.

- **The right to restitution:**

  The victim has the right to restitution in cases where they have been unlawfully dispossessed of goods or property, or where such have been damaged unlawfully. 'Restitution' refers to cases where the court, after conviction, orders the accused to give back to the victim the property or goods that have been taken from them unlawfully, or to repair the property or goods that have been unlawfully damaged, in order to restore the position they were in prior to the commission of the offence.

In a study conducted by Choi et al (2010) to examine the perspectives of participants in a Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM), the findings indicated that victim participants identified the importance of information, compensation and/or vindication and a form of a genuine apology as their critical needs in the healing process. They continue to validate the restorative approach in its support for the victim by saying that most victims were able to share their victimization and acquire further information that seemingly deepened their understanding about the incidents (Choi et al, 2010:269).

Victim-Offender Mediation or VOM in short, is, according to Umbreit et al (2000), one of the clearest expressions of restorative justice (Umbreit et al, 2001:1). This I assume is because of its victim sensitive and humanistic approach, it is in essence a model of restorative justice with a focused attention to exclusively victim and offender to the exclusion of the secondary victims

like family members, friends and community as is the case with Family Group Conferencing and Circle Approaches. The following are the possible benefits that a victim could derive from a Victim-Offender Mediation as voiced by various proponents of restorative justice but tabulated by (Plaatjies, 2008:229).

- They have a better understanding of the circumstances surrounding the crime.
- They get answers to some or all of their questions, like why they have been chosen for the crime and if they could have done anything to prevent it.
- The restorative process undertaken could help them get rid of anger, fear and other emotions.
- Victims might have certain concerns that are sometimes affirmed or dealt with during the session.
- Victims can even get a sense of closure, which enables them to move on with their lives.

In drama therapy, the emotion of fear is profoundly altered when it is transformed from the real to the imaginative world. It is no longer the direct apprehension of misfortune hanging over our own life – it is the sympathetic shudder we feel for those whose character in essentials resembles our own (Butcher, 1951:259 in Warren and Gainer, 2000: 87). Many victims, in an effort to cope through the trauma of a crime, they revert to what Maguire (1991) refers to as the 'why-me' syndrome. This is a coping strategy for many victims and survivors of crime: they look for information to better understand the victimization in an effort to come to terms with the event (Wemmer, 2002:45) while some will seek help in order to vent in a managed environment, for they find that sharing and talking about the crime and how it has affected them may be helpful to

themselves. Being able to express their feelings validated by others can contribute to the healing process (Johnstone, 2002 in Wemmer, 2002:45).

2.5 OFFENDER OVERVIEW

From a religious and theological outlook, an offender is a sinner. A sinner, even in biblical times paid by suffering. This is the general, punitive perception that society maintains and the justice system is no different. It is from these generally held perceptions that we use words like social evils to refer to crime and refer to offenders as evil. Zimbardo (2007) acknowledges that evil consists of intentionally behaving in ways that harm, abuse, demean, dehumanize, or destroy innocent others (Zimbardo, 2007:5).

Juvenile offender however, is juristically defined as a person designated a juvenile (non-adult) who has committed an unlawful act, found guilty in a court of law and sentenced (Van Der Walt et al, 1982:30 in Zondi, 2002:6). The definite age of a person designated as juvenile as suggested above is however not clear, but a standard age can be deduced on the merits of the case i.e. special cases. According to Shoemaker (1996:3) illegal acts committed by youth under the age of 18 years are called delinquent behavior and the youth committing them are referred to as delinquents (cited in Zondi, 2002:18). Glanz (1994:9) gives the age of less than 20 years while Stevens and Cloete (1990:62) say that normally a juvenile offender falls into the age group 7-18 years and in special cases between 18-21 years (Glanz, 1994 and Stevens and Cloete, 1990 in Zondi, 2002:18). Eysenck and Gudjonsson's (1991) explanation is more comprehensible; they explain that according to English law, a juvenile is a young person under the age of 17. However no child under the age of ten years can be guilty of an offence. This is known as the age of

criminal responsibility. A juvenile between 10 and 13 is in common law not presumed to have reached the age of discretion, but this may be rebutted by the prosecution in some cases. The prosecution has to satisfy the court that the juvenile knew the act was wrong and was aware of the probable consequences of his or her actions (Eysenck and Gudjonsson, 1991: 154). For this study the definition of a non-adult, which according to the South African law is 10 – 18 years of age, will be used.

Offending, says Pitts (1990), is a way, albeit often inadequate and self-defeating, of solving problems (Pitts, 1990:36). Take for example a case of mugging to feed the drug habit that an offender got into in order to numb the rejection they experience in the family. He further offers a suggestion that in our attempt to understand the motivation of young offenders we should try to understand the origins of the problems to which their offending is an attempted solution (Pitts, 1990:36). He maintains that understanding young offenders involves the attempt to understand the past, present and the future of the offence. By this he insinuates that every offence has a *Past* in terms of the way the offenders have come to see themselves in the world, and the material reality of the world; a *Present* in which beliefs, feelings, wants and needs are operationalized in (illegal) action and to which a control apparatus responds; and a *Future*, in which the social reaction which the action has evoked may change both the offenders' identity, by recasting them as deviants (Pitts, 1990:36). Smit and Padayachee (2012:6) agree that behavior does not exist in the vacuum, but rather is an end product of cognition as influenced by various (risk/protective) factors from the past as well as the present. This personalizes the offender by giving them a personal narrative that places them in the social and cultural context that is recognizable and tangible. It is therefore clearly important to understand the individual as an entity in the universe

in relation to other entities. In this way, neither of the components of the individual, nor the components of the context in which the individual exists, can be ignored in the pursuit to change behavior patterns that are harmful to the self, others and society (Smit and Padayachee, 2012:6).

Young people in conflict with the law often also live within internalized prison. Institutionalization by way of prison sentence aggravates the situation in which the individuals in conflict with the law are already placed and this leads to limiting their future choices (Smit, 2011:2). This is where diversion programs play a critical role of protecting the young offenders from acquiring a criminal record that might taint their prospects in the future and curtail their economic growth and contribution. Not only do they offer that security from a criminal record, but they also offer a second chance to the offender to rehabilitate. Diversion programs need to be transformational in nature i.e. focused on changing behavior, thought and attitude. Given that they seek to encourage both cognitive and behavioral change, such programs need to engage participants in the testing of different behavioral options within the safety of the programme (Smit, 2011:3).

CHAPTER 3

THE COLLABORATION

> *Any work with role in dramatherapy makes the assumption that the self can assume different, fictional identities. The development of this notion in dramatherapy is that the fictional self can be enacted. A relationship is set up between the enacted fictional self and the client's usual identity, and this dynamic, active relationship is seen as the basis of therapeutic change in role-based work within dramatherapy (Jones, 2007:192).*

Landy also asserts that one of the assumptions underlying role theory is that an individual is not one thing, a core self, but a multitude of roles that exists in relationship to their several counterparts (Landy, 2008:103). In this chapter, attention is paid particularly to the actual interventions process. Firstly a restorative justice intervention will be presented and then analysed in the drama therapy perspective, that is, how a drama therapist is likely to see and understand the intervention. Consequently, a drama therapy based restorative justice intervention plan is presented to give an indication of one session towards role modification.

As mentioned before, word for word records of conferences are rarely available to the public. Following though is a published and accurate account of a real restorative justice meeting that has taken place. Every name has been changed or made anonymous as have other identifying features such as times, locations and names of places … while this record is not particularly a

Victim-Offender-Mediation and not meant for diversion purposes, it is however a restorative justice intervention with a victim and offender face-to-face encounter.

3.1 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE MEDIATION

Location: Prison in the Midlands

Date: June 2013, commencing at 10am Present:

Larry - Victim of crime

John - Offender

Amina - Offender Manager

Jasmine - Facilitator

Edith - Observer

John burgled Larry's home and stole his car key, phone and rugby season ticket. The harmed person and the facilitator are sitting in circle and the offender is brought in by the offender manager, who remains in the room.

Jasmine the facilitator conducts brief introductions and explains that the meeting pertains to a burglary that took place at xxxx during on xxxx on Larry's property. She reminds those present that the discussion must focus on what happened and not be about the character of the offender or the victim. She says that everyone in the room must respect confidentiality and respect others

when they are speaking. She then asks John to explain what happened on xxxx when he burgled Larry's home

John: What happened – I tried this door, it was open. Obviously took your phone and took the car.

