“You can choose your friends, but not your neighbours”

A field study of the informal practice of restorative justice and its ties to community resilience in rural communities in Nakuru County, Kenya
Abstract

The justice system in the east-African country Kenya has long been subject to severe corruption and lengthy bureaucracy. Both historical and current injustices have been left unattended and unaddressed, obstructing community resilience. This has lead to the development of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms that often build on traditional practices. In this study the ADR of restorative justice is examined. The study seeks to explore the relationship between the informal practice of restorative justice and the social dimensions of community resilience in the rural communities of Nakuru County in western Kenya. By merging questions on the practice of restorative justice with indicators of community resilience the study has found that the informal practice of restorative justice indeed has links to the shaping of community resilience. The practice has enabled dialogue between different ethnic groups. This has facilitated reconciliation and healing of trauma partly because new narratives have formed and partly because the culture of silence has been broken allowing people to share testimonies of violence and conflict. The study has also informed the community resilience field on the importance for collectivistic communities to have historical and ancestral events honoured, shared and addressed in order to fully enable conditions under which community resilience can form. However the practice shows ambiguous tendencies when it comes to inclusion of all members of society as community elders’ possesses a lot of power over the process, partially restricting community resilience to form.
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1.0 Introduction

Situated just south of the conflict-ridden horn of Africa, Kenya has been perceived as a robust hub in the region. After the violent ending of British colonisation in 1963 Kenya started a trembling journey towards a functional democracy, with the founding father Jomo Kenyatta as president. By the end of the 1970’s Kenya had a prosperous economy and a promising democratic progress. The rise of democracy did however not last, in the end of the 1980’s political freedom was confined and Kenya became a one-party system. Human rights were violated and opposition leaders and politicians were imprisoned. Despite the reintroduction of the multi-party system the Kenyan democracy eroded (Swedish Institute of international affairs 2015).

From Kenyatta’s initial focus on reunion of the 44 ethnical groups present in the Kenyan society, the downfall in democracy also meant a downfall for the reunification. By the end of the 20th century and in the beginning of the 21st century ethnical violence increased, killing hundreds and forcing hundreds of thousands of people to leave their homes. The ethnic violence was in many cases fuelled by political provocations and decisions (Swedish Institute of International Affairs 2016). The ethnic violence gained momentum in the aftermaths of the presidential election in 2007, partially because of alleged electoral manipulation. Police, high-ranked politicians as well as local citizens were accused of taking part in the violence. Neighbours turned against neighbours of other ethnic affiliation and communities were shattered and traumatised. Around 1100 people died and more than 600 000 people were displaced as a result of the violence. Thousands were injured in rapes, machete attacks and beatings (Amnesty International 2014:14-16).

The strife for justice after 2007 has been littered with disappointment and unfished processes. In 2012 the International Criminal Court, owing to the post-election violence, charged four people with crime against humanity for the uprisings in 2007. None of the charges led to conviction; the last charge was dropped in 2016 (Swedish Institute of International Affairs 2016). In its world report for 2016, Human Rights Watch states that Kenya has made no progress with the process on accountability for the national trauma caused by the post-election violence (Human Right Watch 2016a: 352-354). Moreover, formal justice processes have been characterised by corruption, extreme slowness and impunity, truly challenging the
healing of Kenyan communities (Amnesty 2014; Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16).

1.1 Research problem

The impunity of ethnic violence has according to Amnesty International left Kenyans with “a sense that the Kenyan justice system has repeatedly failed them” (Amnesty International 2014:9). The overall lack of justice combined with an absence of community reparation is suggested to have made Kenyan communities more vulnerable to political provocations and fractions (Human Rights Watch 2011; Interview Imara 01/11/16). The trust in the formal justice system has been undermined and the access to it is very limited, especially in rural areas (Amnesty International 2014; Interview Annette Mbogoh 17/11/16). As a response to the lack of justice, lengthy bureaucracy and high corruption, alternative informal justice practices are used. These alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, often based on traditional practices, are mostly used in rural areas (Interview Imara 01/11/16; Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16). ADR can be seen as a generic term for different types of mechanisms and processes aiming to resolve conflicts without formal litigation (Lindell 2007). Relevant to this study is the ADR mechanism of the informal practice of restorative justice1. Restorative justice, known for its capacity to handle individual trauma, has in a Kenyan context been relocated to a local level and intermingled with traditional justice practices (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16). Reasons for using the ADR of restorative justice vary but have in a Kenyan context largely derived from a lack of access to the formal justice system. The lack of formal accountability can be argued to have a negative effect on community resilience as the impunity has led to that communities react more violent to new political and ethnical provocations (see Amnesty International 2014). Further violence and antagonism appears fuelled by the impunity and lack of formal justice. Hence the use of ADR raises the question whether it may have an effect on community resilience, in this study perceived as a process that enhances communities’ transformation in time of stress and challenges (see Norris et al. 2007; Steiner et al. 2016).

---

1 The informal practice of restorative justice indicates that the practice is not in any way linked to the formal justice system. From now on the informal practice of restorative justice may be referred to as “the practice”, “restorative justice” or simply “the practice of restorative justice”.
The county Nakuru, located within the Rift Valley in Western Kenya, was one of the most affected areas during 2007 years’ violence (Waki report 2008). It suffered land burns, property destruction, machete-attacks, forced circumcision, rape and killings (Human Rights Watch 2008). The impunity that followed has been substantial and many of the multi-ethnic communities have struggled socially and economically due to this. Local organisations have since tried to support rural communities in performing the ADR of restorative justice with the ambition to heal communities, enhancing their ability to handle future ethnic and political disruptions (Interview Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Justus Kinyua 30/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16).

There are links between the theory of community resilience and the practice of restorative justice, since they contain similar aspects. The link between the two is however new and underdeveloped, which warrants a descriptive and explorative study. An explorative study may also highlight if restorative justice, as an ADR mechanism, may be a way to operationalize a practice that can be thought to lead to enhancement of community resilience. ADR has strong links to criminology. In contrast, the intention is to employ a study of restorative justice from a community resilience perspective, which can be connected to the realm of societal security. This may highlight how micro-level initiatives tie into a broader spectrum of social perspectives on resilience, allowing for a contribution to both the field of restorative justice as well as to the relatively new and straggling field of resilience.

1.2 Research Aim

The aim is to explore the relationship between the informal practice of restorative justice and the social dimensions of community resilience within rural communities in Nakuru County. By studying the informal practice of restorative justice, the study will explore how the inaccessibility and distrust in the formal justice system has permitted a formation of alternative justice mechanism and how this may affect the social dimensions of community resilience. The study does not aim to investigate if the informal practice of restorative justice is beneficial to the Kenyan society as a whole.

1.3 Research Question

In what ways, if any, can the informal practice of restorative justice enable an enhancement of the social dimensions of community resilience in the rural communities in the Nakuru-County?
1.4 Disposition

Firstly, previous research on the theoretical foundation of restorative justice is presented, placing this study within a larger context of ADR in a sub-Saharan context. A theoretical framework of resilience, based on Norris et al. (2007) and Steiner et al.’s (2016) theories, is then presented, discussed and criticised. This is followed by a discussion and evaluation of the method and material used, based on the field study performed in Kenya from October 2016 to January 2017. A brief description of the conflicts in Nakuru\(^2\), traditional justice practices in Kenya and the use of restorative justice in Nakuru are included and presented before the analysis. With the theoretical framework as a foundation findings and analysis are presented, followed by a discussion on challenges for community resilience in Nakuru. Lastly conclusions are drawn and further research opportunities discussed.

1.5 Previous research

The following section will develop perspectives on ADR from a sub-Saharan context. Moreover the ADR of restorative justice will be presented as well as position the study within the field. Lastly, critique against restorative justice is highlighted.

1.5.1 Alternative dispute resolution in a sub-Saharan context

ADR concerns processes and techniques that resolve conflicts short of formal litigation. ADR may include several practices, processes and techniques such as restorative justice, mediation and arbitration (Lindell 2007; Roche 2006). Several researchers note that ADR has always been part of sub-Saharan societies and that it is used continuously, both formally and informally (Grande 1999; Baker 2013). Grande argues that ADR in an African context must not be seen strictly from a legal point of view, rather ADR is truly intermingled with political conflict thus relevant and important to political science (Grande 1999:69). Baker recognises that justice is truly political – the access to formal justice is in many cases limited for people living in rural areas hence informal justice do play an important role. Conversely, the use of ADR can be problematic thus communities may, while trying to act on the communities’ best, decide on solutions that may be abusive. This touches upon that unequal power dynamics in a community will be evident using ADR practices. Baker does however note that many rural

\(^2\) From now on Nakuru County may be referred to as Nakuru. If Nakuru town is intended this will be indicated.
communities lack formal possibilities to solve disputes and injustice, making the ADR mechanisms the only option available for creating accountability (Baker 2013).

1.5.2 Restorative justice

The ADR of restorative justice builds on the idea that the punitive justice system does not pay enough attention to the harm caused by criminal behaviour, restorative justice aims to go further than the criminal justice system to heal the broken relationships caused by crime (See Roche 2006; Saulnier & Sivasubramaniam 2015:510; Zehr & Gohar 2002). Having its origins in traditional justice practices, Leonard and Kenny points out that restorative justice answers to a sphere of thought concerning how the modern state, often a colonial other, have “…’stolen the conflict’ from communities, victims, and offenders” (Leonard & Kenny 2014:796). The objective within restorative justice is focused on reparation rather than punishment. Thus, restorative justice contrasts the modern criminal justice system, which is primarily based on the notion of punitive justice. Saulnier and Sivasubramaniam argue that the objective of restorative justice is to create “restoration for all affected parties” (Saulnier & Sivasubramaniam 2015:510). Restoration is noted to be:

“…a process to involve, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense, and to collectively identify and address harms, needs and obligations, in order to heal and put things as right as possible” (Zehr & Gohar 2002:40).

Zehr and Gohar note that restorative justice is not about forgiveness, reconciliation or mediation. It is not a special programme or blueprint, rather it is an approach including the ideas contained within in the definition of restoration (Zehr & Gohar 2002). The underlying principles are that crimes violate relationships. This creates an obligation to put right to the wrongs. Restorative justice rests upon a collective perception of society, as it does not only pay attention to individuals directly involved in crimes but also to the “community” that these individuals belong to.

Moving from the concept to the practice of restorative justice, the diversity inhibited in the concept becomes evident. Given that restorative justice is not a blueprint, practices of it are diverse. Zehr and Gohar argue that restorative practices, regardless of type, must in some way include: a focus on the harm that has been caused rather than what rules have been broken, a
focus on victim(s), offender(s) and the community/ies around or involved with victim(s) and offender(s). Moreover restorative practices must include opportunities for dialogue (indirect or direct) between victim(s) and offender(s) (Zehr & Gohar 2002:44).

1.5.2.1 Criticism of the practice of restorative justice
Despite that the criticism of restorative justice mainly derives from a criminologist perspective, arguing that restorative justice does not reduce imprisonment or have an effect on offenders, criticism from a political science point of view exists. Most importantly restorative justice is criticised for eroding the formal justice system and therefore weakening the legal system (Baker 2013). Therefore, the practice has been critiqued for not paying enough attention to vulnerable groups such as women, children or minor ethnic groups. Furthermore, it has little to offer when it comes to cases where victims and/or offenders do not wish to meet or where offenders do not acknowledge to the crime (Roche 2006). One could also argue that restorative justice risks letting criminals away too easily and that the restorative guidelines do not support what is commonly described as retribution.

1.6 Theoretical framework
Many theories may be used when studying how a specific ADR, like restorative justice, affects communities. The practice of restorative justice is often tied into the domain of criminology research, examining at how restorative justice can serve as a complement to the formal retributive system and also the formal legal system (see Akhtar 2013; Orji 2012; Daniels 2013). Additionally, ADR’s connection to sustainable peace building in post-conflict contexts has been researched extensively. In an east-African setting the cases of Rwanda and Uganda are highly relevant. The research in these areas has provided insight on how ADR practices may be combined with formal justice in order to create accountability as well as the importance of accountability after national trauma (see Baker 2011; Doughty 2014). However, as this study examines closer on how the informal practice of restorative justice may affect resilience in communities a theoretical framework based on community resilience theories from Norris et al. (2007) and Steiner et al. (2016) is used.

1.6.1 Community resilience
Community resilience derives from the broader concept of resilience, which has its roots in natural science. Resilience is commonly used to describe the capacity of a material or system to stabilize after displacement, in other words to bounce back rather than break. The concept
is however not only applied in natural science but also in social science (Norris et al. 2007:127; Shaw & Maythorne 2011:45; Enarson 2012:181). This study draws on the community resilience theories presented by Norris et al. (2007) and Steiner et al.’s (2016). Norris et al.’s (2007) theory is presented in a comprehensive yet precise way, hence the main theoretical framework is based on Norris et al. (2007). Steiner et al. (2016) develop comparable ideas, however they thoroughly clarify how economic and social aspects are combined in the shaping of community resilience and will serve as a complement.

Community resilience responds to a sphere of thought where communities despite crisis, disasters and times of hardship may prosper and flourish. Norris et al. and Steiner et al. define community resilience as a process, rather than an outcome or state of being (Norris et al. 2007:130; Steiner et al. 2016:3-4). Adaption and transformation are two general premises evident throughout the theory. The capacity to adapt evolves around the conception of absorption and ability to cope under severe stress and in crisis (Norris et al. 2007:132). Adaption may be seen as problematic since it implies an element of adjusting to change, which in a development context may suggest adaption to states of oppression or political violence. However, adaption is used in the sense of reshaping and adjusting to challenges in a way that allows communities to resist oppression and prosper despite difficulties (Norris et al. 2007; Steiner et al. 2016).

The focus on transformation reflects the ability to change rather than return to a state previous Transformation also includes a focus on recovery in that social entities (individuals, societies, organisations etc.) seek to mitigate risks in order to enhance their ability to cope in crisis (Norris et al. 2007:141). Steiner et al. and Norris refute the notion of resilience as a capability to “bounce back”, arguing that community resilience rather is characterised by transformative capacities (Norris et al. 2007; Steiner et al. 2016:4). Accordingly, community resilience is defined to be:

* A process that enhances communities’ ability to transformation in times of crisis and the ability to absorb provocations and adversities (see Norris et al. 2007; Steiner et al. 2016).

Community resilience is described as a fusion between communal economic and social factors in a community. These factors can be seen to construct two dimensions: an economic and a social one (Norris et. al 2007; Steiner et. al 2016:4). Norris et al. further operationalize
the dimensions into capacities (Norris et. al 2007). By using these dimensions and capacities community resilience may be clarified but also easier to locate when studying the informal practice of restorative justice. The economic dimension is not described or included in the methodological framework as the informal practice of restorative justice solely regards human activity effecting the social dimension.

1.6.1 Social dimension
Norris et al. divide the social dimension of community resilience into three sub categories: social capital, community competence and information communication. These subcategories are further divided into different aspects (Norris et. al 2007). The social dimensions of community resilience are constituted of capacities based on direct human activity but may include some economic measures.

1.6.1.1 Social Capital
Norris et al. define social capital as the aspects of social support, network structure and sense of community, place attachment and citizen participation (Norris et al. 2007:137-140).

The aspect of social support consists of perceived and received social support. Perceived social support involves individuals’ beliefs that community members would help them in times of crisis or difficulties. Support can be defined as emotional/psychosocial and/or physical. Support may be of simple means such as having friends in community that can function as emotional support, or actual physical support such as having a house that can resist harsh weather conditions. Received support is the concrete support community members can access such as fire protection or health care. Norris et al. note how received social support has an important effect on perceived social support, and how erosion of perceived social support may lead to instability in communities. A high level of perceived social support may enhance communities’ ability to work together as it enhances trust in fellow community members (Norris et al. 2007:138).

Furthermore, functional network structures within communities are crucial to community resilience. Response to disasters and difficulties calls for a broad reaction from organisations and other key members in society. If networks are well-structured and able to work together in times of crisis or difficulties it may enhance resilience. Important to note is that very tightly
coupled networks may be less resilient as they may be too dependent on separate entities (Norris et al. 2007:138).

Lastly, Norris et al. state that sense of community, place attachment and citizen participation are central parts of community resilience. Sense of community is the trust and bonding with other members in the group and/or members of other close communities – indications are members’ service to others, concern for community issues and sense of connection to other members. Place attachment “implies an emotional connection to one’s neighbourhood or city, somewhat apart from connections to the specific people living there” (Norris et al. 2007:139). Norris et al. argue that when place attachment is high, individuals will strive for improving their community and hold it together during crisis and hardships. However, in times of war or severe disasters, displacements may be a result. A high place attachment may then cause severe disruptions in communities, which will decrease resilience. Finally citizen participation in formal organisations and events may increase community resilience as it can enhance involvement in the community. Such activities can include school groups or religious groups. Involvement in community is, as it creates structures of responsibility and local grass-root leadership, central to community resilience as it alters community members’ willingness to act in favour for their community (Norris et al. 2007:140).

### 1.6.1.1.2 Community competence

Community competence includes aspects of collective action, decision-making, collective efficacy and empowerment. Collective action and decision-making concerns how communities effectively identify and address problems as well as how implementation of solutions is done. For this to succeed communities must collaborate with various actors within the community but also with different communities. By promoting an inclusive approach to the identification and tackling of problems, community resilience may be heighten as large parts of the community are involved. This creates mechanisms for early detection of problems. Furthermore, a broad involvement in undertaking solutions to problems is thought to ease implementation, as solutions then are anchored in the community. This may increase engagement in group-processes to resolve and resist “undesirable influences”. A result of this can be increased community resilience as community members then are more willing to take community action (Norris et al. 2007:141; Steiner et al. 2016:4).
Collective efficacy and empowerment have strong connections to perceived social support as it concerns how community members perceive the “effectiveness of organised community action” (Norris et al. 2007:141). Trust in that community action does generate an ability to change, absorb or resist undesirable influences may facilitate community action and can also enhance empowerment. Creating a feeling of entitlement to act upon issues within a community can lead to that community efficacy is increased but also that people feel empowered to act and therefore gain greater control over their lives. Furthermore, engagement in group processes may create a sense that community members are inter-linked through social networks that will support them in times of crisis and hardship, which may improve resilience (Norris et al. 2007:141-142; Steiner et al. 2016:5).