Jasmine: Talk us through what happened.

John: About three in the morning. Obviously, I was drunk as well. I don't know what I was thinking...Tried the door.

Jasmine: What thoughts did you have?

John: Previous months and weeks, everything went wrong. I didn't have a care in the world.

Jasmine: What happened next?

John: Went round doing what I could.

Jasmine: Was it the only one that night?

John: Only one that night. Not sure. Yeah, think so.

Jasmine: After burglary, what happened next?

John: Drove down to B- Street. Left it there. Near enough 6am.

Jasmine: What have your thoughts been since?

John: First obvious one is that I should not have done it. I wasn't thinking like that at the time. The total opposite. I did not care.

Jasmine: Did you think about who'd been affected?

John: No.

Larry: I will put the scenario. I am from Bristol. Moved up with job from Bristol to Gloucester. With a lady. We moved in to the house 5 C- Road. After two years, the relationship broke down. She left. I am 30 miles away from family and friends. Emotionally I was alone.

I think I'm quite good at security. I set my alarm for 5am – I have a radio clock by my bed but I use my phone to wake me up – this is important you will see why in a minute. But when I woke up at 5.30am, I thought, 'What the...' And reached for my phone. No phone, I found the lead, but no phone on lead. I look like this (looks around him) and the bedroom door is wide open. Go onto landing and all doors are open. Rush downstairs and everything is still in place – TV and Hi-fi. I look across and usually see the car at the top of the drive. I was looking for a broken window or door. I go outside and the car's gone.

I could have done without that. My partner left me and am keeping down a fulltime job. 5.30am. I'll ring the police, cannot because of mobile; jump in car? Don't because no car. Don't go banging on neighbours' doors. I'm not that kind of person.

I put on a coat. One mile up to M- Lane and then 1 mile up another road – no payphone. I went home and sat until I heard a neighbour come out and they called on their mobile.

I felt totally devastated by what happened that morning. When the police arrived, they had picked up where the car was – but it was locked. Apparently this is not unusual because sometimes they do that. The car was taken to the pound. I had to pay for new locks and release fee.

Why did you pick my house?

John: I ran over the grass on the other side.

Larry: Were you on your own?

John: Yes.

Larry: Definitely?

John: Yeah.

Larry: It's done. Can't be undone.

John: I tried handle and it was open. As I went in your back door was locked but the front door was open. Wearing gloves – just tried it.

Hadn't come out of jail long. My girlfriend had a baby while I was in jail and it was good and then broke down after a month or two. I couldn't see my son. I done what I could to try and that was my attitude – I just give up. No money.

Larry: Was that what it was for?

John: Year money. I wasn't thinking about people's feelings at the time.

Larry: Did you try anywhere else?

John: Yeah, I did.

Jasmine (addressed to Larry): Explain why you moved and events leading up to the move.

Larry: Because I could not understand why my house had been burgled. I put control alarms on the doors and an ottoman across the bedroom door. I wasn't anxious but I couldn't sleep. I lived like that for a month. I want to ask you, when you came into my bedroom, if I came across someone within six inches of my head, my phone and rugby season ticket.

John: I just didn't care if I got caught. This is not something I've got previous for.

Larry: This is something I can't understand.

John: In some cases I wasn't immune to what I was doing.

Larry: I know you have a little one. Sometimes I have my granddaughter staying. Can you imagine if she had woken up and seen you? It would have freaked her out. You've explained you'd been drinking and did not care. You've been brave enough to do it.

What happened to the phone and rugby ticket? I had people looking out for it on the turnstiles.

John: Gave the phone away. Season ticket was no use to me.

Jasmine: A prompt – is there anything else you want to ask?

Larry: Why did you not take anything else?

John: Not being rude – enough to get a car. A buzz. I'm twenty-three. Been in jail most of my life. Only had 3-4 cars. A buzz.

I've been in and not taken Christmas presents. I knew not to take them. TV is worth money. I didn't even bother to take it.

Larry: Usually people pack up the car and drive off. You seemed to take so little but left a wake

of destruction.

Jasmine: What has been the hardest part for you?

Larry: I couldn't stay there, dragging the ottoman across, wondering if someone is going to come down through the ceiling. I've got a room in a shared house. It is a weakness on my part. Anxiety. Bars by my bed. John says my front door was not open. I have no reason to disbelieve you. Nothing was broken so you must be telling the truth.

John: I was wearing gloves. PVC doors only have one handle, so if unlocked, easy.

Larry: Ironically, I am a Prison Custody Officer at Cheltenham. I got a message that you were admitted under the TiC programme, that you burgled my house and that you have a wee one.

John: My girlfriend and baby live in Stroud.

Larry: Personal matter – your dad died.

John: Yeah, while I was in jail.

Larry: I thought it would be enough to know your name but needed to come and see.

John: I came back on a recall, gave me another 2 years 9 months. Out for September next year.

Larry: Has your outlook changed?

John: I have not been brought up by my parents. I have not had the greatest upbringing. But I chose this life.

Larry: I hear a lot of stories especially about upbringing but that don't excuse it.

John: Obviously I didn't want to do it. I was on run from November 15th and they caught me on December 30th.

Jasmine: Anything else?

John: I am glad I done this. I understand more about you. I am sorry.

Larry: You were brave. I don't like to say it. Could have been a 6 foot 18 stone man.

John: I didn't go in them other rooms.

Larry: You just left them open.

John: I am sorry about it.

Jasmine: Anything that would make things better?

Larry: Time to move on. Relationship finished and moved out. I would like John to think even if he thinks about what he's doing before he's done it.

John: I don't want an excuse just because I was drunk. But....

Jasmine: Do you think there is anything you can do to change things?

John: I can try and change. Think before I act. I've done a TSB Course – Thinking skills programme. Helped me for a while and then went back to same as before.

Larry: Are you a third striker?

John: No.

Larry: You are building up to it!

John: I took someone else car and got in a police chase. I got two years for burglary and chase. You've been at it by the TiCs.

I am lucky just to get that. That was one of the judges I did not want.

Jasmine: Do you see the choices you've made?

John: One thing was the granddaughter that's got me. I know how I would be if it was my son.

Larry: Lots of people have said, 'I would have hit them with a stick.' But they don't know! To be there at 3am and waking....

It was about a week before the car locks were changed. This company called Yates – insurance company forensics said the locks intact. Back seat ripped off and parcel shelf taken off. I think they might have done it themselves as an insurance write off. So the car had to go.

John: I did put a bike in the back and then took it out – did not damage the car. Larry: Why did you get the bike?

John: Got the car to get the bike.

Larry: I was anticipating that I would see you in the cells. But TiC used a video link.

Jasmine: We are at the stage where we look at outcomes. From our discussions, you wanted answers, have you got them? (looking at Larry)

Larry: Yes I have. No windows or doors locked.

John: You should have the right to have your door open. People said, ‘why are you doing this?’ To be fair, I thought it would help me.

Larry: Please don’t expect me to say thank you before I met you. I am grateful – too strong – that you’ve me and answered my questions.

John: Just want to say I am very sorry for what I’ve done. Obviously up to you.

Larry: I think you’ve got some genuineness from body language that you’ve meant it.

Jasmine: I am going to write up an outcome agreement that you’ve said sorry. That you have accepted the apology.

Do you both feel you’ve had a chance to say what you feel?

Larry: I have got answers.

Jasmine: On your own?

Larry: (addressed to John) You are a follower not a leader. Were you on your own?

John: Some of the other situations, the older person gets the blame. I am not a sheep. I done it. I was on my own.

Jasmine: I am going to make a cup of tea and biscuits. Write this up.

The meeting takes a break at 11am. Tea and biscuits are served and Jasmine writes up the contract, which both participants sign. Victim and offender chat to each other about prison, judges and Larry gives John advice about what to do next.

3.2 CASE ANALYSIS

As previously mentioned, it is the idea of having the victim and offender as the only participants in a Victim-Offender Mediation that attracted my attention to restorative justice. As a result the additional people, although their roles are important in this process, are not a viable addition for a drama therapy session. The concern for a drama therapist would be the spectator value that these additional people might bring to the session. Their professional roles may also have an influence in what is being said and done in the process. They pose as 'the judging eyes'. For example, apart from the time it takes to prepare the offender that is from the first phone call or meeting to suggest the restorative justice process to the actual meeting with the victim through the offender manager; nothing of their relationship is known. Thus, how much bearing the manager has on the client is also unknown. It would therefore be appropriate to exclude them from a drama therapy session. This will foster the safety of the therapy space. An agreement can be reached with the manager in terms of how to communicate or signal them when and if they are needed and for them to wait outside. Their participation will not be considered because they are not the clients and therefore should the process evoke their issues, how will they be held in the context of this process. Depending on the drama therapists, the additional people could be appropriately placed within the room and a dramatic ritual of excluding them and marking the therapy space through laying out physical boundaries could be observed in preparation. The manager and observer could be used to come in and out of the process as dramatic support.