1.6.1.1.3 Information communication
Information communication concerns how common narratives and communication infrastructure influence community resilience. Norris et al. note that availability to accurate information in times of disruption is a central aspect of community resilience. Such information may be communication on how to keep safe, such as curfews, but also information on how events and crisis unwraps (Norris et al. 2007:140).

Narratives and rituals within communities are important as they shape and help creating a common meaning and purpose to events. Narratives help communities constituting its self-image but also its image of others. A shared self-image may lead to resilience as common group meanings may become a mechanism for empowerment as it helps individuals to deal with trauma and feel part of a group. A shared narrative may also emphasise collective stories of resistance, which can help a community to deal with a collective trauma. A continuance of community rituals during and after crisis may help to foster resilience as it supports a sense of normality during crisis and therefore mirrors both adaption and transformation (Norris et al. 2007:140).

1.6.2 Criticism of theory
The use of a community resilience theory may be criticised in several ways. As resilience is a buzzword the research about it is sprawling and somewhat indistinct. This leads to bluntness making it hard to actually define and operationalize what a resilient community really entails. Moreover, its bluntness makes it hard to show causality i.e. to elucidate what really causes a community to become resilient, especially when performing a qualitative study. However, the
purpose is not to find casualty between the informal practice of restorative justice and resilient communities. Rather, the study examines how the informal practice can enable conditions under which resilient communities can be realised. Through a study of the informal practice of restorative justice the soaring theory of resilience may be clarified and concretized. Despite the indistinctness of the field, resilience holds a rare power to grasp the concept of holistic emancipation and ability to “cope”. Its interdisciplinary feature may well be seen as an asset: it bears the potential to connect different fields of study enabling dialogue and cooperation within the academic world but also in reality of the field.

1.6.3 Definitions

Crises refer to the subjective construction of a situation that pose a threat to “basic structures or the fundamental values and norms of a system” (Boin et al. 2013:2). In addition crisis may be of social, economic and physical dimensions (Boin et al. 2013).

Community is, both by the literature and informants in this study, defined in various ways. The definitions vary, from that all people of one ethnic group constitute a community (Interview Annette Mbogoh 17/11/16) or that community is a specific geographical area (Norris et al. 2007). In this study community is based on loose geographical areas where people live together, interact and share common facilities such as schools, markets and hospitals. Thus, a community can be made up of more than one ethnic group. The informal practice of restorative justice can both address conflicts inter-ethnic conflicts as well as conflicts within an ethnic group. When informants refer to “community”, clarification on what community means to them will be made (Norris et al. 2007:128; Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Jamani 02/11/16: Focus group 02/11/16).

Elders refer to community representatives. Elders have large normative power, often seen to bear ancestral wisdom, which is important in rural communities. Communities may have one or more elders depending on size. Elders may include women. (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16: Imara 01/11/16).

1.7. Methodological framework

The method for the study is semi-structured interviews and on-the-spot observations. The semi-structured interviews are followed by an independent analysis based on the community resilience. The study is a qualitative field study using the case to localise how the informal
practice of restorative justice and the theory of community resilience in effect can be connected. By merging questions concerning the practice of restorative justice with indicators of community resilience, the study examines on how the practice of restorative justice can be linked to the shaping of community resilience in rural areas of Nakuru. This can be argued to fall within a heuristic purpose, using the case to explore and possibly refine the theory (Kaabo & Beasley 1999:375; George & Bennet 2005).

The use of a qualitative case study limits the study; most importantly a qualitative case study may oversee important variables in how restorative justice may be linked to community resilience. Consequently, the study is purposely framed to examine how restorative justice may be an enabling factor for community resilience, and not to examine causality. This means that the study examines how the informal practices of restorative justice may create conditions allowing communities to heighten their resilience. Consequently the study will not investigate whether the practice directly leads to community resilience, but merely if it can facilitate its creation.

Teorell and Svensson claim that a single case study is problematic when it comes to making generalisation, as it is hard to prove systematic relationship when only reviewing one case. This may well be the case, especially when investigating an informal practice that may vary between different places. However, single case studies may contribute to important insight on micro-practices and contribute to new hypothesis (Teorell & Svensson 2013).

1.7.1 Semi-structured interviews
Semi-structured interviews make up the main data-collection method for the study. Semi-structured interviews are conducted as a conversation between the informant and the researcher. Kapiszewski et al. call the form of semi-structured interview style used in this study “information needed”. These in-depth interviews are modelled in such a way that they cover certain themes and questions, partly to assure a certain level of reliability and partly to create an opportunity to do comparison between interviews (Kapiszewski et al. 2015:196). Since interviews unfold in different ways this interview style lets informants highlight topics of certain interest, still assuring that certain themes and questions are covered. As interviews partly covered sensitive matters in this study, semi-structured interviews allowed conversations where the informant can share his or her story as well as information about
power dynamics or other sensitive matters. This is risked to be lost in a fully structured interview. The option of doing fully structured interviews were further rejected as it could restrain the caption of depth and hinder informants to share aspects they would have found important, and that the interview question would not have covered (Kapiszewski et al. 2015; Bryman 2001).

Questions were formed to be open-ended – sometimes reworded, paraphrased and asked in various order. This was done to ensure validity, making sure the informant fully could comprehend the essence of the questions. Kapiszewski et al. suggest that open-ended questions allow informants to highlight new problems, aspects and dilemmas of the topic that might not be a part of the published literature or not be apparent to the researcher (Kapiszewski et al. 2015:206). As the interviews are set in a local Kenyan context unravelling power-dynamics was considered to be of highest concern, thus supporting the choice of open-ended questions (Kapiszewski et al. 2015:206; Teorell & Svensson 2007:89-90). The interviews were audio-recorded those occasions the informant approved. Notes were taken during all interviews.

1.7.2 On-the-spot observations
Kapiszewski et al. argue that field interviews may be combined with other research methods such as observations (Kapiszewski 2015:204) On-the-spot observations contributes to a deeper contextual understanding of the informal processes of restorative justice, but has also permitted a more structured way of providing the thesis the insights gathered in the field (Gustafsson & Johannesson 2016:22-23). Observations, as well as informal conversations, have continuously been documented. These field notes include date, time and location together with all information deemed to be relevant. Observations have been made in environments where the people observed are aware of the purpose of my presence (Teorell & Svensson 2007:88).

1.7.3 Assessment of community resilience
The following section clarifies how the informal practice of restorative justice is assessed in order to see in what ways, if any, it can be connected to community resilience. The section is therefore connecting the theoretical framework to the methodical procedure, supporting the foundation on which the semi-structured interview questions were built on. The themes and questions for the interviews were based on the theory of community resilience. By merging
questions of the practice of restorative justice with the theory of community resilience a possible link was investigated and explored. Community resilience was undertaken from a human activity perspective, permitting elaboration of the theory beyond “undue concern with how those meanings correspond to known physical properties or laws” (Norris et. al 2007:128).

Based on the theoretical framework, community resilience has been split over four realms based on Norris et al. (2013) and Steiner et al. (2016) main assumptions and categorisation (see figure 1). Each realm includes the main competences as described in the theoretical framework. In reality these realms and competences are intertwined and interdependent, however categorising them serves the purpose of making them more assessable. This does indeed pose a problem to reliability as indications of community resilience in the informal practice may correspond to several aspects. However, in order to structure the analysis the use of an analytical scheme (figure 1) was considered to be crucial. The analysis as well as the interview guide for the semi-structured interviews was based on the four realms in figure 1. Interview guides are found in appendix 3 and 4.

![Community resilience diagram](image)

*Figure 1 is based on the main assumptions of community resilience theory in order to give a structured and a more comprehensive overview of the main competences and indications of community resilience (Berggrund 2016. Based on Norris et al. 2007 and Steiner et al. 2016)*
1.7.3.1 Social capital

Questions for the realm social capital were designed based on the three central capacities in order to create a better understanding of these and what they mean in a Kenyan context. This clarifies how the different skills are interpreted, thus increasing transparency as the informants were allowed to uncover preconceived ideas and notions. Sense of community was not included in the battery of questions – the linkage is thought to be clarified in the questions regarding community competence and in the more general questions about the practice. Moreover, place attachment was not incorporated, as it was not found to be relevant in the practice.

1.7.3.2 Community competence

The realm of community competences includes three central skills. Questions firstly aimed to clarify how “community” is perceived – in the majority of the interviews leading to a discussion about restorative justice’s relation with the individual and the community within the local context. Questions regarding collective action and decision-making addressed how the practice identifies problems and solutions. Informants were also able to evaluate what aspects had been successful and what aspects posed challenges within the organisation as well as with the practice. In addition, questions aimed to elucidate participation in the practice in order to see how collective the practice of restorative justice is. The skill of collective efficacy and empowerment were operationalized into questions regarding conflicts in the practice. The purpose was to highlight how the practice of restorative justice may overbridge differences in a community thus increase the effectiveness of organised community action. Additionally general questions about the practice were thought to reveal how community engagement perhaps can lead to empowerment and a trust in community action.

1.7.3.3 Information & communication

Lastly, the realm of information and communication was explored through questions regarding narratives, rituals and information sharing. The narrative questions intended to investigate how the informal practice of restorative justice, which includes the sharing of stories, affect people and how the sharing of stories approaches community’s understanding of violence. Due to the specific local context, a focus on stories of violence was found appropriate. Moreover, the process of sharing information, trusted sources of information and information network were investigated. The questions were intentionally kept general as the connection between restorative justice and this realm was unclear.
1.7.4 Ethical considerations

Studying the informal practice of restorative justice demands an understanding that the practice touches upon sensitive matters such as ethnic violence. Thus a sensible and empathic tone has been established throughout the interviews and informants have been informed about the objective with the study as well as been granted anonymity if so wished (Teorell & Svensson 2013:21). Informants were also informed of their right to not answer questions or to terminate the interview at any time (Teorell & Svensson 2007:89-90; Bryman 2001:301).

Despite the establishment of an empathic tone, the researcher shall remain objective by addressing ambiguities or contradictions during interviews (Kapiszewski et al. 2015:224). Furthermore, the sustentation of an objective approach may be challenged by what can be seen as unintentional influence from the researcher on the informants. Informants may feel that the researcher is searching for a specific answer, an unintentional consequence of that the researcher has to steer the interview. The risk of informants possibly wanting to depict the practice as more positive than it may be is also an factor in informants wanting to “satisfy” the researcher, this is further discussed in chapter 4.0 Discussion. The awareness of that respondents are answering questions in their specific local context is crucial – what is considered “normal” or “fair” is influenced by the local and cultural setting. In order to clarify this, increasing the validity and objectivity, respondents were encouraged to give examples (Kapiszewski et al 2015).

1.8. Material

Material was collected via on-the-spot observations, semi-structured interviews and a literature review. The initial plan was to base the study on a single project at an organisation working with restorative justice in rural Kenyan communities. Due to unexpected changes of circumstances in the field, the study had to be replanned. Instead of focusing on one organisation a specific geographical area was chosen: Nakuru County. This choice was partly done because of personal safety reason and partly because of the areas ethnic composition and conflicts. Material collected from the northern parts of Kenya could possibly have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the process but due to the current security situation this was not possible (Chopra 2008). The geographical base for the interviews has been in Nakuru, the largest city in the area. Interviews have also been conducted in Nairobi with practitioners having ties to Nakuru County, in order to get sufficient amount of data. In addition, several
interviews with people that have experience from the field has been performed in order to
gain an even deeper understanding of the practice and specific context. A full list and short
presentation of informants is found in appendix 1.

Furthermore, a focus group was held in the rural village of Banita in Nakuru County. The
focus group included five community elders from different ethnic groups including the two
main groups Kikuyu and Kalejin. The use of a focus group was useful as it highlighted how
interaction between participants materialised in addition to a clarification of power-dynamics
within the practice. It also provided an important realisation of the limits with the informal
practice of restorative justice and its connection to community resilience (Kapiszewski et al.
2015:194). Interview guide for the focus group is found in appendix 4.

1.8.1 Selection of informants
A form of snowball sampling was used in order to select informants. By reaching out to
relevant people working with projects related to restorative justice in Nakuru initial contact
was made with three informants. These informants worked in different ways with the practice
of restorative justice, including non-governmental work and independent researchers. After
conducting interviews with them, they gave support in accessing other relevant informants. In
order to ensure validity and reliability the selection of key informants was based on a number
of criterions deriving from research on restorative justice presented in chapter 1.5.2
Restorative justice. These criterions can be found in appendix 2 and key informants are
marked with an asterisk in appendix 1. Without the use of a modified snowball sampling it
would have been challenging to reach informants such as community elders but also
facilitators working in the field (Teorell & Svensson 2013:86-87; Cohen & Areili 2011).
Snowball sampling does however pose challenges to representatively as it prohibits a random
selection of informants from the field, potentially leading to a bias in the result. In order to
limit this parallel snowball networks were used (Cohen & Arielli 2011:428).
2.0 Background

2.1 Conflicts in Nakuru County

Nakuru\(^3\), part of the Rift Valley area in western Kenya, was before colonialism populated by pastoral communities of diverse ethnic setup. The colonial rule did however force these pastoral groups away and came to bring in labour from other ethnic groups (Wairimu Nderitu 2014:8; Interview Justus Kinuya 30/11/16). This caused ethnic tensions as groups originally living in the area perceived their land to be occupied and stolen. After the end of colonial rule, groups that had been forced away could return resulting in growing ethnic tensions and sporadically erupted violence. The political development in Kenya fuelled the conflict: the “ethnicisation” of Kenyan politics led to that politicians in office favoured their own ethnicity leading to increased ethnic antagonism. This has been, and still is, manifested in “politicization of perceptions of economic exploitation, exclusion and unequal access to resources and opportunities” (Wairimu Nderitu 2014:10). Additionally, communities living in the area before colonial rule has repeatedly expressed that the historical injustices caused by colonial rule, have not been compensated or attended to (Wairimu Nderitu 2014:10-12).

During the post-election in 2007, violence hit Nakuru County hard. The largest town Nakuru experienced machete attacks and petrol bombs. The surrounding countryside experienced similar attacks but also sexual violence mainly against women and children. Human Rights Watch does also report that forced circumcising of men took place, in some cases using cut glass (Human Rights Watch 2016b:51; Waki Report 2008:97-113). Furthermore, private and official properties were destroyed such as houses, schools and health centres. In the Nakuru county, over 200 people were killed and many more were physically and physiologically injured (Waki Report 2008).

2.2 Traditional justice practices in modern Kenya

The legal system in Kenya is pluralistic, meaning several systems of law coexist and intermingle. After the end of the colonial rule traditional justice practices were intentionally

\(^3\) Today Nakuru county is populated mainly by the ethnic groups Kikuyu and Kalejin. Kalejin is the largest community in the area. Moreover the ethnic groups Luo, Luhyia, Kamba, Meru and Kisii populate the area. The county has approximately 1.5 million inhabitants, the main city is Nakuru (County Government of Nakuru)
integrated with the formal justice system introduced by the British. This lead to that the use of traditional practices was somewhat formalised. However this resulted in a minimisation of the traditional systems, often deeply rooted in communities. Despite not being recognised informal (i.e. not recognised by the formal system) traditional practices are still used, especially in rural areas. Reasons for using traditional justice practices vary but one of the most important factors is believed to be the lack of access to formal justice. This includes both the expansiveness of the formal system as well as physical accessibility, as courts often are located in urban centres out of reach for inhabitants in rural areas (Kinama 2015; Tobiko 2013).

2.2.1 Informal restorative justice in Nakuru
The informal use of restorative justice practices studied in Nakuru derives from the traditional justice systems that are in place and used within the local context. Some of these practices vary between different ethnic groups, already have some restorative measures (Interview Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16). The practices of restorative justice address both disputes within communities of different ethnic setup and also in conflicts within communities that are ethnic homogenous. Offences handled ranges from land issues, cattle rustling to direct physical violence. All practices studied have mechanisms for addressing historical injustices. The practices studied are based on a number of criterions resting upon central values of restorative justice. These criterions include having victim and offender present during the process and dialogue taking place between the two. Criterions are found in appendix 2.
3.0 Findings & analysis

The informal practice of restorative justice in the rural Nakuru area is supported and organised by local non-governmental organisations (NGO). These NGOs work with different community-restoring projects such as agricultural education, disaster relief and the practice of restorative justice. The interviews and observations have not revealed how communities are chosen to participate in restorative justice projects. The key informants work with communities of different ethnic setup and aim their restorative justice practices to deal with ethnic adversaries.

The NGOs provide facilitators to the communities participating in establishing the informal practice of restorative justice. The facilitators function as a neutral and coordinating part between different ethnic groups within communities. As communities often are deeply shattered the NGOs introduce the informal practice of restorative justice by a starting workshop or closely monitored meeting where community members from different ethnic groups can participate. Workshops or meetings can take up to 3-4 days and does in all cases studied allow for the different groups to tell their stories of historical and current injustices. The practice in itself is voluntary; the interviews do however disclose that elders’ participation is fundamental. Hence NGOs have to ensure that elders are involved if the practice is to be introduced at all. Moreover compensation is also discussed in these initial meetings with help of the facilitators. After this primary workshop or meeting the facilitators encourage and support communities to set up structures from where they can continue the use of restorative justice. This support is often given to elders’ as to their position in the communities. Support can include anything from the facilitators attending community meetings, connecting elders from different ethnic groups or holding additional workshops.

3.1 Social capital

The informal practice of restorative justice has enabled restitution of social capital in aspects of network organisations, social support citizen participation and sense of community.

3.1.1 Network organisations

The informal practice of restorative justice has large influence on the network structure in the rural areas of Nakuru County. The practice has created a platform in the communities from which crimes and injustices can be addressed. This platform is composed of community
members having a structured way to call for community meetings when they feel that injustices have to be dealt with. The foundation of this platform consists of the elders from the different ethnic groups within communities along with other key members of society, such as church leaders. This platform facilitates a general dialogue and interaction between different ethnic groups within communities. Even though this may not be a network of organisations, the development falls under this category as the practice assists linking of important actors within a community. The creation of the platform is considered to be one of the main impacts restorative justice has had on community resilience, as other aspects of oftentimes build on this (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 1/12/16; Focus group 2/11/16).