Warming –up is important for the participants to recollect their thoughts and 'arrive' in the space. The restorative justice process, while it does not condemn warm-up exercises, it does not advocate for their use. Given the possible tension, fear, anger and any other related emotion in this nature of intervention, the participants are let in cold and in the deep end. The participants

are not prepared through warm ups for this direct confrontation of the issue. John in this case, is still removed and therefore appears, non-committed and brusque in behavior and this can be hurtful to the victim.

No attention is given to the underlying current of emotions, for even after the brief, the offender still comes across in his initial statements as arrogant and disrespectful, which may defeat the purpose of restoring social relationships. From observation of videos and reading mediation transcripts, the overall impression of the offender's reaction is superficial, as opposed to a feeling and an honest reaction that comes from an honest space. Most offender responses feel like 'throw-away' remarks and they behave as detached from the process as they perhaps are from their feelings. Their body language gives away the impression that they are detached from the proceedings whereas it could also be a defense mechanism that they engage in order to cope in the moment.

At least at this stage of the session before the victim put forward their narrative. After warming-up through the actual process, he comes down to a reasonable tone. This process has a clear beginning, middle and end. Therefore it can be structured in ways that can accommodate a notable three-part process in the interest of steadily holding the process for the participants. Babies never just run, they first crawl, walk and then run.

John, in his narrative indicates that he had no concern and even empathy for others at the time of the crime. His personal problems had overwhelmed him and he did not know how to cope. John is an ideal candidate for a role method intervention, for he indicated a lack of internal support. By this I mean he does not have a lot of internal positive roles he could call upon when the situation demands it. He seems to lean onto negative roles to rescue him in the moment but in the

long term they land him in prison. Role method will offer him an array of positive roles that he can rehearse in a safe environment before he can inhabit them for use in the real world. In fact he will discover those roles for himself through the non-prescriptive drama therapy.

Larry on the other hand, in his commendable nature to draw control boundaries for himself that helps him respect other people's space, had in fact held himself hostage and perpetuated his victimization even more. In an emergency situation, those boundaries became an obstacle. They stopped him from asking for help from the neighbors for 'he is not that kind of person'. Role method will help him accommodate other vulnerable roles in a way that makes it positive to allow yourself to be and feel that way.

Both participants have powerful personal narratives that can be used to benefit each other through role reversal exercises. It was only after each of them had put forward their personal narrative that the other showed empathy.

3.3 DRAMA THERAPY PROCESS

The following Drama Therapy session (i.e. table), although it is in essence the third meeting – with the first being the individual clients sessions separately – it would actually be the second time that the clients are in the same therapy space together for group work. The first two sessions leading to this third one are summerised below as follows:

- FIRST SESSION:

  The drama therapy individual client sessions would be aimed at assessments, hearing and allaying any questions, fears and concerns that the clients may present about meeting the other and about the approach itself in preparation for group therapy sessions.

The assessment tool for this session would be an adaptation of the social atom as conceived by Moreno to diagnose social dysfunction, plan a course of treatment, and evaluate the treatment's effectiveness (Leveton, 2010: 12). The client will be asked to complete their present social atom using the following instructions:

> Your social atom is composed of you and those who are important to you in your life. You are now going to construct a picture of your social atom. Imagine that the piece of paper infront of you is your life space today. Then, using different buttons before you arrange on the paper, in relation to you those who are significant in your life. If they feel close to you, put them close. If they feel far away, place them far away. If they feel big in your life, make them big. If they feel small in your life, make them small. Put a name or initials in each figure so that you will remember who is who after you've completed the process.

For the button version of the social atom, different sorts of buttons are used to depict roles of the person represented i.e broken, shiny, rough, big, small and chracter buttons like animals, fruits etc. These helps to better put a dramatic expression to the description and meaning of the exercise with regard to roles.

- SECOND SESSION:

  This would be the first time that both clients will be meeting for the beginning of the group work and the main aim would be to introduce the clients to each other, the issues at hand and the approach.

  The issues of anger, shame, fear, anxiety, trust etc as elicited by the crime are likely to present in the session as the urge to purge is eminent. It is important therefore, for the drama therapist to hold the session so that not too much is expressed too soon in this readying session, with much emphasis placed on facilitating group cohesion and space safe enough to alllow the clients to inhabit it and work without fear.

  For this, the Role Profile exercise was chosen. The exercice is explained by Landy as a structured test that involves the sorting of 70 index cards, each of which contains the name of a role, into categories (Malchiodi 2004:105). The clients are presented with a stack of cards. On each card is the name of a role. The client need to shuffle the cards thoroughly and place each card in one of four groups that best describes how they feel about themselves in the moment. Each group is labelled by a large card which says: I Am This, I Am Not This, I Am Not Sure If I Am This, and I Want To Be This. The clients should try to group the cards as soon as possible (Malchiodi 2004:106). .

  The 70 role cards range from somatic, cognitive, affective, social/cultural, spiritual, and aesthetic catergories of role. They are meant to assess the clients ability to invoke and relate to roles.

The 70 role cards are:

1. Child
2. Adolescent
3. Adult
4. Elder
5. Asexual
6. Homosexual
7. Heterosexual
8. Bisexual
9. Beauty
10. Beast
11. Average person
12. Sick person
13. Healer
14. Simpleton
15. Clown
16. Critic
17. Wise person
18. Innocent
19. Villain
20. Victim
21. Bigot
22. Avenger
23. Helper
24. Miser
25. Coward
26. Survivor
27. Zombie
28. Lost one
29. Pessimist
30. Worrier
31. Optimist
32. Angry person
33. Rebel
34. Lover
35. Egotist
36. Mother
37. Father
38. Wife
39. Husband
40. Daughter
41. Son
42. Sister
43. Brother
44. Orphan
45. Conservative
46. Radical
47. Outcast
48. Judge
49. Witness
50. Homeless person
51. Poor person
52. Rich person
53. Warrior
54. Bully
55. Slave
56. Police
57. Killer
58. Suicide
59. Hero
60. Visionary
61. Sinner
62. Person of faith
63. Atheist
64. Spiritual leader
65. God
66. Saint

67. Demon

68. Magician

69. Artist

70. Dreamer

AIM: TO ASSESS THE CLIENTS' ROLE REPETOIRE AND THEIR AGENCY FOR THE FUTURE.

PRESENT: Larry - Victim of crime

John - Offender

PHASE	EXERCISE	INTENTION	TIME	MATERIAL
Check-in	Welcoming and introduction of participants and together setting the rules of our therapy space in a verbal or visual/written contract: In a circle, the client will be invited to introduce themselves by way of name, surname and saying one good/positive thing about themselves in the moment. A brief welcome to the intervention, making sure everyone knows why we are meeting and reassuring them.	To set the stage for all in equal partnership and participation, and to facilitate interaction.	7 mins	• Chart • Koki pens • Prestik

	This will be followed by brainstorming of and writing down the rules that we think should govern our time together; on a chart.			
Warm-up	Invite the clients to randomly place pieces of furniture in the room to make obstacles. Invite them to walk about in the room and listen for my clap. When I clap they should stop waking and be aware of where they are in the room. At my next clap they should touch all four walls (they should touch opposite walls and not move around in a circle touching the wall closest to the one they are at). Depending on what is in the room, they must also touch a table, floor, chair and	Warm –up is a readying process as Moreno maintained in his creativity and sponteneity theory. We are readying ourselves to be and act in new ways. Getting the clients to actively participate in setting up the space is a way of getting their ownership of it. Furthermore Casson (2004) states that movement increases	13 mins	Furniture pieces found in the room. i.e tables, chairs etc. N.B it is important to emphasise safety as a priority in this space. Thus the setting of obstacles should not pose any danger.

	something soft and something blue (not on or a member) and return to your spot. They must remember their journey and engage in the exercise in silence and without bumping into anything or each other. After touching everything they must return to their spot. Invite them to think about the journey that they have taken and how they can improve it. Repeat the exercise and prompt the clients to follow their journey with the new stratergy they have just thought about.*	breathing, reduces tension, promotes relaxation and clearer thinking. Through physical action the emotional energy held in the body's muscular tension can be released and peoplegain a sesnse of power and control (Casson, 2004:167).		