The formation of a platform for dialogue between different ethnic groups has created a structure from which interaction is facilitated. The support of NGOs and facilitators is examined to have made interaction between ethnic groups possible. This is seen to heighten community resilience as it offers a way and purpose of building network structures between different ethnic groups. This structure helps communities to resolve matters and absorb external and internal provocations away from the formal justice system, which is described as both corrupt and slow:

*Restorative justice becomes a quick vehicle because they sit and negotiate so they will be able to live together… that sense of immediacy is of critical importance to the Maasai and the Pokot in the location that we visited [Lake Elmentaita in Nakuru county]*

(Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/11/16)

Understanding elders’ influence on communities is vital – elders are representatives for the ethnic group and have a large normative influence on his or her group. Elders are perceived to have wisdom and bear the linkage to the community ancestors something that is important to (rural) communities in Kenya (Interview Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Justus Kinuya 30/11/16). They often function as spiritual leaders for the community and the trust in elders is high: “They are opinion-shapers. When they speak the earth shakes” (Interview Imara 01/11/16). Imara (pseudo), a restorative justice facilitator for the Catholic Church in Nakuru, claims that the network of elders and key members of society have eased early detection and mitigation of problems:
What they do is they summon the community for a meeting called a baraza. Meaning all the people living in that community are there. Then they are told of the news; a stolen cow, a lost child, a lost husband, a lost wife. Or a child has been found in the community, of which they don’t know the owner. So that if the owner is around they can come out and take what belongs to them.

(Interview Imara 01/11/16)

This may appear as a small transformation, however the ethnic division in Kenya is substantial and issues like a lost child or stolen cow have historically been reason enough to spark violence in communities (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/11/16). The enablement of calling for common barazas is truly important for early detection and mitigation of matters that, if left unresolved, could turn into much larger issues. Hence the informal practice of restorative justice has, by enabling the platform for dialogue, enhanced communities’ ability to absorb and adapt to changes and problems. The network structure does however emphasise an unequal power dynamics present in rural communities, further discussed in chapter 3.1.3 Citizen participation & sense of community.

3.1.2 Social support

The informal practice of restorative justice has clear ties to social support. Several informants emphasise that the practice is essential for the restoration of social capital in rural communities. Jamani (pseudo), a restorative justice facilitator from Anglican Development Service, stresses that violence and ethnic division in the Nakuru communities have severely affected community members’ access to social support mechanisms. These support mechanism includes emotional, economic and physical aspects (Interview Jamani 02/11/16). An example of this comes from the community Banita, where less powerful groups were, because of the ethnic divisions, deprived of access to the market, schools and hospitals. As people in the rural and often poverty-stricken areas depend upon being able to sell and, more importantly, trade goods with each other, the inability to access markets had devastating economic consequences for community members (interview Jamani 02/11/16; Focus group 02/11/16). The informal practice of restorative justice has helped communities partly overcome these ethnic divisions and has led to that all parts of the community can access facilities without feeling threatened (Interview Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Focus group 02/11/16). The Banita community elder Reverend Leonard Edward Amboka confirms how
the informal practice of restorative justice has indeed had an impact on social support. He describes that during the conflicts in 2007/2008, or as he refers to it “the war”, the different ethnic groups in Nakuru could not share common facilities such as schools or markets. This severely weakened the ethnic groups of less power in the area – he describes that the use of restorative justice allowed a forum, managed by NGO facilitators, where elders could meet and discuss matters of the conflict. During the focus group it becomes clear that the conflicts in 2007/2008 bring forth emotions regarding historical injustices that fuelled the conflict. The group refers to how the Kalenjin historically have been privileged and how this has and still is fuelling the conflict (Field notes 02/11/16). The restorative justice forums have however allowed for the elders to bring up such concerns as well as contemporary issues, allowing for a feeling of disclosure and restitution (Focus group 02/11/16). The elder Rev. Leonard Amboka describes how this has permitted restitution of social support:

…there is a big difference from the time the community was at war and this time [when using restorative justice] because right now people are together, people’s children are able to attend school with different tribes. The hospital is one for the entire community, the church also has different tribes of the members and the market includes about five counties and people interact without a problem.

(Focus group Rev. Leonard Edward Amboka 02/11/16)

Nevertheless, restorative justice is far from flawless - it has not been able to settle all conflicts in the area. Land allocation remains a pressing issue keeping the Banita community from reaching peace and a fully sustainable community climate. Further discussed in chapter 4.0 Discussion.

Informants testify that the practice of restorative justice in Nakuru communities includes psychosocial support in form of trauma healing. Trauma healing is done in several ways such as through drama, facilitated discussion sessions and psychological support and training. Trauma healing is seen as a ground from where reconciliation or more comprehensive and stable peace can be built: “We call it trauma healing or trauma awareness. Then after that, that is where we see the possibility of reconciliation between the two warring groups” (Interview Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16).
The actual emotional social support has strong ties to the aspect of perceived social support. When asking informants of social capital and its connection to restorative justice, the importance of “neighbours” is repeatedly brought up (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/10/16; Jamani 02/10/16; Justus Kinyua 30/11/16; Focus group 02/11/16). As the theory of community resilience suggests, received and perceived social support is connected in the case of restorative justice in Nakuru (Norris et al. 2007; Steiner et al. 2016). Interviews conducted show that the improved relationships between neighbours that the restorative justice practice contribute to have a great impact on perceived social support, which creates stability and resilience in the communities. In order to understand why informants might stress the relationship with ones neighbour it is important to note that the Kenyan society is largely based on collectivistic norms and commitment but especially loyalty to the community is central (Interview Imara 01/11/16; David Zarembka 07/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16). Imara further pinpoints the importance with the relationship with one’s neighbour:

_Ebba: What does restorative justice do for community members?_  
_Imara: You can choose your friends, but not your neighbours. If God blesses me today and I am blessed with money and buy a shamba [plot of land] and put up a house I don’t know who will buy land next to me. It might be my enemy or someone who in the future I will be in conflict with…_  
(Interview Imara 01/11/16)

Disruptions and ethnic violence are destructive to perceived social support. Both Jamani and Imara describes that a disruption in the relationship between neighbours of different ethnicity lowers perceived social capital but also community resilience as it creates distrust and concerns within the community making them more vulnerable to new political provocation (Interview Jamani 02/11/16; Imara 01/11/16). The informal practice of restorative justice does offer an opportunity to bring neighbours together, allowing them to sit down supported by key leaders in the communities as well as facilitators. By addressing both historic and contemporary injustices between ethnic communities, trust can be (re)established. This trust enables members of community to peacefully address each other without resorting to violence also knowing that community members are there as social support.

In brief, the informal practice of restorative justice appears to facilitate for an enhancement of received social support. More importantly restorative justice is described to have a truly and
significant role in perceived social support. The informal practice of restorative justice allows neighbours and people of different ethnic affiliation, living in the same community, to address both historical and contemporary injustices and problems. This creates a new form of peaceful opportunity for dialogue where tensions and issues can be resolved before erupting, allowing for communities to share common facilities and to have access to social support systems. David Zarembka, founder and coordinator of the Great African Lakes Initiative, recapitulates how restorative justice can bring communities back together and how this is related to community resilience as it helps communities to handle things so they do not get out of hand, destroying social capital:

…”conflicts are going to rise one way or another, by chance or by politics or whatever and you need to put that community back together so that instead of a conflict escalating and to violence, and people being killed or houses burned down or cattle stolen or whatever, that there are people in the community that from both sides that work together, to keep things from getting out of hand.

(Interview David Zarembka 07/11/16)

Informants do however struggle to give a satisfactory explanation of how social support is made available to all members of society. It seems as though the informal practice of restorative justice takes into little account how different members of society may be vulnerable in different ways, therefore requiring different forms of social support. Moreover, the issue of informants wanting to give a positive picture of the practice linger making it problematic to give a fully convincing picture between the practice and community resilience.

3.1.3 Citizen participation & sense of community

Citizen participation was found to have very little connection to the practice of restorative justice. The influence located was however found to have an ambiguous impact on the community, discussed below. Furthermore, sense of community is highly related to the practice. It is briefly discussed in the chapter below, but is evident throughout the analysis.

The informal practice of restorative justice in Nakuru is shown in its very essence enable citizen participation during the processes of accountability i.e. when a crime has been conducted and the aggrieved and offender meet. This allows community members to voice what they think is unjust, creating a feeling of entitlement trough truth telling and
compensation (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Focus group 02/11/16). This is sometimes done in larger groups where large parts of a community can voice both present and historical injustices (Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16).

The practice of restorative justice partly functions as an enabler for citizen participation. Rev. Leonard Edward Amboka gives the example of how restorative justice has allowed for community members to participate in common religious activities despite what ethnic group they belong to: “…The hospital is one for the entire community, the church also has different tribes of the members and the market includes about five counties and people interact without a problem” (Focus group Rev. Leonard Edward Amboka 02/11/16). The involvement in religious activities does create grass root level involvement in the community. Nonetheless, the citizen participation is understood to be endorsed by the community elders (Field notes 02/11/16). Thus, the informal practice of restorative justice and its link to citizen participation is found somewhat conditioned. Even though the participation in church activities does strengthen grass roots to engage in community activities forming structures for interaction, restorative justice seems to bear very little power to truly engage citizens on its own. Rather, the practice works through creating an environment where communities under an elder’s command can resolve matters that enables citizen participation.

The link between the elders’ mechanism and citizen participation raises a question about power dynamics and the informal practice of restorative justice. Elders and community key-members possess great power over the process of informal restorative justice. This makes the citizen participation bounds to restorative justice questionable, as the only certain members of the society are able to pull the wires (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16). Nevertheless, elders are deeply respected and cherished in communities and often seen as the foremost representatives, making their participation essential in order to create a sustainable sense of community. Vincent Kiplagat, a restorative justice programme director and facilitator, describes how elders can help the process, making it smoother but also facilitating community participation that may be hard otherwise:

And that is why restorative justice requires truth telling. And that is why community participation is important. That is why elders come in handy. For example if I say this is my land and someone else says it is theirs because they know the history of the land it reduces the stubbornness.
As elders are seen as representatives and because of Kenyan communities being collectivistic rather than individualistic, elders hold a rare power to influence and create a strong sense of community. This is especially powerful when elders from different ethnic groups within the same community engage and reunite allowing the whole community to work together. This enables community resilience as it makes communities able to absorb and transform political provocations, as structures for both mitigation and dialogue are in place. Conversely, the very same mechanism is in its rigidity obstructing true citizen participation and also community resilience as it conditions and limit citizen initiatives and ideas making them depended upon elders’ engagement.

3.2 Community competence
The sphere of community competence includes collective action and decision-making as well as collective efficacy and empowerment. All the subthemes can be linked to the informal process of restorative justice.

3.2.1 Collective action and decision-making
Collective action and decision making is shown to be essential in the practice. The informal practice of restorative justice has allowed trauma, caused by ethничal violence, to be voiced. This is seen as the first step in order to address the underlying problems and is thus an important part of problem identification, central to collective and decision-making (Norris et al. 2007:141; Steiner et al. 2016:4). Emerging from the interviews were notions around how experiences of violence had been somewhat taboo to speak about.

Things happened, bad things. Children were raped, women were raped in front of their own husbands and children, young boys were killed even at the age of one month as long as you are a man and have been born. Things happened. It was like a hell in Kenya. People could not even speak about what happened.

(Interview Imara 01/11/16)

This can be related to what theorist Tankink and theorist Magak et al. describe in the concept of "a culture of silence" (see Tankink 2004; Magak et al. 2015). This empirical finding goes beyond what the theory of resilience prescribed, and was not something explicitly asked for in
the interviews. However, it is worth mentioning because the sharing of stories subject to this culture of silence appears to have a restorative effect on communities and is thus relevant to community resilience. The informal practice of restorative justice is proved to offer a setting where stigmatized stories can be heard in a structured and organised way. This is also described to offer a feeling of community and belonging. This does not mean that all stories and experiences are unproblematic to share. Experiences of rape or sexual violence were expressed to still be taboo and something that the practice struggled to deal with thus limiting the practice impact on community resilience. Additionally, sharing of stories connects to an enhancement of sense of community, which is important for community resilience: *The sharing of testimonies is very key; because this helps people to understand that they are not alone in the journey, the struggle, of forgiving or asking for forgiveness*” (Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16).

Sharing of testimonies offers a fundamental foundation for addressing core problems in communities: the ethnic resentments and violence. In order to identify historical and present injustices it appears to be important to break the culture of silence (see Tankink 2004):

> ...If you keep this [the violence] secret in your heart it will burn you down they might kill you. You know, if you keep the bad thing in your heart; for example, I keep something bad in my heart against you and every day I see you I get scared, you get scared.
>
> (Interview Imara 01/11/16)

Many communities have had ethnic conflicts for decades, and preconceptions and prejudices about other ethnic groups are explained to restrict reconciliation and the fostering of peace. David Zarembka gives the example of how historical injustices still affects communities:

> There was a massacre there [the town Limuru] during the MauMau times in the 1950s. People there are still divided into two groups depending on what side they were on...if you need to buy some sugar from the duka [shop] you go to the person from your side and not the person from the other side and this is you know, 60 years ago...
>
> (Interview David Zarembka 07/10/16)
The informal practice of restorative justices is found to help communities to voice and address historical injustices, thus creating historical connectedness and apprehension. This appears to be important to community resilience as it helps address root causes of problems by breaking a culture of silence. In these cases, concrete compensation may not be possible, given that injustices happened long time ago. Instead compensation can be received in form of recognition of what happened from all parties. Despite that the platform for dialogue, discussed in chapter 3.1.1 Networked organisations, builds on a somewhat inequitable power-relationship it does indeed offer a forum for inhabitants in the rural areas to tell their story and indicate problems. As the “culture of silence” is persistent throughout the rural communities this platform is very important. The informal practice of restorative justice in Nakuru is shown to function as a counter-force to the culture of silence, allowing people to raise their voices and address current violence, as well as historic division to identify both problems and solutions (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Justus Kinyua 30/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16).

Lastly interviews showed dubious tendencies on to what extent the whole community is included in the process. The practice in itself is voluntarily. Moreover, many communities in Nakuru are poor and as a consequences time and means (in form of transport and loss of income) to participate in meetings may be limited, especially for women (field notes 02/11/16). The interviews did not provide sufficient information on who can participate and raise their voices. However, there are clear indications that the whole of community is not involved, which means that the effects of restorative justice are reduced as the practice has difficulties to be shared broadly by the whole community.

3.2.2 Collective efficacy and empowerment

The practice of restorative justice is strongly connected to collective efficacy and empowerment. The whole essence of the informal practice of restorative justice is to engage communities and different ethnic groups in conflict resolution. This process of collective efficacy and its limits, especially concerning the issue of who can participate, is discussed in length in previous chapters. Instead this chapter will explain how the engagement of different ethnic groups leads to a trust in community, which may empower individuals to take action in order to prevent future crisis. This may also function as encouragement for individuals to engage in the community, thus leading to enablement of community resilience.
Firstly, the informal practice of restorative justice is shown to lead to a feeling of accountability and a sense of that community action may have an effect community life and the relationships to (ethnic) neighbours (Interview Jamani 02/11/16; Imara 01/11/16; Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16). The belief is, that if the whole of the community works together, it will create a sense of action and capacity to help themselves but also to help other communities nearby, in order to create a more stable situation. Dr. Allan Waihumbu, a programme director and restorative justice facilitator, shares a story about a community, where the members were from different ethnic groups, at their own initiative spread the practice of restorative justice in order to help them heal, but also to create a stronger inter-communal relationship:

So these people that we trained they called us. And we sat in a meeting together and they were concerned about the people fighting up there [in another community on the mountain]. So, they devised strategies – we were only listening – they devised strategies and they went and met leaders from the top there, especially church leaders because they had a big influence up there – they brought the church leaders together and they recommended a training so they came here. The church leaders came here – we trained them and now they are spearheading up there

(Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16)

Consequently the informal practice of restorative justice appears to help communities with a diverse ethnic setup to form structures from which new initiatives can be realised which is seen as a form of empowerment. These activities also set communities up for being able to resolve and mitigate sparks of conflict that without any attention may turn into fires of violence: “Restorative justice builds broken relationship so next time we will know how to resolve it without resulting to violence” (interview Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16).

3.3 Information & communication

The informal justice has through the use of narratives and therapeutic storytelling been shown to increase community resilience. The practice has in some instances established information networks from where trusted information can be communicated.

3.3.1 Information networks & communication of information

So these people that we trained they called us. And we sat in a meeting together and they were concerned about the people fighting up there [in another community on the mountain]. So, they devised strategies – we were only listening – they devised strategies and they went and met leaders from the top there, especially church leaders because they had a big influence up there – they brought the church leaders together and they recommended a training so they came here. The church leaders came here – we trained them and now they are spearheading up there

(Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16)

Consequently the informal practice of restorative justice appears to help communities with a diverse ethnic setup to form structures from which new initiatives can be realised which is seen as a form of empowerment. These activities also set communities up for being able to resolve and mitigate sparks of conflict that without any attention may turn into fires of violence: “Restorative justice builds broken relationship so next time we will know how to resolve it without resulting to violence” (interview Vincent Kiplagat 14/11/16).

3.3 Information & communication

The informal justice has through the use of narratives and therapeutic storytelling been shown to increase community resilience. The practice has in some instances established information networks from where trusted information can be communicated.

3.3.1 Information networks & communication of information
Interviews and observations have given a shattered picture of how the informal practice of restorative justice affects information networks and communication of information. Some connectivity is found, mainly in the context to aspects discussed in chapter 3.1 Social capital, regarding the platform for dialogue. As the theory determines availability to accurate information in times of disruption, it is essential to community resilience. Many informants note that misinformation about crimes or injustices previously led to an acceleration of the violence between ethnic groups when injustices have been conducted over ethnic boundaries, confirming the theory (Interview David Zarembka 07/11/16; Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16). The use of committees of elders and key members from different ethnic groups has the ability to conclude matters and injustices, communicating them to communities and thereby reducing disinformation (interview Imara 01/11/16; field notes 01/11/16-02/11/16). Interviews have not shown any clear connection between this aspect and the practice of community resilience, thus no conclusion can be drawn based upon this study.