* Exercise inspired by 'Same Journey' from Geese Theatre Handbook. (Baim et al, 2002:75).

Bridge-in	Still in the same set up, invite the clients to walk around the room as themselves. Encourage them to be aware of their posture and how their body is operating i.e how their feet touch the floor, how their legs carry them forward, their hips carry their torso, the spine is supporting the torso and the head and how they carry their hands etc. Allow them to walk with that awareness for a while. 1. Invite them now to lead their walk with a part of the body that you call out i.e. head, left arm, right foot, backside, shoulder, chest, chin etc). Encourage them to be aware of the effect of that on	To give clients permission to enter into the dramatic reality. Jones (2007) affirms that the body communicates the individual's identity to others. It is also seen as a means by which the individual arrives at a sense of their own identity and as an expressive medium through which society and the individual connect (Jones. 2007: 227).	10mins	Same as above

	their overall character. 2. Now invite them to choose one of the characters they had explored invite them to walk around as that character, to name the character i.e mother, child, teacher etc and build a scenario i.e. where they are, what are they doing.			
Main event	Ask the clients to find their own space in the room and hand out koki pens and A3 paper. Ask them to fold the paper so that they have six euqual sections. Let them write the following as headings in each section: 1. The main character in a setting. 2. Task facing the character.	This six part story that Lahad (2012) put together for assessment allows for the clients to face their obstacles and therefore be realistic about the necessary steps to take towards the future. As Moreno (1946) believed, one	30 mins	• Koki pens • A3 paper

	3. Things/people that cause difficulty for the character. 4. Things/people that help the character. 5. Whether, and how the character succeeds or fails. 6. What happens after their success or failure. Remind the clients about the role profile work that was done in the previous session and invite them to choose a role they would want as the main character of their story and write them down in the first block. Give them time to go through the next five blocks and invite them to share their stories. The pair will be asked to choose one	takes on a role in order to enter the unconcious from the social world and bring shape and order to it (Malchiodi, 2004:94).		

	story that they would like to enact. Through that story more personal issues in general and in particular to their role issues can be explored. The therapist will lead the process and facilitate accordingly.			
Bridge-out	Invite the clients to walk around the room as their character. Then, ask them to return to themselves by walking normally, paying attention to the way their feet touch the floor, how their legs carry them forward, their hips carry their torso, the spine is supporting the torso and the head, and how they carry their	To initiate the process of gradually coming out of the dramatic reality into their reality. To ground them as they derole and prepare for a reflection. This exercise draws together the fictional imaginative world of the main event, and the 'real world'.	5mins	

	hands etc. Ask them to walk around the room and touch the furniture as they pack them away.			
Reflection	Finally invite them to a seated circle of three to reflect on the process. Invite comments on the feelings brought out, or how they experienced the process.This are open questions that are hoped to take the clients into much reflection. Sometimes it is difficult for clients to reflect immediately and so the therapist needs to be prepared to sit with the question for a while before anyone can be comfortable to say anything.	This presents the clients with an opportunity to talk about their experience and any possible connections to their real life that they could have made. Often verbal comments are useful but are not always necessary. The awareness of the journeyis present here and it can be expressed in symbolic and imaginative terms – with gestures or a sign, or even in	15 mins	N/A

		verses, or simply keeping quite and being there (Pitruzella, 2004:122).		
Grounding	To close the session, invite the clients to stomp their feet on the ground. Start slower and crescendo to a finish.	After entering the dramatic reality is important to return to normal state of functioning, being in contact with the ground through concious stomping has a grounding effect. This exercise can aid the client to transition between the therapy space, facilitating their re-entry into everyday world (Landy1994).	3 Mins	N/A

3.4 CASE ANALYSIS

Unlike a traditional approach of a therapy session, where people with a similar case are grouped together for the puposes of therapy, here the clients are on opposite ends of the spectrum and a common meeting place is what together we are working towards it is unlike working separately with a group of victims or offenders. The challenge here is to bring a mediation element that adresses or is able to cater for both in the drama therapy approach.

My challenge in structuring an all inclusive process was how to bring the two parties together without each feeling they should not be engaged in dramatic activities together. My concern was based on the volatile relations between victim and offender given the nature of the event that bring them together. I was to avoid activities that could be uncomfortable and perpertuate unsafe feeling in each others company i.e excercises that involve closing eyes or touching in the initial process or two are not appropriate for the clients still do not know or trust each other or the process for that matter. Also, much consideration went into selecting appropriate exercises that would not intimidate or undermine either as play may be seen by adolescents/juviniles as something out of their developmental stage. Jones asserts that it is important to discover an appropriate developmental level for a group concerning their use of play and drama (Jones, 2007 :176).

Thinking about the drama therapy as a metaphoric journey, I was able to then overlook the challenge, accommodate everybody aboard and allocate seats. Not everyone on the journey is alike, but all must experience the journey as a real experience that has shifted something in their reality. Something that will alter their personal narrative in the positive. Like a narrative the

journey has the beginning, the middle and the end. Andersen-Warren and Grainger (2000) sums the journey's three parts as the departure, voyage and arrival. They explain these as follows :

- *Departure:* in which the ultimate destination is agreed upon, and the people involved prepare to embark on it in each others company.
- *Voyage:* in which security is exchanged for adventure and everything is in a state of flux between 'here' and 'there' and 'now' and 'then'.
- *Arrival:* in which newness and discovery, the way of experiencing things that has emerged from the symbolic transition of the voyage, is celebrated by those present as a way of embodying the experience of personal change which has taken place during the voyage (Andersen-Warren and Grainger, 2000: 24).

This is the the primary structure of a drama therapy session. Many have different names for it but they all claim the tripartite structure that refer to the same process. Pitruzella (2004) referes to them as foundation phase, creation phase and the sharing phase. Chesner (1994), calls them warm-up, development and closure. Drama For Life at the University of the Witwatersrand teaches that they are check-in, main event and check out. These are the references that will be used to analyse the drama therapy plan above.

The check-in

This phase includes the check-in, the warm-up and the bridge-in. The check-in's overall aim is to warm up the clients into the physical and vocal expressive mode of drama. They are given permission to arrive and transition from the outside world into the therapy space through carefully strucured play that is aimed at working towards the main event. In this phase the use of

the body is encouraged since this is the main tool of the language used. As you may notice in the above exercises, the clients are encouraged to be aware of themselves more than before in their movement as they ready themselves to partake in new ways of being.

Furthermore this stage acknowledges that not everyone is familiar with the theatre and therefore this is a way of giving them permission to allow themselves to be the other in a gentle manner. This phase is also a phase of training, in which sponteneity and narrative ability are practised, and the access to the 'as if' dimension is prepared; the dimension that is at the core of the second phase (Pitruzella, 2004:119). In the check-in phase the group assumes a fictional role which is not their own, they invoke and name the roles in preparation for the main event.

Throughout this phase, the pace of the exercises alternates, this allows the clients to catch their breath for; drama therapy is cognisant of the fact that not everyone is physically fit to cope with intense exercises, besides, the intention is not fitness but to get the body and mind ready and relaxed for an embodiment process, so rather get them warmed up for the journey ahead but not exhaust them.

The main event

This is the core of the process where the clients get to experience and live the dramatic reality. In this phase, the imaginative worlds come together and mould each other, embodying in the dramatic reality (Pitruzella, 2004:119). In the case of John and Larry above, the two get to face their challenges as the 'other', the main character. They are going through the paces in the psychological safety net provided for by the distancing mechanism in role playing as they take

personal risks. The structure of the session flows from relative safety at the start, into greater risk-taking during the development phase, and a return to ritual and safety at the closure (Chesner, 1994:125). In this phase, in as much as the drama therapist can have a plan of action, it is the clients who drive the session with the material they bring to the session. The drama therapist uses their skill and understanding of dramatic processes to create structures appropriate to the needs of the group at any time (ibid). Here the group is given an opportunity to play out the roles and explore alternative qualities in the sub-roles.