3.3.2 Narratives & rituals
Further addressing the culture of silence, narratives are shown to enable resilience by allowing disclosure of negative narratives and the creation of new ones. Symbols and rituals are found to be essential in the rural communities often functioning as an assurance and a justification for the mending of relationships.

The informal practice of restorative justice in Nakuru appears to have two mechanisms when it comes to the use of narratives: the sharing of testimonials and storytelling. Firstly, restorative justice does always include sharing of testimonies, i.e. statements of what people in a community have experienced in the form of injustices. Sharing of testimonies is described to have a healing dimension as it helps community members to break the culture of silence and create a shared understanding of events: The sharing of testimonies is very key; because this helps people to understand that they are not alone in the journey, the struggle, of forgiving or asking for forgiveness” (Interview Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16). Moreover, narratives are found, with the support of facilitators, to assist the creation of sustainable narratives of justice and unity between ethnic groups (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16; Imara 01/11/16; Jamani 02/11/16; Justus Kinyua 30/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16). As described ethnic division within communities and the stereotypical narrative used to describe “the other” have accelerated the violence:
You know most of the time there are stories that go around; “Oh the Kikuyus are like that because they are this and that – stereotypes. Some of the things that accelerated the violence are those things. People will believe that the other group are the aggressors or perpetrators. First of all, you have to demystify that.
(Interview Justus Kinyua 30/11/16)

By demystifying stereotypes, by letting testimonies be heard, new narratives of unity and forgiveness can be formed. Letting offenders and victims share their testimonies under supervision is found to allow sustainable narratives to be created. Through this, communities are found to be more resilient as provocations, both internal and external, are more easily absorbed, as new narratives have allowed for disclosure as well as facilitating a mourning process.

This helps communities interpret and process past prejudices and allows for community resilience to be heightened as it discloses destructive narratives. New events or provocations can then be interpreted in a new way. When speaking about the conflicts still remaining within the Nakuru community of Banita, the elder John Ngàng’a Nejnga points out that despite the issues that are still affecting the community the community of Banita is now seen as one: “And yet we are saying that we are one” (Focus Group John Ngàng’a Nejnga 02/11/16). The narrative of being one seems to function as an alternative to stories of ethnic difference and antagonism. This is further supported by Imara: “What we call coming together as the offender and the victim develop a common ground for the purpose of being one as a nation” (Interview Imara 01/11/16).

The risk of forcing forgiveness or reconciliation was found to be present mainly because of the unequal power relationship discussed in previous chapters. The programs are however aware of this. Dr. Allan Waihumbu describes how a government programme was started in Nakuru:

Government came with a programme and that was: you sit in a meeting, and people facilitate dialogue and people talk then they are told okay let say: forgive each other … When people come such meetings they say: “it was a meeting and it doesn’t have any meaning.
(Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16)
This does not eliminate risk of false forgiveness or false remorse but informants have shown an understanding of the problem and thereby decreasing the risk. However the lack of formal accountability and justice is highly worrying from a human rights perspective but also from a sustainable peace perspective.

Secondly, narratives have been used in the sense of storytelling in order to create, or restore a sense of community, connected to the realm of social capital. Dr. Allan Waihumbu and Imara describe how biblical stories are used to create a narrative that communities feel familiarity with and thus have easier to connect to (Interview Imara 01/11/16; Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16). Storytelling, proverbs and tales play an important role in the Kenyan society. The use of religious stories appears to help create a context where testimonies of either perpetrated or experienced injustices can be shared. The religious stories operationalize the values and actions of the practice, making them more approachable. An example is how compensation, a part of restorative justice, is operationalized and made understandable through a biblical story:

We use the model of Zacchaeus in the Bible who was a tax-collector and when he met Jesus after his experience and transformation with Jesus then he was able to declare from within himself without being coerced that he will return to people what he has taken… asking about forgiveness of what I did to you it is also proper that what I took from you, I should be able to give it back.

(Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16)

In the material from Dr. Allan Waihumbus’s restorative justice program, drama and storytelling are central which is letting the participants use religious stories to question the common understanding of ethnicity as a curse (Le Rucher Ministries 2011:19-20). This lets participants, through acting and storytelling, address historical understanding of ethnicity in a way that is more familiar to them. This appears to increase community resilience as it helps individuals within communities, to transform their view and experience of ethnicity and violence through mediums that are familiar to them. Acting does also allow communities to tell stories in a more fictive way, which may be an easier way to address the culture of silence (Interview Dr. Allan 01/12/16; see Tanink 2004; Magak et al. 2015).
Lastly, rituals play an important role in both storytelling and sharing of testimonials. Rituals seem to be used in order to honour and mend ethnic groups within a community together. The theory prescribes that a continuance of community rituals may enhance resilience as it creates a sense of normality (Norris et al. 2007). In ethnic conflicts within communities, sharing of rituals between two ethnic groups appears to show honour and disclosure:

So, when for example the Pocott agreed and finished and engage to an agreed solution to a situation there will be some religious rights and practices that will be performed. It would have to do with a killing of an animal and the use of either the meat and the blood, or the meat alone or the blood alone for certain rights which show we have now concluded the matter and we are bound on this basis to uphold justice with our fellow [ethnic] neighbours.

(Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/10/16)

The theme of disclosure and rituals are closely tied together and appear to be important in the rural communities. The usage of rituals such as the one described by Kisuke Ndiku, appears to create closure to conflicts allowing transformation beyond conflict. Rituals are not only present-time events, but connect to sacred meanings and ancestral practice that bears an importance that cannot be expressed directly. Rituals within the restorative justice practice appear to be an elusive way of communicating what cannot be said, and seem to facilitate healing and tribute to disclosure of conflict. This seems to be of essence to make communities resilient at closure of past historical injustices allowing new events to be interpreted in a way that does not connect to past injustices, something that repeatedly has accelerated violence (Interview Kisuke Ndiku 26/101/16; Imara 01/11/16; see Magak et al. 2015).
4.0 Discussion

In following chapter, informants’ general view on the informal practice of restorative justice as well as its limitations and possible paths of development, are discussed. The chapter is deliberately not named “recommendations”, as this is not the purpose. Rather the purpose is to discuss and accumulate concrete statements and elusive information to reveal how the practice is related to, and in some cases restricted by, the formal justice system. This insight is important as it affects the informal practice of restorative justice’s effect on the enablement of community resilience. Suggestions are made on how a merging of the two, the formal and informal justice practices, are seen to be of essence for further heightening of community resilience. The chapter also partly addresses the issue of that observation and interviews have confirmed the concern that key informants may have wanted to depict the practice in an exceedingly positive way. By discussing its limitations and drawbacks the chapter seeks to nuance the depiction of the practice.

Despite that the informal practice of restorative justice has connections to heightened community resilience in rural Nakuru communities the restricted access to the formal justice system is highly unsettling to communities. Restorative justice is assessed to be an alternative dispute mechanism that may be used where there are truth telling and willingness, from both victims and perpetrator, to jointly talk about events and issues. If this is lacking the practice of restorative justice becomes inadequate and informants have stressed that the formal justice system then is needed. When visiting the rural community of Banita, the community elder John Ngàng’a Nejnga stated that:

“There is peace here. Except when you talk about land. It prevails and even restorative justice is possible but when we get to the issue of land that is when the problems start… That is the only issue the government should come in and intervene, otherwise peace cannot be found at that degree we want.”

(Focus Group John Ngàng’a Nejnga 02/11/16)

Land plays a crucial role in the many rural Nakuru communities as people make a living out of farming or letting their cattle graze the land. Within the communities, land disputes have not been possible to settled with help of restorative justice, and in Banita the involvement of the government is urged for. The informal practice of restorative justice appears to have
evolved as an alternative to the flawed formal justice system. However, it is crucial to remember that many informants urge for a formal and fair governmental involvement in legal issues.