The check -out

This is the third and final phase of the drama therapy structure. The phase of the exit, in which the group returns to everyday conciousness crossing back the border of the dramatic reality (Pitruzella, 2004:122). This phase includes the bridge-out, reflection and grounding. It is an important phase to disengage the clients from the process to the world of reality. It is not to be taken lightly but deserves the same careful treatment as when the client is initiated into the dramatic reality. If not properly done, it has the potential to hang to some degree in the present. We often experienced this 'hang-over' feeling during our practice sessions as drama therapy students, until we finally identified the source. This usually happened when the final stage was rushed through because of time constrains. It is at this phase that the group reflect upon the role play. In this reflection, opportunities may arise for the group to relate the fictional role to everyday life, integrating roles to create a functional role system and discover ways that their behaviour in role affects others in their social environments .

In conclusion, although the two practices align in theory, the challenge comes in the actual practical application. This is because drama therapy is a gradual process that unfolds over time while restorative justice mediation happens over one to two meetings. The drama therapy sessions for example, would be two per week over three weeks with an overall of six sessions. It is therefore not financially viable for the justice system to employ this service. It is however, of benefit for the parties involved to go through the whole pocess to maximise the impact of the intervention. For this reason the research opens an opportunity to investigate what is called brief drama therapy. The research also opens an opportunity to put the collaboration into practice with actual subject to further investigate the process.

CHAPTER 4

EXAMINING THE COLLABORATION

> *The ways in which dramatherapy is practiced varies enormously, responding to the different situations that clients bring to therapy. Dramatherapy now exists in relation to many different health systems, works with many different client groups and has expanded into areas beyond the more traditional health settings of hospitals and clinics. The health systems range between those within the different cultural contexts of healing in many countries (Jennings, 1994).*

Making Amends also looks at building a bridge between restorative justice and drama therapy by looking at the feasibility of merging a non-therapy practice with a therapy practice that is drama therapy. This chapter thus, looks at their similarities and differences in an effort to find their synergy or a space where the two practices meet. The synergy, I found in the similarities. In the differences though, is where I sit with the best practices in drama therapy to complement and anchor restorative principles in a restorative drama therapy process.

The helping professions that is drama therapy and restorative justice have as their basis the hypothesis that people in general are capable of changing from an undesirable role to a more desirable or socially acceptable one. A possible effective mechanism to motivate the necessary change may well lie in a collaboration of these practices based on their shared qualities as they both seek to expand their application.

4.1 DIFFERENCES IN THE APPROACHES

Restorative justice	Drama therapy
1. The process is talk based	It is a creative embodied process.
2. Very direct in its approach	Distancing is crucial
3. A formal structure	A creative journey
4. Focuses on the hurt	Focuses on the healthy part
5. Facilitator led	Therapist led

Talk based process versus an experiential process

Dramatherapy sessions are used as a laboratory for experiments in relationship, rather than a classroom where people are taught how to interact with one another (Adersen-Warren and Grainger, 2000:32). This bears the essence of embodiment in the process, such that the experience is lived and felt, bringing what Chesner (1994:114) calls 'the connection between the physical and the psychic'. Furthermore, he explains that this evokes the necessary change from inside-out and not from outside-in as in the 'clinical' setting experienced in the mediation sessions. Chesner also shares that when we express ourselves through action we engage at a physical level and there is profound connection between the body, senses, emotional and mental states. By engaging at a physical level, the client has access to their emotional and inner world. This form of expression through drama does not rely on literacy, nor does it necessarily require verbal fluency. When non-verbal methods are used, drama helps those who are less confident to express themselves (Baim et al, 2002:xii) through or within the dramatic reality. Dramatic reality in drama therapy refers to a category of experience that is unique to dramatic interaction, which

involves a tangible entrance into an imaginary realm, engaging in make-believe play, in 'as-if' behavior, etc… in essence it is imagination manifested (Pendzik, 2006:271).

A restorative justice process, in particular victim offender mediation, is a process of raising and resolving conflicts by dialogue facilitated by an impartial mediator. In fact, the victim offender mediation is also known as 'victim-offender dialogues', 'victim-offender conferences' or 'victim-offender meeting', all of which denotes dialoging. The process involves preparation, which allows the victim and the offender to tell their story in the company of the mediator alone. This also provides an opportunity to clarify how the process will unfold, as well as the platform where their fears, expectations and concerns are managed and any rules or conditions under which they decide to work are heard. Edgar and Newell (2006) point out that at the meeting itself, under the guidance of a facilitator, the victim and the offender have the opportunity to express their perceptions of the events and the feelings it caused. Victims are able to seek answers to questions that are often neglected by the traditional criminal justice system processes (Edgar and Newell, 2006: 11).

Drama therapy on the other hand has its foundation in theatre, an experiential event. While there is dialogue, it only serves as one of the many means of expression. Drama-based methods harness the power of 'learning by doing' in a uniquely powerful way. Because of this, these methods have significant advantages over discussion-based or instructional approaches. The memory of a discussion can easily be lost. The experience of doing is harder to forget, especially if the doing is closely related to one's own life experience (Baim et al, 2002:xii).

Direct versus distanced approach

In a one-on-one mediation session with the offender and victim, the participants sit with each other to answer to direct questions in an encounter. A direct, facilitated, face-to- face meeting with adequate screening, preparation and safeguards is often an ideal forum for this involvement. A meeting allows victim and offender to sit face to face with each other, to ask questions of each other directly as well as to negotiate how to put things right together. It provides an opportunity for victims to directly tell offenders the impact of the offense or to ask questions (Zerh, 1992: 25). Edgar and Newell (2006), and Zerh (1992) outline the guiding questions at the heart of a restorative session as follows:

- Describe in your own words what happened.
- What were you thinking at the time?
- Who do you think has been affected by what happened?
- In what ways were they affected?
- What are their needs?
- What should happen to put things right?

Drama therapy on the other hand has an indirect approach in its use of the drama tools such as metaphor, role, story and play. It prefers fictional stories to straightforward autobiography, allowing those taking part to 'sit more easily' in what is unfolding around them, choosing whether or not they want to take it personally by becoming involved (Andersen-Warren and Grainer, 2000:28). The drama therapy approach, as Andersen-Warren and Grainger (2000) puts it; aim to produce as 'un-clinical' an atmosphere as possible. It tries not to 'do things' to people or allow them to feel like patients or - worse still - experimental subjects (Andersen-Warren and

Grainger, 2000:30). This is to say that the approach employs creative means to alleviate the unnecessary pressure that inevitably comes with the situation that our clients find themselves in as victims and offenders. This approach also lessens the pressure added by the formality of the set-up in a typical victim-offender mediation setting, as described above. This creative approach brings a level of playfulness, for it operates in what Landy (2005) calls 'the fictional frame'. This is where the clients take on the role of people or objects different from themselves (Landy, 2005:92), and it is this 'special category of playfulness' according to Blatner and Blatner (1988), that things are allowed to be 'real and unreal at the same time'. This is done so that the mind 'seems to experience a kind of pleasure in being able to encompass these seemingly irreconcilable opposites' (Blatner and Blatner, 1988:29 in Andersen-Warren and Grainger, 2000:29).

This use of the creative means to deal with the subject at hand puts the clients in a psychologically safe space that allows them to approach their real issues indirectly in the 'unreal' world of role-playing. This kind of 'detached involvement' or 'involved detachment' (ibid: 30) is commonly referred to as 'distancing', and is applicable to all drama therapy interventions as the main therapeutic tool. Warren and Gainer (2000) cite Landy (1993) in his study of dramatic role, when he uses the idea of *role-distance* to explain the way in which taking a part in a play – assuming the 'mask of drama'- allows us to behave more courageously than we normally would do. '*The fact that the role I am playing in the drama obviously is not really me at all gives me the freedom (distance) to express my feelings, attitudes and desires in an undercover way'* (Warren and Gainer, 2000:87).

In addition, the above-mentioned questions are generally addressed in the reflection section of the intervention where clients have an opportunity to reflect on their experience in the dramatic space and the connections they choose to draw between the real and the unreal. At this point in the session, says Chesner (1994:129), the group distances itself from the dramatic roles, by talking as themselves about the experience.

Formal structure versus a creative journey

Restorative justice process takes approximately, a total of three sessions at most but two appears to be standard. The first session is held with individual clients separately, in order to prepare them for the actual meeting of the two parties together. In general, preparation meetings are understood to consist of private, face-to-face contact with the participant by either the actual mediator or some other workers from the VOM program. In fact, such meetings are sometimes carried out by telephone (Umbreit et al, 2004:285). It seems plausible that a third meeting, which rarely happens becomes necessary in case of unforeseen circumstances, i.e. if an agreement could not be reached on the day but there is a chance of that happening in all likelihood. The structure of the actual intervention is straightforward with the victim choosing what they want to happen i.e. if they should be the first in the room, followed by the offender or visa versa and who should be the first to talk. From then onwards the session is left to be dominated by the communication between the affected parties with the facilitator intervening to facilitate progress. Very often there are observers in the room, for example the police official in charge and the support structure in the form of family member or friend (as is evident in the restorative justice case study in the previous chapter).

In drama therapy, those individual sessions would still be held as assessment sessions. Assessment sessions are concerned with the relationship, an exchange of necessary information, and establishing an empowering, therapeutic alliance and creative culture (Casson, 2005:99). The drama therapy structure on the other hand is like a journey. The participants are led into the process through a carefully structured session that seamlessly spans from warm-up, into main event and then reflection through play, without being prescriptive and protocol-bound but still allowing spontaneity. In order to be therapeutic, creative interventions must be flexible and engaging in a light hearted manner. The client must feel that they have a license to play in the safety of the therapeutic space as provided for by the drama therapist. The sessions end with a crucial step of de-roling or grounding which enables the person or group '*to be grounded in the here and now social reality'* (Casson, 2005:243). The therapist plays varying roles as deemed appropriate in the moment of play. They could be an observer, a director or a participant. The sessions are not standard in number but rather take cognizance of the fact that every client has different needs therefore the amount and nature of the sessions is tailored according to the needs of the clients.

Focus on the harm done versus on the healthy part of the individual

Edgar and Newell cannot stress enough the notion that the primary goal of restorative justice as being healing the harms that arise from a crime (Edgar and Newell, 2006:09). Zerh (2003) stipulates that restorative justice focuses on harm. Its strongest view is that it perceives crime as harm done to the victim. The subsequent restorative intervention suggests a process of repairing and restoring the harm that is brought about by the criminal act to both the offender and the victim equally. In other words, each works towards making amends for the harm done.

Restorative justice specifically personalizes the process, primarily recognizing the equal humanity of both parties. It views crime primarily as injury, and the purpose of justice as healing. It also recognizes the emotional effect of crime on victims, offenders and the community alike. As a practice, restorative justice seeks healing of the emotional effects of crime as an important part of putting right the wrong (New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 1995:21 in Edgar and Newell, 2006). Restorative justice response to intervention therefore begin with a focus on identifying and repairing the damage caused by the actions of offenders…by moving away from the principle of entitlement to the principle of social exchange (Bazemore, 2001:209).

In an attempt to heal the harm, drama therapy would focus on the healthy part of the individual or the circumstance they are in. In essence, the practice does not focus directly on the commission of a crime (the weakness or unhealthy part). In the case of the victim and the offender, the therapist attention would be the victims' and offenders' efficacy to change behavior. The role of the drama therapist would then be to facilitate the process that would guide that change without focusing on the 'worst self' because 'we are all better than our worst deeds' (Baim et al, 2002:25).

Facilitator-led versus therapist-led

The facilitator's job is to guide the mediation process for the purposes of addressing the harm and does not delve deep into the psychological wellbeing of the participants. A facilitator can be a screened and trained member of the community who will be able to conduct the process in a fair manner without prejudice. Although there are trained experts, they do not always sit in meetings

as facilitators, they sometimes sit in, as observers and they would refer the participant for Psychological consultation should there be a need.

A drama therapist on the other hand has to undergo specialized training and be a registered professional and it is her who should interact with the client. The therapist's role is to hold the process and guide the clients to navigate their journey and is also interested in the psychological well being of the client.

Both practices hold onto similar but different key elements as demonstrated in the next table. This elements while they may come across as differences; they could also be seen as highlighting the similarities.

Key Elements of mediation	**Key elements of drama therapy**
1. Continual centering of the mediator	Therapist is central to the process
2. Deep compassionate listening	Empathy and compassion for clients
3. Impartiality of mediator	Impartiality of therapist
4. Creation of safe, if not sacred, space	Creation of a safe space to play
5. Dialogue driven meeting	Embodied expression
6. Non-directive style of mediation	Non-prescriptive style of therapy
7. Mediation is voluntary for both parties	Therapy is voluntary for the clients

4.2 SIMILARITIES IN THE APPROACHES

Social practices

To make reference to my earlier statement, all the world is a stage and all that is played on that stage is influenced by the reality of our social drama. This affirms the notion that we play roles that society, as our audience; has cast us in. As victim and offender, we are given titles based on the roles we played or continue to play in the drama of crime. If we have each developed the ability, first of all to see ourselves playing different roles, and to go ahead and play these roles, we have therefore the power to alter, to a great or lesser degree, the plot of the whole social drama (Warren and Grainer, 2000:56). Both drama therapy and restorative justice, in their interest to effect personal and social change work from the premises that we have this power, therefore as the helping endeavors, they offer themselves as possible mechanisms of catalyzing that change towards a better social interaction.

Group encounters

Drama itself is a group event, even if two people are present (Warren and Grainer, 2000:19). Drama therapy is therefore essentially a group therapy even if two people, a therapist and client are involved. This is for the reason that the therapist is always a participant in the process, although the level of participation or role of participation may differ. Although human beings possess the ability to act out dramas in their own imagination and these private scenarios can have any number of characters, actual interpersonal, rather than intra-personal, drama requires at least two people so that there may be a dialogue between them, and each can be aware of the effect his or her presence, or what he or she is doing or saying, has on the other person and vise versa; in other words, so that interaction can take place (ibid).

The fact that every human meeting is a kind of drama, even if it involves only two people as said by Goffman (1956), gives me the basis to argue that a restorative justice intervention is one step towards the drama orientation and by operating in a group mode of mediation. For the encounter between the victim and the offender, from the moment one party steps into the room to meet the other party; an encounter that Goffman (1956) calls the 'little dramas' ensues with both parties telling their narratives with the beginning, middle and end. In that way another tool of drama, story telling, is involved.

Emphasis on safe space

The creation of a safe space in the helping endeavors is crucial, for often our clients are at their vulnerable and need reassurance in this relationship with their therapist or mediator. Phil Jones (2010) informs us that in clinical work, the drama therapy space is created by a number of different factors. These include the ways in which the therapy space is framed by the approach taken to change, the ways boundaries are created, the way the client arrives at the space through referral and the way the space is created in relation to the setting it is within. In addition, the space is created in relation to the rest of the client's life. It is not as if the drama therapy space is something that is apart: it is different but related (Jones, 19:2010).

Holistic approach to clients.

Both practices acknowledge an individual as a whole being i.e. a social and psychological entity whose life circumstances are determined by one dimension and not the other. In addressing the harm with respective clients, the processes will acknowledge the social and psychological impact of the crime on individuals.

Both practices believe in the individual's capacity to act in their different circumstances as posed to them in the environment they inhabit. The offender in restorative practice is expected to take responsibility for their actions, i.e. the crime in order to make amends, while the victim is expected to actively participate in order to regain their control and manage their fears. The idea is to do things with the client as opposed to doing things for or to the clients. This gives the participants human agency for change.

Each client is different

The practices acknowledge that although we are from the same human race we are different individuals. They both value the individuality of the client and acknowledges that no two clients are the same, therefore there is no common template of a session that can be applied, what Yalom call 'standardized' therapy and 'protocol' therapy. In his autobiography, asserts Yalom (2002), Jung describes his appreciation of the uniqueness of each patients' inner world and language, a uniqueness that requires the therapist to invent a new therapy language for each patient (Yalom, 2002:34). Every client deserves to be treated according to what they bring to the session. This value of interconnectedness must be balanced by an appreciation for particularity. Although we are connected we are not the same. Particularity is about appreciating diversity. It is about respecting the individuality and worth of a person. It is about taking seriously the specific contexts and situations. The value of particularity reminds us that context, culture and personality are important (Zerh, 2002:38).

Personal narrative

Victim-offender mediation highlights the victim and offender as the primary parties in the offence, and gives greater emphasis to storytelling and problem solving through dyadic dialogue (Umbreit and Armour, 2011:78). The offender and the victim engage as the one who committed the crime and the one on whom the offence was committed, the two are on the opposite ends of the spectrum and needs to be brought on the same page in order to (re)member them in what the restorative justice calls interconnectedness and for that story telling is used. Telling of a personal narrative, be it metaphorically or otherwise in drama therapy serves to externalize the clients internal conversation.