Accordingly, the informal practice of restorative justice may be seen as a reaction to a current and historically flawed and corrupt formal justice system that has eroded community resilience. The practice has allowed for the heightening of community resilience by the mechanisms described in the analysis. It has also allowed people to speak up, breaking the culture of silence, which was found evident in the interviews. Aspects, like storytelling, are important to enable community resilience, advising that in order to form a sustainable formal justice system integration of such aspects are crucial. As described in chapter 1.5 Previous Research, Leonard and Kenny claims that the “state” often is perceived to have stolen the conflict from communities (Leonard & Kenny 2014:796). In order for the state to successfully claim the conflict back from the rural Nakuru communities, measures to include restorative and traditional aspects must be taken. If this not is done, formal justice proceedings may hinder fostering of community resilience. Dr. Allan Waihumbu describes how accountability enforced by government is good, as it allows a stable and functional Kenyan state. However, the formal justice system does not address root causes, such as ethnic resentments and violence:

… we have also seen government enforced restitution in some instances – recently we had people that stole cows from one community stole from the other and the government came in and the chief of the area was forced to pay the cows to the victims. That happened and it is good. But at the end of the day it widens the gap between the two [ethnic] communities

(Interview Dr. Allan Waihumbu 01/12/16)

Some efforts to include restorative measures in the formal system has indeed been done, but are described as inadequate and inaccessible for people in rural communities (Interview Annette Mbogoh 17/11/16). In order to create sustainable community resilience, the formal justice system must include restorative measures so that root causes may be addressed and community be involved. It must also include mechanisms to ensure inclusiveness and accessibility for people in rural areas.
5.0 Conclusion

This study has been examining the question:

*In what ways, if any, can the practice of restorative justice enable the building of the social dimensions of community resilience in the rural communities in the Nakuru-County?*

By using a framework developed from the community resilience theory, the study has indeed found connectivity between the use of the ADR restorative justice and community resilience. Exploring the practice of informal restorative justice by basing questions on indications of community resilience the study has shown that the practice has allowed for rural Nakuru communities to transform beyond conflict, creating tools and mechanism to absorb and deal with issues without resorting to violence. The most important effect is found to be the creation of a platform for dialogue, from which community elders have a forum to raise concerns regarding community problems. This has allowed for early detection and mitigation of problems, but also as a foundation from which solutions to such problems can be agreed on. Moreover, the sharing of testimonies from community members, a key part of the practice, appears to break the culture of silence that has been hampering community resilience. This has created new narratives of unity, shown to be essential to the healing of trauma and restitution of the social dimension of community resilience.

Nonetheless, the field study has shown that the practice has challenges to function as an inclusive practice for all members of society. The elders’ influence makes the practice effective but does pose problems when it comes to ensuring that all members of society are heard and attended to. This partly restricts the prospects of sustainable community engagement in restorative activities as this engagement is somewhat conditioned by elders. The unequal power dynamic in the practice, caused by the elders’ influence, must however be noted to be a feature of the rural Kenyan society and not only related to the practice itself. Moreover, the possibility of informants giving a biased depiction of the practice partly limits the possibility to draw a too extensive conclusion regarding the link.

Lastly, the study has shown how unsolved historical injustices have great influence on the effectiveness of present justice efforts as well as on community resilience. In the collectivistic Kenyan society historical injustices are shown to spread through generations, influencing
contemporary communities. The practice has exposed that in order to enable the social dimension of resilience to be realised, restorative measures such as storytelling, rituals and sharing of testimonies are crucial. The study has consequently shown how a local micro initiative ties into a broader social perspective on community resilience: it has informed the community resilience field how contemporary collectivistic communities’ resilience in many cases are influenced by historical events and memories. These historical and ancestral events must be heard, shared and addressed in order to allow the restitution of community resilience. This would be an interesting starting point to conduct further research from, perhaps asking how ethnically divided post-colonial states and their formal justice systems can include and regard historical injustices in order to enable a heightening of community resilience. As the people of the rural communities in Nakuru continue their strife for justice, restoration of historical and contemporary injustices will be of highest importance, in order to create resilient communities.
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**Appendix 1 – Presentation of informants**

Dr. Allan Waihumbu is the program director Way of Peace and a facilitator within the same programme. Way of Peace is a non-governmental organization providing restorative justice workshops for Nakuru communities. Dr. Allan Waihumbu is a former employee at the Anglican Development Service and has yearlong experience as a restorative justice facilitator.

Annette Mbogoh is a Mombasa based lawyer with the non-governmental organisation Kituo Cha Sheria Legal centre that helps Kenyan citizens, often living in rural areas, to access the formal justice system.

David Zarembka is the founder and coordinator of the African Great Lakes Initiatives (AGLI). AGLI was founded in 1998 and is today an organization working with trauma healing, peace building and reconciliation. David Zarembka, originally from the USA, has lived large parts of his life in Western Kenya and has worked in several parts of the country, including Nakuru area.

Donald Thomas is a manager at Manager at Alternatives to Violence Kenya. 2016. Interview 10th of November 2016. Originally from England he now lives in Nairobi with his wife Ruth Thomas, also present during the interview. Both Donald and Ruth Thomas are engaged Quakers and is deeply involved in community development throughout Kenya.

Gabriel (pseudo) is a facilitator at Kituo Cha Sheria Legal Centre, a non-governmental legal aid centre helping Kenyan citizens to access the formal justice system. Gabriel currently works with collecting testimonials from police rape during 2007/2008.

Hezron Masitsa is the National Peacebuilding Coordinator for World Vision Kenya. World vision Kenya works with realising the sustainable development goals from the UN. Hezron Masitsa is a Quaker and has been involved in Alternatives to Violence Kenya as a facilitator and has facilitated several restorative justice processes throughout Kenya, including Nakuru County.
Imara (pseudo) is the secretary at Catholic Justice and Peace Commission Nakuru (CJPC). He also works as a facilitator in restorative justice processes that CJPC does in the Nakuru area and has several years experience working with communities that are ethnically divided.

Jamani (pseudo) is a facilitator at the Anglican Disaster Relief Nakuru (ADR). Jamani has worked with restorative justice for 6 years in the Nakuru area. She is specialized in working with economically deprived communities helping them both to develop their community economically as well as facilitating restorative justice processes.

Justus Kinyua is the program director at Anglican Disaster Relief Nakuru (ADR) and is responsible for ADR:s different programme in the region. Justus Kinyua works with developing restorative justice programmes and handle the day-to-day organization and allocation of facilitators and projects.

Kisuke Ndiku is the program director and researcher at Precise Research. Precise research undertakes peace research and conflict analysis in Kenya, especially in rural areas. Kisuke Ndiku has also worked as an informal restorative justice facilitator and is deeply passionate about peace building in Kenya. He is truly passionate about peace building and is the co-founder of the Active Non-Violence Initiative active in Kenya.

Vincent Kiplagat is the program director for the NGO Daima Initiatives for Peace (DIPAD). DIPAD works with restorative justice from a more formal perspective helping communities to perform formal justice processes in a more formal way. Vincent Kiplagat also has experience in working with restorative justice in rural communities himself.
Appendix 2 – Criterions for selection of key informants

Criterions programmes:
Programmes must:
- Include mechanism of victim and offenders to meet. If programme includes a group process both victims and perpetrators shall be present.
- Involve key members of community in the process
- Include a mechanism for compensation. This must not have to be used by shall be an option.
- Include sharing of testimonies and stories from both offender and victim
- Have no ties to the formal system

Criterions informant:
Informant must:
- Have experience or extensive knowledge from restorative justice practices Nakuru county
- Have experience from restorative justice for at least 5 years
Appendix 3 – Interview guide

Presentation of the interviewee and organisation
- Who are you?
- What NGO/organisation do you represent and what do they do?
- What is your experience in “restorative justice” field?
- What does restorative justice mean to you?
- How does your organisation or you work with “restorative justice”?

Information communication

Narratives and rituals
- How does sharing stories (of violence) affect people do you think?
- How does the restorative justice approach community’s understanding of violence?
- What role, if any, do rituals play in the practice of restorative justice?

Information networks
- Where is information about crimes within communities obtained?
  - How does restorative justice affect this process?

Community competence
- What does “community” mean in a Kenyan context?

Collective action & decision making
- What role does the “community” play in restorative justice?
- Who can engage in the restorative justice processes?
- In what ways do restorative justice identify problems and agree on solutions within the community?
- How are decisions taken within the practice of restorative justice?

Collective efficacy and empowerment
- How are conflicts between participators handled in the process of restorative justice?
Social capital

_Social support_
- What do you perceive as “social support” in a local Kenyan context?
- What is offered, if anything, to survivors in form of social and/or psychological/economic support through the practice?
- Did the participators return the practice of restorative justice for other disputes?
  o Why/Why not?

_Network structure_
- In what ways, if any, do your organisation and the programme of restorative justice work with other organisation?
  o In what way is this important?
  o What are the challenges working with other organisations?

_Citizen participation_
- Who can participate in the programme?
- How do your organisation encourage members in community to participate in the restorative justice programme? Please could you give some examples of this?
Appendix 4 – Interview guide Banita focus group

Introductory discussion: Introductory discussion will give an opportunity for each participant (responder) to introduce him/herself. Moreover, an introductory discussion will be held around the topic of what restorative justice is in the specific context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1 – Social capital</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To clarify how respondents perceive restorative justice in terms of social support to their community.</td>
<td>What can be expected in terms of social support from the practice of RJ for participators?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To clarify how sense of community is tied to restorative justice</td>
<td>How does the process of restorative justice affect the participators approach towards their own, and other communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To clarify who can participate in the process and how participators are chosen and/or informed about the process</td>
<td>How are people chosen to be a part of a restorative justice process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2 – Community competence</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To clarify how respondents work together with their communities in the restorative justice process in order to clarify how stakeholders experience the process and how they see it affecting the community.</td>
<td>What has restorative justice done for your community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is your role in your community and in the process of restorative justice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How does restorative justice affect the participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3 – Narratives</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To clarify how respondents see the sharing of stories affecting their communities and to clarify how information is shared within the communities about the process of restorative justice</td>
<td>How does sharing of stories of violence within the process of restorative justice affect your communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where can information about the process be obtained? How do you reach out to participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>