Victim-offender mediation usually involves a victim and an offender in direct mediation facilitated by one or more facilitators; occasionally the dialogue takes place through a third party who carries information back and forth, a process known as 'shuttle' mediation (Umbreit and Armour, 2011: 77). In drama therapy the information could be relayed between the two parties, by the two parties, with sociometry exercises like role reversal guided by the drama therapist. The processes, whether drama therapy or restorative justice; will not succeed without the narratives of both parties. This in essence implies that for the narratives to be told, whether directly or metaphorically, the characters in that narrative need to assume particular roles.

Healing

Notions of healing are central to all helping professions, but the actual meaning of the kind of healing the practice effects may differ. What I regard as one of the central similarity is the healing aspect of both practices. Crime inspires powerful emotions. Restorative justice

recognizes those emotional effect of crime on victims, offenders and the community…restorative justice seeks healing of the emotional effects of crime as an important part of putting right the wrong (New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 1995:21 in Edgar and Newell, 2006: 9).

Dramatherapy builds upon the healing aspects that are present in dramatic and theatrical activities. Generally speaking these healing aspects are based in the process of creativity, playing and acting (Jones 2007:15) These healing aspects, within a therapy frame, allows for the connections to the unconscious and emotional levels to be made with the two parties empathetically received in the therapy space thus presenting both offender and victim an equal opportunity for a catharsis without favor or prejudice.

As opposed to what Daems (2009) implies when he says, it is important to note that the medical origin of the term suggests a therapeutic connotation, which would assume that something needs to be healed. In this case, nonetheless, what has to be healed is not just a moral or emotional injury, as is assumed when speaking about restoration, but deeper and more devastating psychological damage, trauma (Daems, 2009 in Bolivar, 2010: 243). General literature on the subject has led the researcher to believe that the practice concentrates on the moral and emotional injury, as mentioned above because it is not a therapy but 'deeper and more devastating psychological trauma' is referred to relevant practitioners. The researcher is more aligned with the idea that healing in this sense is related to 'the feeling of closure so that both parties can move on' (ibid, 244). The researcher agrees that restorative justice is indeed therapeutic as it has the power to be psychologically challenging and life enhancing, but it has its boundaries as mainly a social experience, focusing mainly on the social functioning of its participants, and, therapy is not

its intention. Baim et al confers with me when they say that, to go into the therapy realm is to purposely aim at surfacing deeply personal material, tracing behavioral and emotional patterns back to their origins, and, where appropriate, working through past life experiences (Baim et al, 2002:xv) and possessing the skill to hold the process when you cross that boundary. The meaning of *healing* conferred by the healing practices includes the personal, social, religious and moral significance of affliction and recovery. The forms of power invoked in healing include personal feelings of efficacy and self-control…and forms of economic, political and spiritual power (Kirmayer, 2004: 46)

Role

The most important of the similarities is perhaps role. It is role theory as provided for by Moreno and Landy in this case, that allows me to systematically go through the use of role in the two practices. As Baim (2002) puts it 'much of human interactions can be understood by considering the roles and scripts we perform as we go about our daily lives' (Baim et al, 2002: 20).

In restorative justice there are two clearly indicated social roles that are of interest in the victim-offender-mediation (VOM) encounter. These main roles are offender and victim. Offender, as we saw above refers to someone who commits an illegal act, and victim denotes a person harmed, injured, or killed as a result of a crime, accident, or other event or action. Each is dependent on the other to exist. So, role is the behavior that a person engages in when taking a position in relation to others (Meldrum, 1994: 75). For an 18 year-old boy for example, to be an offender, there must be a person against whom he commits a crime. The stance he takes against someone at that moment ascribes him the role of offender. Also, an elderly lady takes on the role of victim because of the commission of crime against her by the offender.

By merely labeling the parties involved in restorative process as offender and victim, we have marked them as one who should be treated favorably and the other who deserves the opposite. This marking process, Jones (1983) argues, typically has devastating consequences for emotions, thought, and behavior. Many words have been applied to the resulting status of the deviant person. He or she is flawed, blemished, discredited, spoiled, or stigmatized. In the classic case, the mark or sign of deviance initiates a drastic inference process that engulfs impressions of the deviant target person and sets up barriers to interaction and intimacy (Jones, 1983:5). This insinuates that the community may not openly welcome an offender, by virtue of their deeds and the resultant negative relationship with the justice system and the social role that seem so automatic.

Restorative justice uses the social names given to these characters to label its participants as victim and offender respectively. This social labeling has a potential to entrench the related behavior. The victim could possibly be holding onto negative feelings of intrusion of personal space, fear of another attack and other emotional issues and calling them 'victim' could perpetuate these feelings because that is who they refer to, as opposed to survivor for example, which carries rather positive connotations. I call these labels roles because it is not part of who they are but rather, they acquired it because of the commission of a crime and who society call such characters. In drama therapy though, the roles are taken further by the taxonomy of roles. The client has an opportunity to chose and experiment with different roles new and old, comfortable or not so comfortable and from different domains etc, to explore and diversify their role repertoire and acknowledge opposites, harmonious and discordant roles.

For example, in a drama therapy session using the story of The Lion King, a victim can choose to be the king, which immediately takes them out of the affective domain as the victim into the social domain as king. In reflection, simple discussions around how they felt playing those roles can, depending on individuals, end up with connections of what it means for them.

Role theory assets that life is theatre, in essence holding the view that most of our everyday activity is the acting out of socially defined categories that dictates our behavior and greatly influences who we are. Robert Landy believes that as human beings we have the capacity to take on and enact many roles in our lifetime and discover ways to live effectively among them. But as we inevitably encounter our limitations that capacity diminishes (Landy, 1993:167). Offenders and victims can regain a positive sense of self as they investigate and integrate the roles that each play in the restoration of self and another.

Favor and prejudice in the justice system is consciously or unconsciously practiced, especially towards the victim. For example, in the interest of serving justice, resources are mainly concentrated towards apprehending and punishing the offender and not as much towards the contribution the system can make towards the healing process of the victim of the crime. Victims are further victimized by the system that should in fact serve them; especially if one considers that it is against them that the crime has been committed. Muttingh and Shapiro in their paper on NICRO Diversion Options highlight the fact that of all the role players in a criminal case, the victim is the most marginalized...the victim is seldom, if ever, given an opportunity to air feelings or to question the offender (Mutting and Shapiro, 1993:5). The victim thus remains a silent spectator in the justice proceedings. This spectator role assigned to the victim by the system is

directly addressed in restorative justice by consciously involving the victim and reassigning them an active participant in the process that affected and still affects them. The change begins internally with the offender accepting the obligation and working together with the victim and the community to make things right. This creates a collaborative environment and brings honor to the victim, the community and also to the offender. The victim's role is affected positively even in the initial stage of accepting responsibility according to the five R's.

In this process of putting things right the three primary stakeholders; the victim, the perpetrator and the community are considered. These stakeholders all need to be willing participants who are ready to now embark on an emotional dimension of the crime, the need that the criminal justice does not cater for. The criminal justice seeks to deal with crime dispassionately - restorative justice recognizes the emotional effect of crime on victims, offenders and the community - restorative justice seeks healing of the emotional effects of crime as an important part of putting right wrong (New Zealand Ministry of justice, 1995: 21 in Edgar and Newell, 2006:9).

In the wake of trauma caused by violence, victims meet in facilitated interventions with offenders who harmed them as part of their search for meaning and some measure of closure (Umbreit and Armour, 2011: 76). In cases where an offender is not caught, VOM practice allows for the use of surrogate offenders because the victims of such cases are equally in need of gaining a greater understanding of why people commit such crimes. Often victims also find it beneficial to help hold others similar offenders accountable for their actions even though their own offenders were never caught (Umbreit and Armour, 2011:83). Here VOM plays with the assumptions on role as outlined by Landy (2001) into play, i.e. human beings as role takers and role players by nature.

That is, the abilities to imagine oneself as another and to act like the other are essentially unlearned and genetically programmed.

This chapter presents the similarities and the differences. In so doing it also demonstrates how the earlier outweighs the later. That is a great indicator that there are more ways that the practices are similar than they are different, therefore the space where the two meet is considerably common than different.While the overall goals of mediation and therapy in this instance are greatly shared between these two practices, it is the method of achieving those goals that is different. Mainly because both practices belong to different approaches – that of the mediation milleau and the therapy milleau distinctively. This distinction does not however mean that one practice cannot borrow or merge with the other to positively utelise its strengths and perhaps enhance its weaknesses in a collaboration of methods.

The principles of restorative justice are intergral to healthy social relations and drama is a tool that encourages social relations and is a strong medium of engaging the person in their totality. Thus when drama therapy is used to apply restorative justice principles with the offenders and the victims, the roles they rehearsed not only become part of who they are through the embodiment process, but will also help them diversify their role repetoire. This implies hat the clients will have positive roles to draw from when in need. Baim (2002) puts it to us ‘that the memory of a discussion can easily be lost. The experience of doing is harder to forget, especially if the doing is closely related to ones own life experience’ (Baim, 2002: xii).

There is also no guarantee that the roles as rehearsed means a transformation for the client, but rather that the clients will be empowered with the skill and knowledge to implement that change as they deem important. This will be plausible since they have been exposed to alternative roles to rely on. 'Many people assume that role play is primarily a once-off event. A person plays out a situation once and this solves or resolves an issue. This is rarely the case in my experience' asserts Jones (2007: 192) this is a process.

4.5 CONCLUSION

This report set out to examine two processes in the helping profession, with the intention of examining their similarities and differences towards a possible collaboration of methods. The knowledge that is put forward is gathered through the literature that I have engaged with, and is by no means all there is to know about the subject. This study is therefore not an absolute measure of this topic, but rather the beginning of a journey of discovery into the two approaches.

The researcher also wish to acknowledge that, the recorded sessions did not bring to life an expected experience of victim-offender mediation, and none was a South African experience, which was important to her in as far as experiencing the local version of the practice. Thus the last chapter is based solely on the written encounter and not on the visual encounter, for as per the 'why me' restorative justice website, word for word records of conferences are rarely available to the public. It was also impossible to attain recorded sessions that are South African based, online or through referrals. Such confidential recordings are kept as such – confidential. This presents an oppurtunity to study this collaboration of methods on the field and make private recordings on the sessions.

What this research managed to do is to answer the research question by putting forward a demonstration in the form of a drama therapy session plan. The plan was able to put forward the techniques that are available in role method to suggest that there are ways that drama therapy can examine and transition the roles of victim and offender. The hypothesis that somewhere in the course of their development, human beings unconciously limit their role repetoir by getting fixated on certain roles. It is through presenting them with a wider role spectrum that they learn to be flexible and experiment with other positive roles. There is however no guarateed immediate change as this is dependent on the individual drive to change or even their ability to relate the events of the dramatic reality to their reality.

REFERENCES

Andersen-Warren, M and Grainger, R. (2000). *Practical Approaches to Dramatherapy: The Shield of Perseus*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers. London and Philadelphia.

Baim C, Brookes S, and Mountford A. (2002). *The Geese Theatre Handbook: Drama with Offenders and People at Risk*. Waterside Press. Unites Kingdom.

Balfour, (2004). *Theatre in Prison: Theory and Practice*. Intellect Books. United Kingdom.

Bazemore G. (2001). *Young People, Trouble and Crime: Restorative Justice as a Normative Theory of Informal Social Control and Social Support*. Sage Publications.

Bolivar D. (2010). *Conceptualising Victims 'Restoration' in Restorative Justice*. Sage Publications.

Casson, J. (2005). *Drama, Psychotherapy and Psychosis: Dramatherapy and Psychotherapy with People who Hear Voices*. Brunner-Routledge. New York.

Cattanach, A. (1996). *Drama for People with Special Needs.* (2nd ed.). Drama Publishers. New York, NY.

Choi J.J, Green D.L, Kapp S.A. *Victimization, Victims' Needs and Empowerment in Victim Offender Mediation.* International Review of Victimology. Sage Publications.

Criminal Justice Handbook Series 2006. *Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes.* United Nations. New York.

Doak, J and O'Mahony, D. (2006). *The Vengeful Victim? Assessing the Attitudes of Victims Participating in Restorative Youth Conferencing.* Sage Publications.

Edgar, K and Newell, T. (2006). *Restorative Justice in Prisons: A Guide to Making it Happen.* Waterside Press. United Kingdom.

Emunah, R. (1997). *Drama Therapy and Psychodrama: An Integrate Model*. International Journal of Action Methods.

Garcia, A. (2010). *Healing with ActionMmethods on the WorldSstage*. In E. Leveton (Ed.), *Healing Collective Trauma using Sociodrama and Drama Therapy* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY: Springer. In-text: (Garcia, 2010)

Goffman E. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre. Edinburgh.

Hamber, B. Nageng, D and O'Mally, G. 2000. *'Telling It Like It Is': Understanding The Truth and Reconcilliation Commission from the Perspective of Survivors*. In Psychology Society (PINS), 2000, Vol. 26, pp 18-42.

Jennings S, Mitchel S, Chesner A, and Meldrum B. (1994). *The Handbook of Dramatherapy*. Routledge. London and New York.

Jones P. (2007). *Drama as Therapy: Theory, Practice and Research*. Routledge. London and New York.

Kirmayer L,J. (2004). *The Cultural Diversity of Healing: Meaning, Metaphor and Mechanism*. British medical bulletin.

Landy R.J. (1993). *Persona and Peformance: The Meaning of Role in Drama, Therapy and Everyday Life.* Guilford Press. New York.

Landy R.J. (2001). *New Essays in Drama Therapy: Unfinished Business*. Charles Thomas Publishers. Illinois.

Landy R.J. (2008). *The Couch and the Stage: Integrating Words and Action in Psychotherapy*. Jason Aronson Publishers. United Kingdom.

Leventon E. (2010). *Healing Collective Trauma using Sociodrama and Drama Therapy.* Springer Publishing Company. New York.

Maepa T. (2005). *Beyond Retribution. Institute for Security Studies*. Pretoria. South Africa.

Morstad, M.D. (2003). *Drama's Role in School Counseling.* The Graduate School of Winsconsin – Stout. Menomonie.

Muntingh L,M and Shapiro R. (1997). *Nicro Diversion Options.* Royal Dutch Embassy. Cape Town.

Neuman L.W. (1994). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Second Edition. University of Wisconsin. Whitewater.

Neuman L.W. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Sixth Edition. University of Wisconsin. Whitewater.

Malchiodi C,A. (editor). (2005). *Expressive Therapies*.The Guilford Press. New York and London.

Pendzik, S. (2006). *On Dramatic Reality and its Therapeutic Function in Drama Therapy.* Arts in Psychotherapy, 33, 271-280

Pitruzzella, S. (2004). *Introduction to Dramatherapy: Person and Threshold*. Brunner-Routledge. Hove and New York.

Plaatjies M,F. (2008). *A Model for Implementation of Restorative Justice in the South African Correctional System.* University of South Africa. Pretoria.

Skelton A, and Batley M. (2008). *Restorative Justice: A Contemporary South African Review*. Acta Criminologica 21(3).

Smit, A. (2011). *Research Report : A Quantitative Statistical Presentation of Cases*

Diverted to NICRO Programmes by Courts in South Africa from June 2009 to May 2010. NICRO.

Smit, A and Padayachee, V. (2012). *Criminal Cognition as a Risk Factor for Recidivism.* Open Society Foundation. South Africa.

Steyn, F. (2010). *Approaches to Diversion of Child Offenders in South Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Programme Theories. University of the Free State*. South Africa.

The American Society of Psychotherapy & Psychodrama (ASGPP).

Umbreit M.S, Coates B.R, and Vos B. (2004). *Victim-Offender Mediation: Three Decades of Practice and Research.* Wiley Periodicals Inc.

Venter A. (2005). *Guidelines for Victim-Offender Mediation for Probation Officers in South Africa.* North-West University. Potchefstroom.

Victim Participating in Restorative Youth Conferencing. International Review of Victimology. SAGE. http://irv..sagepub.com/content/13/2/157

Walklate, S. (1989). *Victimology: The Victim and the Criminal Justice Process.* Unwin Hyman Ltd.United Kingdom.

Why me: Restorative justice Records. www.why-me.org

Yalom I,D. (2007). *The Gift of Therapy: An Open Letter to a New Generation of Therapists and Patients*. Harper Collins e-books.

Zerh, H. (1990/1995). *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice.* Herald Press. Pennsylvania.

Zerh, H. (2002). *The Little Book of Resorative Justice*. Good Books. Pennsylvania.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil.* Random House. United States.